

Embodiment of Divine Knowledge in Early Judaism

This book explores the early Jewish understanding of divine knowledge as divine presence, which is embodied in major biblical exemplars, such as Adam, Enoch, Jacob, and Moses.

The study treats the concept of divine knowledge as the embodied divine presence in its full historical and interpretive complexity by tracing the theme through a broad variety of ancient Near Eastern and Jewish sources, including Mesopotamian traditions of cultic statues, creational narratives of the Hebrew Bible, and later Jewish mystical testimonies. Orlov demonstrates that some biblical and pseudepigraphical accounts postulate that the theophany expresses the unique, corporeal nature of the deity that cannot be fully grasped or conveyed in some other non-corporeal symbolism, medium, or language. The divine presence requires another presence in order to be transmitted. To be communicated properly and in its full measure, the divine iconic knowledge must be “written” on a new living “body” which can hold the ineffable presence of God through a newly acquired ontology.

Embodiment of Divine Knowledge in Early Judaism will provide an invaluable research to students and scholars in a wide range of areas within Jewish, Near Eastern, and Biblical Studies, as well as those studying religious elements of anthropology, philosophy, sociology, psychology, and gender studies. Through the study of Jewish mediatorial figures, this book also elucidates the roots of early Christological developments, making it attractive to Christian audiences.

Andrei A. Orlov is Professor of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity at Marquette University, Milwaukee, USA. He is the author of eighteen books, including *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* and *The Glory of the Invisible God: Two Powers in Heaven Traditions and Early Christology*.

Routledge Studies in the Biblical World

A Commentary on Numbers

Narrative, Ritual, and Colonialism

Pekka Pitkänen

Masculinities in the Court Tales of Daniel

Advancing Gender Studies in the Hebrew Bible

Brian Charles DiPalma

Religion, Ethnicity, and Xenophobia in the Bible

A Theoretical, Exegetical and Theological Survey

Brian Rainey

Job's Body and the Dramatised Comedy of Moralising

Katherine E. Southwood

Male Friendship, Homosociality, and Women in the Hebrew Bible

Malignant Fraternities

Barbara Thiede

Embodiment of Divine Knowledge in Early Judaism

Andrei A. Orlov

For more information about this series please visit: www.routledge.com/classical-studies/series/BIBWORLD

Embodiment of Divine Knowledge in Early Judaism

Andrei A. Orlov

First published 2022
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2022 Andrei A. Orlov

The right of Andrei A. Orlov to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-1-032-10589-5 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-10591-8 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-21610-0 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003216100

Typeset in Bembo
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Larry Hurtado, in memoriam.

And whoever seeks that he may learn this mystery, let him learn knowledge from the living creatures who are before Him – their walking, the appearance of their faces, their wings. Their walking is like the appearance of a lightning flash; a vision of them is like the vision of the rainbow in the cloud; their faces are like a vision of a bride; their wings are like the radiance of the clouds of glory.

Hekhalot Zutarti §353

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	x
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xi
Introduction	1
1 The divine image as the hypostasis of divine knowledge	27
2 The divine Face as the hypostasis of divine knowledge	83
3 The divine Name as the hypostasis of divine knowledge	112
4 The epistemology of divine presence and pseudepigraphical attribution	166
Conclusion	185
<i>Bibliography</i>	187
<i>Index</i>	206

Preface

This book was written in the Spring and Summer of 2020, during the initial stages of the coronavirus outbreak in the USA. I am thankful to the Raynor Library staff for helping me with interlibrary book loans during that difficult time of the quarantine.

I am grateful to my research assistants, Jennifer Siefken and Caleb Douglas, who worked diligently through different versions of the manuscript to help improve the text in both style and substance. Their meticulous editing has saved me from numerous errors. But all remaining mistakes are solely my own responsibility.

I would like to express my appreciation to Amy Davis-Poynter, the commissioning editor for Routledge's classics, archaeology, and biblical studies for her help, patience, and professionalism during the acquisition process.

I dedicate this book to the memory of Larry Hurtado, a scholar whose work on Jewish divine mediators and early Christology has shaped many scholarly debates mentioned in this study.

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee
Lazarus Saturday, 2021

Abbreviations

ÄAT	Ägypten und Altes Testament
AB	Anchor Bible
AGAJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
ArBib	Aramaic Bible
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research Series
BAC	Bible in Ancient Christianity
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BSJS	Brill's Series in Jewish Studies
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
<i>CBR</i>	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
CM	Cuneiform Monographs
ConBOT	Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
<i>CTR</i>	<i>Criswell Theological Review</i>
DCL	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
EJL	Early Judaism and Its Literature
<i>ErJb</i>	<i>Eranos Jahrbuch</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
<i>FJB</i>	<i>Franfurter Judaistische Beiträge</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments

GAP	Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte
GRBS	Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies
HBM	Hebrew Bible Monographs
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
ICC	International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments
<i>ITQ</i>	<i>Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBTh	Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie
JCTCRS	Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JRitSt</i>	<i>Journal of Ritual Studies</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
JSHRZ	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period</i>
JSJSS	Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period. Supplement Series
<i>JSJT</i>	<i>Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSS	Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series
<i>JSOR</i>	<i>Journal of the Society of Oriental Research</i>
JSOTSS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSS	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha. Supplement Series
<i>JSQ</i>	<i>Jewish Studies Quarterly</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LCJP	Library of Contemporary Jewish Philosophers
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NPAJ	New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis

OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumrân</i>
RGRW	Religions in the Greco-Roman World
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
<i>RRJ</i>	<i>Review of Rabbinic Judaism</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
<i>RTL</i>	<i>Revue theologique de Louvain</i>
SAALT	State Archives of Assyria Literary Texts
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBLTT	Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations
SC	Sources chrétiennes
SHR	Studies in the History of Religions
SJ	Studia Judaica
SJJTP	Supplements to the Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SJS	Studia Judaeoslavica
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SOTSMS	Society for Old Testament Study Monographs
SSEJC	Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity
SSLJM	Sources and Studies in the Literature of Jewish Mysticism
SSN	Studia Semitica Neerlandica
STAC	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SVC	Supplements to <i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
TCS	Text-Critical Studies
TED	Translations of Early Documents
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
UNT	Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
UUÅ	Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WAWSSBL	Writings from the Ancient World. Supplements Society of Biblical Literature
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ŻM	Źródła i monografie

Introduction

Divine knowledge and theophany

It is well established that the biblical patriarchs and prophets in various Jewish biblical and extra-biblical accounts gain celestial knowledge through several ways: by acquiring it through their visions, by listening to the instructions and explanations of angels and God, or by reading it from heavenly books and tablets. Meticulous records of such elaborate routines, that are used in the acquisition of divine knowledge, appear to be important in the construction of authority and the social power of these revelations. A passage found in the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (1 *Enoch* 93:2) succinctly summarises the different ways that divine knowledge is harvested. In this text the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch relays the revelations that he acquires from *the heavenly vision, the words of the holy angels, and the tablets of heaven*.¹ The references to these three sources underscore the fact that the disclosures to the patriarch were apparently given on various levels and through various means of mystical perception: seeing (a vision), hearing (oral instructions of an *angelus interpres*), and reading (the heavenly tablets). It is also possible that 1 *Enoch* 93:2 might attest to a hierarchy within the different means of mystical perception, in which a direct vision of God occupies a primary position. One can see this tendency in the idea that the deity's apparitions are the pinnacle of revealed knowledge already in the biblical materials, where, in the Book of Job, the chief protagonist of the story utters "I know" after God's theophany. Furthermore, this and other accounts attest to an ancient belief that the acquisition of divine knowledge is closely tied with the divine presence. Only when the deity is manifest can the proper grasp of the divine mysteries occur. In fact, in an ancient epistemological framework, the divine presence often equals divine knowledge.

While the scribal and sapiential routines of the biblical exemplars have received ample attention in recent years from scholars of early Judaism, the epistemological situation of the seer's visions, especially his direct visions of God, has avoided a rigorous analysis. Furthermore, some peculiar ways in which theophanic disclosures and their iconic knowledge are transmitted to various audiences not only through a seer's oral and written testimonies but also through his transformed body remain, in my opinion, understudied. Yet, these various ways in which the exemplar received and mediated theophanic knowledge to

2 Introduction

his adepts, often in peculiar cultic frameworks, might help us grasp the dynamics of the attribution of power and authority to these revelations.

While in many apocalyptic stories their exemplars routinely bring celestial knowledge to the earth through prophecies and handwritings, they also deliver another type of revelation from the upper realm, namely an *embodied* iconic knowledge about God and his glorious manifestations. This is reflected in the adepts' transformed body which emulates God's Form as he becomes His image, His Face, or an embodiment of His Name. This type of iconic revelation, transmitted through the medium of an adept's body, occurs already in the Book of Exodus where Moses carries from the holy mountain not only the tablets of the Law but also the memory of the deity's theophany reflected on his face. Brian Britt observes that

the frightening and miraculous transformation of Moses' face, and its subsequent concealment by a veil, constitute a kind of theophany. Just as the face of God is usually off-limits to Moses (with the exception of Exod 33:11 and Deut 34:10), so the face of Moses is sometimes off-limits to the people. . . . While these parallels may not bear directly on Moses' transformed face, they offer suggestive evidence that theophany and divine enlightenment can appear on the human face.²

Some biblical and pseudepigraphical accounts suggest that a theophany expresses the unique, corporeal nature of the deity that cannot be fully grasped or conveyed in some other non-corporeal symbolism, medium, or language. The divine presence requires *another presence* in order to be transmitted. To be communicated properly and in its fullest measure, the divine iconic knowledge must be "written" on a new living "body" that is able to hold the ineffable presence of God through a newly acquired ontology. The transmission of the divine presence and knowledge through a "living organism" has a paramount cultic significance. This is why in ancient Near Eastern routines of making cultic images, the deity's statue must be "brought to life" through elaborate rituals known as the "washing of the mouth" (*mīs pī*) and the "opening of the mouth" (*pīt pī*). These cryptic rites illustrate that only by a living embodiment can the fullness of the divine theophany be appropriately dispersed. In this epistemological framework, "'to know' means 'to become that same reality that is known,' to be transformed . . . into the actual object of knowledge, overcoming and removing the dichotomy between subject and object."³ Instead of carrying only a description of the theophany in his mind or his books, an adept now carries the form and the act of the theophany in his body, thus preserving both the visible and concealed aspects of the theophanic presence. Esther Hamori points out that the

physical embodiment in human theophany does not indicate the limitation of God's knowledge and power to that body. Like the metaphor which serves to organize our view but not identify a one-to-one correspondence,

the appearance of God in human theophany shows us the part of God that is like us, but does not mean that this is equal to the whole of God's nature or identity.⁴

The special mediation of divine theophanic knowledge through the exemplar's ontology has not received proper attention in scholarly literature and the cultic context of this mediation has been also neglected. Yet, this type of mediation might hold the key to many aspects of Jewish biblical and apocalyptic literature, including the riddle of pseudepigraphical attribution, since it attests to a unique epistemological situation in which the exemplar becomes a hypostasis or a personification of the divine knowledge.

The ontological transmission of heavenly knowledge does not appear to be odd or coincidental since it is closely associated with the ancient understanding of divine knowledge itself, envisioned not merely as introspection, but as a reality that is objectively present. Unfortunately, nowhere are the limits of our modern epistemological sensibilities manifested so clearly as in our misunderstanding of the ancient concept of knowledge and, more specifically, divine knowledge.⁵ However, in an ancient epistemological framework, shared both by the Greco-Roman philosophical traditions and by the Near Eastern mythological milieus, the very source of any true knowledge, including divine knowledge, was always situated in its proper abode – the upper realm.⁶ This outlook appears in the Platonic model, which postulated the existence of the noetic world of ideas, as well as in Mesopotamian, Egyptian, and Greek myths about heavenly knowledge and its otherworldly revealers, who lawfully or illegitimately brought these mysteries to humankind. It should be noted that there was no other religious epistemological model at the time when biblical and pseudepigraphical accounts were produced that construed the origin of knowledge without referring to the upper, divine realm.⁷ Michael Stone suggests that the authors of early Jewish accounts “claimed – and presumably they believed – that the teachings they propagated stemmed from the transmundane realm.”⁸

In early biblical and extra-biblical materials, divine knowledge was depicted as originating, as well as permanently and objectively existing in the heavenly realm in celestial tablets, books,⁹ or patterns.¹⁰ These heavenly media were often understood not merely as “books” or “tablets” in their conventional sense but also as attributes or parts of celestial organisms – forms, limbs, and garments of heavenly beings on which divine knowledge became permanently affixed.¹¹ Indeed, various Jewish apocalyptic and mystical accounts portray the celestial knowledge being inscribed on God's palms,¹² his throne,¹³ his celestial curtain,¹⁴ or his servants' bodies and accoutrement.¹⁵ Like with any other celestial object – God's throne, chariot, or footstool – which are not made from “earthly” materials, like wood or metal, but instead from elements of his angelic retinue, heavenly knowledge can also be written on celestial bodies instead of on paper and parchment. Furthermore, whole branches of celestial knowledge can be embodied or hypostasised in celestial beings. In some Jewish

apocalyptic materials various fields of heavenly knowledge receive their own angelic personifications. Early Jewish angelological lore reflected in the *Book of the Watchers* hints at the possibility of the embodiment of divine knowledge and divine secrets in angelic figures. In this early Enochic text each fallen Watcher's name reflects a particular field of celestial knowledge which he illicitly transmitted to humankind, signifying his role as a personification or hypostasis of such knowledge.¹⁶ Józef Milik argued that "the names of the twenty principal Watchers . . . are for the most part derived from astronomical, meteorological, and geographical terms."¹⁷ Embodiment of the divine knowledge in celestial form, of course, was not exclusively an invention of the Enochic authors. This concept was deeply rooted in Mesopotamian lore. Thus, already in Mesopotamian *apkallus* traditions, which some argue constitute the background of the Enochic Watchers traditions, one can see similar conceptual constellations. Reflecting on these similarities Amar Annus points out that

the names of many antediluvian *apkallus* are fairly transparent titles or Sumerian incipits of learned scholarly compendia, or other cuneiform series. Giving to the antediluvian sages names resembling titles of scientific treatises served the purpose of establishing the explicit connection between contemporary and primeval scholarship. . . . In comparison, the names of 20 principal Watchers in *1 Enoch* 6:7 are for the most part derived from astronomical, meteorological and geographical terms, their names being related to their areas of expertise.¹⁸

Annus further suggests that "in both cases the names of the antediluvian experts present them as *hypostases* of learned, and presumably secret, corpora."¹⁹

Furthermore, in some early Jewish sources, heavenly knowledge became openly hypostasised in otherworldly beings, including the figures of the divine Wisdom, the divine Logos, the Angel of the Lord, the Messiah, the Son of Man, and others.²⁰ These celestial figures themselves can be seen as embodied "heavenly tablets" which act as anthropomorphic deposits of celestial mysteries. Many of them will serve as important conceptual precursors for the pseudographical exemplars in their roles as the personifications of divine knowledge. In view of these influences, we should now pay closer attention to the two most important paradigmatic hypostases of knowledge in early Judaism: the divine Wisdom and the divine Logos. Before we approach these figures, a few words should be said about the terminology of "hypostasis," which will be extensively used in our study.

Hypostasis terminology

During a large part of the twentieth century, personification of divine attributes and qualities, including the attribute of divine knowledge, has often been interpreted by scholars through the lens of "hypostasis," a concept which has traditionally played an important role in later Christological and trinitarian

debates. Applications of this concept to early Jewish mediatorial figures played a prominent role in the studies of W. Bousset,²¹ S. Mowinckel,²² W. O. Oesterley and G. H. Box,²³ H. Ringgren,²⁴ J. Dunn,²⁵ C. Gieschen,²⁶ and others. One of the most consistent applications of the “hypostasis” category to mediatorial figures occurring in ancient Egyptian and Near Eastern sources is found in Helmer Ringgren’s book “Word and Wisdom.” In his study Ringgren prefers to use a broader understanding of the term, mainly in accordance with previously formulated definitions by Oesterley-Box and Mowinckel. He defines hypostasis as the “quasi-personification of certain attributes proper to God, occupying an intermediate position between personalities and abstract beings.”²⁷ Ringgren writes that

the hypostases represent a personification of qualities, functions, limbs etc. of a higher god. . . . But the personal character should not be stressed too much. In fact there are cases when a divine quality is spoken of as an independent entity without it being personified, and I should like to use the term “hypostasis” in these cases as well. But it should also be kept in mind that the result of a personification is not always a hypostasis; it may very well be an allegory or a poetical metaphor.²⁸

According to Ringgren “the personification is . . . vacillating between the metaphor and the hypostasis.”²⁹ The scale of possible options ranges from an abstract concept or figure of speech, metaphor, or poetic personification to a real quasi-personal divine entity that depends on God or a real, personal divine entity that is distinct from God. In his comments about the personification of Wisdom in early Jewish materials, Ringgren argues that in some of these materials Wisdom is not “an abstraction or a purely poetic personification but a concrete being, self-existent beside God.”³⁰

Considering the extensive legacy of the term “hypostasis” in Christian doctrinal debates and its occasional misuse in early Jewish studies, some scholars have tried to avoid this notion by instead using the term “personification.”³¹ However, one of the problems with the use of “personification” is that it clouds the ontological status of the entity to which the term is applied. Charles Gieschen states that the concept of personification “is not adequate to describe the independent identity of divine attributes.”³² One can agree with Gieschen that “personification” remains an ambiguous term since this designation can be understood either as an abstract concept or as an ontological reality.³³ Because of this ambiguity, this study will continue to use the terminology of “hypostasis” as defined by Gieschen, Ringgren, Oesterley-Box, and Mowinckel, despite its limitations.

Wisdom as the hypostasis of the divine knowledge

With this in mind our study will now proceed to a closer investigation of divine Wisdom and divine Logos as the two earliest hypostases of knowledge in Jewish lore. In the past, these mediatorial figures have received unprecedented

attention from scholars who often attempt to understand Jesus' role as the divine Logos through the prism of these early Jewish traditions. Because of the extensive history of research, it is virtually impossible to present a comprehensive review of all the relevant aspects of the Logos and Wisdom traditions in the few pages of our introduction. Therefore, we will focus on only a few epistemological aspects of these traditions, where Wisdom and the Logos are envisioned as the hypostases of divine knowledge.³⁴ We will start our excursus into these conceptual trends by concentrating on the epistemological dimension of the Wisdom figure.

Early biblical materials developed Wisdom's profile as a heavenly, preexistent figure. Experts are often puzzled by Wisdom's portrayal within the monotheistic framework of early Judaism.³⁵ The exact origins of Wisdom's personification in biblical materials cannot be established with certainty³⁶ and the exact nature of such personification also remains shrouded in mystery.³⁷ One can see early roots of this already in the Book of Job. For our study, it is important that the early depictions of Wisdom contain some theophanic markers that reveal dialectics of revelation and concealment. In Job 28:12–28, for example, Wisdom is characterised as an entity “hidden from the eyes of all living and concealed from the birds of the air.” In Prov 3, Wisdom is associated with the Tree of Life, a known theophanic abode of the deity in many early and late Jewish accounts. Prov 8:1–9:12 contains the first unambiguous example of Wisdom's conceptualisation as a person.³⁸ Prov 8:22–26 portrays Wisdom as coming into existence before the rest of creation, possibly imagining her as an embodied plan of creation.³⁹ Furthermore, in Prov 8:27–31 Wisdom is depicted as God's companion in creation.⁴⁰ Gieschen argues that in Prov 8:22–31 Wisdom “is described as a primordial figure who enjoyed a close relationship with God in the act of creating the world.”⁴¹ Tying the personified Wisdom to the process of creation has an epistemological significance. The repetition of this feature in various accounts of the personified Wisdom points to a pivotal aspect of Jewish understanding of knowledge in general and divine knowledge in particular, in which creation represents the revelation of God's nature and plan. Regarding this connection, Gershom Scholem argues that “creation and revelation are both principally and essentially auto-representations of God himself.”⁴² In this framework, creation is intimately connected with divine knowledge because it reveals God's mind which is actualised in the created order.⁴³ The emphasis on the demiurgic functions of Wisdom will be continued in the Wisdom of Solomon, where she is depicted as “‘the fashioner of all things’ (7:22), ‘an associate in his [God's] works’ (8:4), and the one by whom God ‘formed man’⁴⁴ (9:2).”⁴⁵

Another important epistemological aspect of early Jewish Wisdom traditions pertains to Wisdom's association with a special deposit of divine knowledge – Torah.⁴⁶ This tendency⁴⁷ is openly or implicitly attested to in a large number of early⁴⁸ and late⁴⁹ Jewish texts. Larry Hurtado suggests that this connection is already present in Proverbs where “there is the linking of Wisdom with the fear of God and obedience of his commands (e.g., Prov 1:7, 29; 2:1–6).”⁵⁰ The identification of Wisdom with the Torah is clearly expressed in the Wisdom of

Ben Sira,⁵¹ a writing usually dated in the second century BCE.⁵² Roland Murphy proposes that in Ben Sira

the explicit identification of Wisdom and Law occurs in seven passages (15:1; 17:11; 19:20; 21:11; 24:23; 34:8; 45:5) and an implicit identification in twelve passages (1:26; 2:15–16; 6:36; 15:15; 19:24; 24:22; 24:32–33; 32:2–3; 38:34; 44:4; 51:15, 30).⁵³

The most important cluster of traditions is in Chapter 24. In verse 23 of Chapter 24 Andre Villeneuve observes that:

Ben Sira reveals another facet of her identity in what is perhaps the book's most stunning declaration. Lady Wisdom is the “the book of the covenant of the Most High God, the law which Moses commanded us as an inheritance for the congregations of Jacob” (v. 23). This reference to the βιβλος διαθήκης θεοῦ refers to the Sinai covenant code (cf. Exod 24:7), using an exact quote from Deuteronomy (Deut 33:4; cf. 2 Kgs 23:2; 2 Chr 34:31). Ben Sira thus identifies Lady Wisdom with the Torah,⁵⁴ considered to be the ultimate source of wisdom.⁵⁵

This identification has profound consequences for both Wisdom and Torah traditions. It bolsters Wisdom's epistemological profile by envisioning her as the ultimate conduit of divine knowledge while also contributing to the Torah's novel profile as a hypostatic pattern of creation. Villeneuve comments that:

this identification of Wisdom with the Torah means that for our author, Wisdom came down and was “given” to Israel at Mount Sinai. At the same time, Wisdom's identification with the Torah considered in light of her presence at the time of creation implies a close relationship between the Torah and creation. Torah–Wisdom may have been given to Israel through Moses at Mount Sinai; but its initial revelation to the world was already implicit in creation itself (cf. Sir 16:24–17:20).⁵⁶

An additional aspect of Wisdom's economy found in Sirach is her procession from the mouth of the deity. Sir 24:3 states that Wisdom “came forth from the mouth of the Most High, and covered the earth like a mist.”⁵⁷ This again demonstrates Wisdom's epistemological and revelatory roles that link her with the Word of God. John Collins suggests that “this motif lays the foundation for the identification of Wisdom with the word of God, which also proceeds from the mouth (cf. Isa 45:23; 48:3; 25:11).”⁵⁸

In the Wisdom of Solomon, which is usually dated in the first century BCE, one can see a keen attention to Wisdom's role as a mediator of the theophanic knowledge when she is portrayed as the mirror of God, by revealing the deity's form and attributes.⁵⁹ Her mediation of the divine presence alludes to Wisdom's cultic role. Interpreters often neglect this important aspect of Wisdom's

embodiment of God's theophany. Yet, the apodictic disclosure of the divine form and attributes is often regarded as the pinnacle in revelation of heavenly mysteries in many Jewish biblical and pseudepigraphic accounts. Wisdom's mediating role reaches its apex in Wis 7:25–26, when she appears with stunning theophanic attributes:

For she is a breath of the power of God, and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty; therefore nothing defiled gains entrance into her. For she is a reflection of eternal light, a spotless mirror of the working of God, and an image of his goodness.

Jacob Jervell claims that “Hier ist also die Weisheit als Mittler zwischen Gott und Menschen εικὼν Gottes. Das ‘Bild’ ist hier nicht mehr ein Humanitätspredikat, sondern es bekundet das Göttliche des Abgebildeten.”⁶⁰ Wisdom's role as a reflection of eternal light (ἀπαύγασμα γὰρ ἐστὶν φωτὸς αἰδίου) and an image of God's goodness (εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ) again illustrates an essential characteristic of ancient Jewish epistemology: to know God means to perceive God's Form. For our study it is important that Wis 7:25–26 characterises Wisdom as “a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty” (ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰλικρινῆς). Although the Middle Platonic background of this expression has been underlined in previous studies,⁶¹ scholars have underestimated its ties to Jewish theophanic traditions. Yet, the presence of “δόξα” clearly illustrates the connection. In this passage, Wisdom is again portrayed as an entity responsible for communicating divine theophanic knowledge to creation by being depicted as a glorious form.⁶² Reflecting on the divine Glory traditions found in Chapter 7, Ringgren states

it is obvious from what has been said that Wisdom has a divine nature. This is still further confirmed by the fact that Wisdom is not only an emanation of the δόξα of God, but itself possesses this divine quality.⁶³

An additional theophanic attribute of Wisdom that connects her to δόξα traditions is found in Wis 9:4⁶⁴ and 9:10,⁶⁵ where she is depicted enthroned on God's seat. Gieschen rightly observes that “‘sitting’ on the throne is a very exalted depiction full of significance”⁶⁶ and “although the significance of Wisdom being enthroned next to God may not be apparent to modern exegetes, it would be to Jews living at the beginning of the Common Era.”⁶⁷ Gieschen further argues that “this detail is especially significant for establishing Wisdom's relationship with God and with the rest of the heavenly host” because “Wisdom's position on the divine throne reflects her divinity.”⁶⁸ This motif also occurs in *1 Enoch* 42:1–2 where Wisdom is enthroned in heaven in the midst of the angels:

Wisdom found no place where she could dwell, and her dwelling was in heaven. Wisdom went out in order to dwell among the sons of men, but

did not find a dwelling; wisdom returned to her place and took her seat in the midst of the angels.⁶⁹

In Sir 24:4 she is enthroned in a cloudy pillar: “I dwelt in the highest heavens, and my throne was in a pillar of cloud.” In respect to Wisdom’s enthronement, Ringgren suggests that

Wisdom is conceived as the *πάρεδρος* or “throne-partner” of God. This seems to imply a completely developed personal being. She dwells with God and is loved by him (Wis 8:3). And in Wis 9:10⁷⁰ Solomon prays: “Send her from the throne of Thy glory.”⁷¹

Some scholars contend that Wisdom’s enthronement might associate her with the divine Glory. For instance, Gieschen argues that “the phrase ‘throne of your Glory (*θρόνος δόξης σου*)’ in Wis 9:10 may allude to an identification of Wisdom as the Glory who is seated upon the throne (cf. Ezek 1:26).”⁷² He further proposes that

it is possible that “glory” is not an adjective modifying throne, but a noun referring to the occupant of the throne. Therefore, although the “throne of my Glory” in Wis 9:10 is certainly referring to the divine throne, it could also be linking Wisdom with the image of the enthroned Glory.⁷³

Scholars often argue that in the Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom is closely linked with even the most recondite divine knowledge. Joseph Dodson observes that in Chapter 8 “God, the master of all things . . . lives with and loves Sophia, who is privy to his divine mysteries.”⁷⁴ In 8:4 Wisdom is indeed described as “an initiate in the knowledge of God, and an associate in his works.”⁷⁵ And in Chapter 9 “Sophia understands all things and knows what is pleasing in God’s eyes and upright in his commands. She can guide the sage in his actions and guard him in her glory.”⁷⁶

As in other early biblical texts, in Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom’s demiurgic role is apparent. Ringgren explains that:

according to 8:5 Wisdom is the one who “works” or “creates” (*ἐργαζομένη*) everything, and in 7:12 she is the *γενέτις* (creator, producer) of everything. And when in 7:21 she is denoted as the *τεχνίτις* of everything, the conclusion is evident: Wisdom has been the assistant of God at the creation.⁷⁷

Wisdom’s association with creation reveals an epistemological dimension. Robert Hall rightly detects that in this early Jewish understanding, only “the creating mind has true knowledge and real power”⁷⁸ and “by revealing divine agents who participated in creation, they teach readers how to conform to the divine knowing and to stand in God’s presence.”⁷⁹

Logos as the hypostasis of the divine knowledge

After our exploration of the epistemological dimensions of Jewish Wisdom traditions, we will now proceed to another early Jewish hypostasis of divine knowledge represented by Philo's Logos. Scholars have long noted that, by melding together Jewish and Greek traditions, Philo views the Logos "as the mediator through whom God indirectly orders and sustains the material world."⁸⁰ The Logos plays a central role in Philo's thought which makes the systematic presentation of this concept difficult, if not impossible. Hurtado writes that "the frequency of the term *logos* in Philo's extant writings (over fourteen hundred occurrences!) and the difficulty in systematizing his use of the term are both well known."⁸¹ David Runia expresses a similar concern noting that it is difficult to distill a systematic and consistent doctrine of Logos from Philo's works.⁸²

Because of this, our excursus will focus mainly on the epistemological dimension of the Logos' activities and especially his role as a mediator of divine knowledge. Experts often underline the noetic thrust of the Logos' economy, yet, for our study it is important that Philo associates the Logos with God's visual and aural presence by absorbing the traits of many theophanic mediators. According to Alan Segal, "Philo wants the Logos, the goal of the mystical vision of God, to serve as a simple explanation for all the angelic and human manifestations of the divine in the Old Testament."⁸³ Furthermore, as scholars have previously noted, in some passages "Philo explains biblical theophanies as appearances of the Logos."⁸⁴ David Runia writes that "in many texts the Logos represents God's presence or activity in the world, so that the distinction between God and the Logos is more conceptual than real."⁸⁵ In many Philonic passages the Logos is portrayed as a mediator of the divine presence. Winston observes that

the Philonic Logos is thus not literally a second entity by the side of God acting on his behalf, nor is it an empty abstraction, but rather a vivid and living hypostatization of an essential aspect of Deity, the face of God turned toward creation.⁸⁶

An important aspect of the Logos' office as a mediator of the divine knowledge, and especially iconic knowledge about the deity, is his role as the image of God. Gregory Sterling collates seven texts where Philo explicitly connects the "image of God" with the Logos⁸⁷: *Opif.* 25; *Leg.* 3.96; *Her.* 231; *Spec.* 1.81; 3.83, 207; and *QG* 2.62.⁸⁸ Almost all of Philo's speculations about the image of God are anchored in narratives that are linked to major biblical theophanies. Many of these also invoke Gen 1:27, which narrates the creation of humankind in the image of God. For example, *Opif.* 25 reads:

It is Moses who lays down this, not I. Witness his express acknowledgment in the sequel, when setting on record the creation of man, that he was molded after the image of God (Gen 1:27). Now if the part is an image of an image, it is manifest that the whole is so too, and if the whole

creation, this entire world perceived by our senses (seeing that it is greater than any human image) is a copy of the Divine image, it is manifest that the archetypal seal also, which we aver to be the world described by the mind, would be the very Word of God.⁸⁹

This passage portrays the Logos not only as the image after which God molds humanity, but also as the blueprint for the entire creation.⁹⁰ George van Kooten says that in this passage “not only man is ‘an image of an image’ . . . the visible cosmos, too is ‘a copy of the divine image.’”⁹¹ Regarding these two functions of the mediator, Thomas Tobin adds that the Logos is

an image in a twofold way, a reflection of the truly existent God above and a model on the basis of which the universe below was ordered. The Logos was the archetypal idea in which all of the other ideas were contained (*Opif.* 23–25). But the Logos was not simply the image or paradigm according to which the universe was ordered, it was also the instrument (*organon*) through which (*di’ hou*) the universe was ordered.⁹²

In *Leg.* 3.96, Philo also describes the Logos as the divine image and the instrument of creation. Reinterpreting the story of Bezalel crafting the Tabernacle, Philo speculates:

We must say, then, that here too we have a form which God has stamped on the soul as on the tested coin. What, then, the image impressed on it is we shall know if we first ascertain accurately the meaning of the name. Bezalel means, then, “in the shadow of God”; but God’s shadow is His Word, which he made use of like an instrument, and so made the world. But this shadow, and what we may describe as the representation, is the archetype for further creations. For just as God is the Pattern of the image, to which the title of Shadow has just been given, even so the image becomes the pattern of other beings, as the prophet made clear at the very outset of the Law-giving by saying, “And God made the man after the image of God” (Gen 1:27), implying that the image had been made such as representing God, but that the man was made after the image when it had acquired the force of a pattern.⁹³

Here, the Logos is again described as a mediator between God and the created order, being manifest as the image who “becomes the pattern of other beings.” Yet, Philo’s reflection is closely tied to Gen 1:27 which, in the Priestly tradition, serves as an enduring rationality for God’s anthropomorphic shape. In view of this, the question remains if the Logos’ role as the formative pattern of human beings links him to the divine anthropomorphism which find its most forceful expression in the imagery of the divine *Kavod*. Indeed, Philo’s speculation about the Logos as the image of God often involves Gen 1:27 and

one can find such a reference also in *Her.* 231.⁹⁴ Philo also identifies the Logos with the image of God in *Spec.* 1.81:

For if the priest's body, which is mortal by nature, must be scrutinized to see that it is not afflicted by any serious misfortune, much more is that scrutiny needed for the immortal soul, which we are told was fashioned after the image of the Self-existent. And the image of God is the Word through whom the whole universe was framed.⁹⁵

Here again, the Logos serves as the pattern for the creation of humankind and for the entire cosmos, both of which are made in his image. Marianne Meyers Thompson reasons that by stating that human beings are made in the image of the Logos “Philo wants to maintain both the biblical affirmation that human beings are created ‘in the image of God’ and the impossibility that the corruptible physical world can bear the ‘image’ or form of the immaterial, incorruptible God.”⁹⁶

A similar attitude is evoked in *QG* 2.62, where Philo states that “for nothing mortal can be made in the likeness of the most high One and Father of the universe but (only) in that of the second God, who is His Logos”:

Why does (Scripture) say, as if (speaking) of another God, “in the image of God He made man” and not “in His own image”? Most excellently and veraciously this oracle was given by God. For nothing mortal can be made in the likeness of the most high One and Father of the universe but (only) in that of the second God, who is His Logos. For it was right that the rational (part) of the human soul should be formed as an impression by the divine Logos, since the pre-Logos God is superior to every rational nature. But He who is above the Logos (and) exists in the best and in a special form—what thing that comes into being can rightfully bear His likeness? Moreover, Scripture wishes also to show that God most justly avenges the virtuous and decent men because they have a certain kinship with His Logos, of which the human mind is a likeness and image.⁹⁷

Hurtado comments that “in *QG* 2.62, Philo calls the Logos ‘the second god’ (*ton deutron theon*) and states that the ‘God’ in whose image Adam was created in *Gen* 1:27 is actually the Logos, which the rational part of the human soul resembles.”⁹⁸

The Logos’ role as the image of God is often compared with the role of Wisdom in the Wisdom of Solomon. Sterling, for example, sees these two developments as stemming from a single exegetical tradition. In his consideration of the five attributes of Wisdom in *Wis* 7:25–8:1, which include “‘a breath of God’s power,’ ‘a pure emanation of the Almighty’s glory,’ ‘a reflection of eternal light’ (*ἀπαύγασμα . . . φωτὸς αἰδίου*), ‘an unblemished mirror,’ and ‘an image of his goodness’ (*εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ*),”⁹⁹ Sterling writes that “the final

attribute uses the language of Gen 1:27, although it does not allude to the text directly.”¹⁰⁰ He further mentions that:

it probably reflects the same exegetical tradition that we find in Philo that identified the Logos with the image, except in this instance Wisdom rather than the Logos was identified with the image. The point is that the identification of the image with Wisdom or the Logos was part of an exegetical tradition that is attested in Alexandrian texts.¹⁰¹

Wisdom’s and the Logos’ mediation of the divine presence reveals a distinctive cultic dimension, since already in the Hebrew Bible such mediation always appears in the cultic context. Wisdom’s and the Logos’ roles as the image of God make them the unique “embodiment” not only of the divine presence but also of the divine knowledge. This epistemological role of the *imago Dei* will play a crucial role in the stories of the pseudepigraphic mediators, including Enoch, Jacob, and Moses, who will also be depicted as the divine image in order to secure their role as the hypostases of the divine mysteries.

Like the Wisdom tradition, another epistemological dimension of the Logos is his association with the Torah. Harry Austryn Wolfson notes that for Philo, the revealed Law which is to govern the conduct of man is nothing but the Logos or Wisdom which is both the pattern after which the world was created and the law by which the world is governed, for the revealed Law is in conformity with the law of the universe.¹⁰²

The Logos is identified with the Torah in *Migr.* 130, where Philo uses Deut 33:3 for his justification of this connection:

“Law” being evidently nothing else than the Divine word (λόγος) enjoining what we ought to do and forbidding what we should not do, as Moses testifies by saying “he received a law from His words” (Deut 33:3). If, then, the law is a Divine word (λόγος), and the man of true worth “does” the law, he assuredly “does” the word: so that, as I said, God’s words are the wise man’s “doings.”¹⁰³

Wolfson also draws attention to QG 4.140 where Philo states that the holy books of the Lord are not monuments of knowledge or vision but are the divine command and the divine Logos.¹⁰⁴ He further suggests that

all these statements are not mere rhetorical phrases with Philo. They are an expression of his philosophic belief. According to him, before the creation of the world, God created the Logos. Upon the creation of the world, the Logos was implanted in it by God to act as its law.¹⁰⁵

The Platonic epistemological model which associates true knowledge with the world of ideas undoubtedly serves as an important philosophical background

for understanding the Logos' role as the personification of divine knowledge. However, while for Plato the world of ideas has its own independent existence, for Philo, it becomes personified, now being associated with God and the Logos. Peder Borgen writes that

one of the most important features of Philo's revision of the Platonic theory of ideas is his application of the term Logos to the totality of ideas and his description for it as the place of the intelligible world, which in turn consists of the ideas.¹⁰⁶

The hypostatisation of divine knowledge in the Logos is important for our study. Regarding this personification process, David Runia notes that

before God commenced his creative task, he first made – just like a good architect – a plan or blue-print, an intelligible or noetic cosmos which he placed in his Logos. . . . A striking difference, however, is that Philo locates the plan, which is equivalent to the Platonic world of ideas, in God or his Logos, whereas for Plato the ideas are quite independent of any deity for their existence.¹⁰⁷

In his role as the personification of divine knowledge, the Logos becomes a perfect mediator, envisioned in the words of Runia, as “the Face of God turned towards reality.”¹⁰⁸

Another dimension in the mediation of divine knowledge, which the Logos shares with Wisdom, includes his role in creation. Robert Hall notes that:

the Logos creates both the world (*Cher.* 127; *Migr.* 6; *Spec.* 1.81; *Her.* 130–140) and human minds (*Spec.* 3.83, 207) to reflect the divine mind. . . . Since human reason and created reality both share in the Logos, human reason can know created things.¹⁰⁹

These passages reveal that the Logos' role as a mediator of the divine knowledge embraces not only his embodiment of the divine mysteries but also his duties in creating conditions for the human soul to comprehend it. Tobin argues that:

the function of the Logos in Philo was anagogical, that is, the Logos was meant to guide the human soul to the realm of the divine. . . . The possibility of the human soul attaining the knowledge and vision of God was rooted in the soul's fundamental relationship to and participation in the divine Logos.¹¹⁰

To conclude our analysis of the Wisdom and the Logos traditions, we should now reiterate some common aspects of their mediation of divine knowledge.

First is their role as the hypostases of God's plan or design which acts as the blueprint for creation. In Philo, the Logos is presented as the sum of all ideas.

The Logos and Wisdom thus are able to unveil the divine knowledge through their manifestation of the preexistent patterns which are actualised in creation.

Second is the shared identification of Wisdom and the Logos with the Torah – the pivotal deposit of the divine knowledge, which is personified in these mediatorial figures. In this framework Wisdom and the Logos are understood as an embodied Torah, the organism of heavenly knowledge.

The third dimension involves the offices of Wisdom and the Logos as hypostases of the theophanic knowledge, which is closely tied to their role as the image of God. Their mediation of divine knowledge is revealed through their endowment with some traditional theophanic attributes of the deity found in the Hebrew Bible, including the attributes of the divine Glory.

Our preliminary excursions into early Jewish Wisdom and Logos traditions demonstrate that the conceptions of hypostasised divine knowledge were well established in the Second Temple period. With this knowledge, we should now proceed to an in-depth exploration of the phenomenon of personified divine knowledge in early Jewish biblical and pseudepigraphical materials. I will argue that various exemplars of these accounts (represented by the biblical patriarchs and prophets, such as Enoch, Jacob, and Moses) were understood by their ancient audiences as hypostases of divine knowledge. Once established, such hypostatic, epistemological entities, in the form of heavenly Enoch or heavenly Jacob, would serve as a perennial source of divine knowledge for generations of adepts. Through their apocalyptic and mystical routines, the adepts would be able to garnish knowledge about God's mysteries from these personified "signs of knowledge for all generations." Since it is impossible in the framework of a single study to cover all biblical exemplars – our investigation will focus on three major mediatorial trends in early Jewish lore that are connected to Enoch, Jacob, and Moses.

Notes

- 1 *1 Enoch* 93:2: "according to that which appeared to me in the heavenly vision, and (which) I know from the words of the holy angels and understand from the tablets of heaven." M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 2.223.
- 2 B. Britt, *Rewriting Moses: The Narrative Eclipse of the Text*, JSOTSS, 402 (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004) 85. Thomas Dozeman also notes that "the function of Moses as mediator is not limited to his role as representative of the people before Yahweh, for he also acts in just the opposite role, namely as the representative of the divine presence to the people." T. Dozeman, *God on the Mountain*, SBLMS, 37 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1989) 138–139.
- 3 G. Filoramo, *A History of Gnosticism* (Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, 1990) 41.
- 4 E. Hamori, "When Gods Were Men": *The Embodied God in Biblical and Near Eastern Literature*, BZAW, 384 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008) 63. In another part of her study, Hamori suggests that:

the metaphorical nature of theophanic language functions to organize our view of God in a way that highlights certain characteristics and pushes others to the background. . . . God in theophany has not lost God's non-human nature and become

less than divine, but human characteristics are pressed to the foreground, organizing our view of the divine character in that interaction.

Hamori, "When Gods Were Men," 55–56

She further adds that:

the analogical language of theophany is rich, full, mysterious, logically odd, and requires a depth of exploration beyond univocal language. Though counterintuitive, the very richness of this mystical anomaly is lost without the recognition of the form as literal embodiment (rather than vision, angel, metaphor, etc.). It is only the literally embodied divine form that offers the richness of the theophanic analogical language.

Hamori, "When Gods Were Men," 56

5 Reflecting on these challenges, Zainab Bahrani notes that:

in studying these cultures, our interpretive task is made all the more difficult since we are dealing with a system of thought, a worldview that existed long before ours, yet we have no means of approaching it from outside our own ontological system.

Z. Bahrani, *The Graven Image: Representation in Babylonia and Assyria* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003) 122

6 In this system of belief, even the ways in which knowledge is transmitted, such as through an alphabet or writing, originate from above. Reeves and Reed note that in this worldview "writing and the material technologies associated with its practice are not considered . . . to be human inventions. They belong instead among a revelatory knowledge which originates from the supernal world." J. C. Reeves and A. Y. Reed, *Enoch from Antiquity to the Middle Ages, vol. 1. Sources from Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018) 56.

7 As Markus Bockmuehl mentions

for these writers, "mysteries" subsist in heaven at present but a glimpse of their reality and relevance can be disclosed to select visionaries who pass on this information to the faithful few (the "wise", i.e. the righteous) to encourage them in waiting for the impending deliverance (*1 Enoch* 1:1–9, 37:1–5, etc.). At present the divine wisdom is known only through such revealed mysteries, since her abode is in heaven (*1 Enoch* 42:1–3; 48:1; 49:1).

M. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*, WUNT, 36 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990) 31–32

8 M. E. Stone, "Pseudepigraphy Reconsidered," *RRJ* 9 (2006) 1–15 at 11. Scott Noegel notes that "at the upper end of the scribal elite were the scholars, who referred to themselves as integral links in a chain of transmission originating from the gods." S. Noegel, "'Literary' Craft and Performative Power in the Ancient Near East: The Hebrew Bible in Context," in *Approaches to Literary Readings of Ancient Jewish Writings*, eds. K. Smelik and K. Vermeulen; SSN, 62 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014) 21.

9 R. H. Charles argued that this concept can be "traced partly to Ps 139; Exod 25:9; Exod 26:30, where we find the idea that there exist in heaven divine archetypes of certain things on earth." R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912) 91. On heavenly books/tablets, see L. Baynes, *The Heavenly Book Motif in Judeo-Christian Apocalypses 200 B.C.E. – 200 C.E.*, JSJSS, 152 (Leiden: Brill, 2012); H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*, WUNT, 2 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1951) 231–254; W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, HNT, 21 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1926) 258ff.; R. Eppel, "Les tables de la Loi et les tables célestes," *RHPR* 17 (1937) 401–412; F. García Martínez, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, eds. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ, 65 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997) 244–260; C. Münchow, *Ethik und Eschatologie: Ein Beitrag zum*

Verständnis der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik mit einem Ausblick auf das Neue Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981) 44–49; F. Nötscher, “Himmliche Bücher und Schicksalsglaube in Qumran,” *RevQ* 1.3 (1959) 405–411; S. M. Paul, “Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life,” *JANES* 5 (1973) 345–352; E. Rau, *Kosmologie, Eschatologie und Lehnautorität Henochs* (Ph.D. diss. Hamburg University, Hamburg, 1974) 345–398; P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1934) 290–292, 303–304; G. Widengren, *The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book*, UUA, 7 (Uppsala: Lundequist, 1950).

- 10 Exod 25:8–9: “And have them make me a sanctuary, so that I may dwell among them. In accordance with all that I show you concerning the pattern of the tabernacle and of all its furniture, so you shall make it.” Exod 25:40: “And see that you make them according to the pattern for them, which is being shown you on the mountain.” Exod 26:30: “Then you shall erect the tabernacle according to the plan for it that you were shown on the mountain.” Exod 27:8: “You shall make it hollow, with boards. They shall be made just as you were shown on the mountain.” Num 8:4: “Now this was how the lampstand was made, out of hammered work of gold. From its base to its flowers, it was hammered work; according to the pattern that the Lord had shown Moses, so he made the lampstand.” All biblical quotations are taken from the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) unless otherwise indicated.

- 11 These traditions were perpetuated in Jewish lore for millennia. Moshe Idel points to a specimen of this belief in a late midrash, *‘Aseret ha-Dibberot*, where the following tradition is found:

Before the creation of the world, skins for parchments were not in existence, that the Torah might be written on them, because the animals did not yet exist. So, on what was the Torah written? On the arm of the Holy One, blessed be He, by a black fire on [the surface of] a white fire.

M. Idel, *Absorbing Perfections: Kabbalah and Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002) 47

See also *Midrash Tanhuma*: “How was the Torah written? It was written with letters of black fire on a surface of white fire, as is said: His locks are curled and black as a raven.” S. A. Berman, *Midrash Tanhuma-Yelammedenu: An English Translation of Genesis and Exodus* (Hoboken, NJ: KTAV, 1996) 3. Idel suggests that in this passage the Torah is written on “the head of God, as the mention of the locks apparently implies.” Idel, *Absorbing Perfections*, 49.

- 12 Isa 49:16: “See, I have inscribed you on the palms of my hands; your walls are continually before me.” 2 Bar. 4:2–6:

Or do you think that this is the city of which I said: On the palms of my hands I have carved you? It is not this building that is in your midst now; it is that which will be revealed, with me, that was already prepared from the moment that I decided to create Paradise. And I showed it to Adam before he sinned. But when he transgressed the commandment, it was taken away from him – as also Paradise. After these things I showed it to my servant Abraham in the night between the portions of the victims. And again I showed it also to Moses on Mount Sinai when I showed him the likeness of the tabernacle and all its vessels. Behold, now it is preserved with me – as also Paradise.

A. F. J. Klijn, “2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985) 1.615–652 at 1.622

- 13 3 *Enoch* 41:1–3:

R. Ishmael said: Metatron said to me: Come and I will show you . . . the letters by which wisdom and understanding, knowledge and intelligence, humility and

rectitude were created, by which the whole world is sustained. I went with him and he took me by his hand, bore me up on his wings, and showed me those letters, engraved with a pen of flame upon the throne of glory, and sparks and lightnings shoot from them and cover all the chambers of *'Arabot*.

P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985) 1.292

14 3 *Enoch* 45:1–6:

R. Ishmael said: Metatron said to me: Come and I will show you the curtain of the Omnipresent One, which is spread before the Holy One, blessed be he, and on which are printed all the generations of the world and all their deeds, whether done or to be done, till the last generation. I went and he showed them to me with his fingers, like a father teaching his son the letters of the Torah; and I saw: Each generation and its potentates; each generation and its heads; each generation and its shepherds; each generation and its keepers. . . . And I saw: Adam and his generation, their deeds and their thoughts . . . The Messiah the son of Joseph and his generation, and all that they will do to the gentiles.

Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.296–299

For the *Pargod* traditions in rabbinic literature, see also; *b. Yoma* 77a; *b. Ber.* 18b; *b. Hag.* 15a–b; *b. Sanh.* 89b; *b. Sotah* 49a; *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* 4:6; *Zohar* I.47a; II.149b–150a; *Maseket Hekhalot* 7.

- 15 For example, in 3 *Enoch* 13 God writes with his finger, "as with a pen of flame," upon Metatron's crown, "the letters by which heaven and earth were created."
- 16 On the correspondences between angelic names and areas of instruction, see A. Y. Reed, "Heavenly Ascent, Angelic Descent, and the Transmission of Knowledge in 1 *Enoch* 6–16," in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*, eds. R. S. Abusch and A. Y. Reed (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) 47–66 at 55–56.
- 17 J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 29.
- 18 A. Annus, "On the Origin of Watchers: A Comparative Study of the Antediluvian Wisdom in Mesopotamian and Jewish Traditions," *JSP* 19 (2010) 277–320 at 287–288.
- 19 Annus, "On the Origin of Watchers," 288. *Italic is mine.*
- 20 Markus Bockmuehl notices that in some traditions, the Messiah or the Son of Man were understood as embodied mysteries, hidden with God until his revelation at the eschaton. Bockmuehl notes that:

1 *Enoch* frequently features the conviction that the Messiah/Son of Man is already present and hidden with God since the beginning of the world, in order to be revealed in the eschaton (*1 Enoch* 38:2, 48:2–7, 62:6, 69:26–29). Similarly, 4 *Ezra* knows of the future revelation of the Messiah hidden in heaven (7:28; 12:32; 13:25f.; 13:26; 13:32). At least in 1 *Enoch* and 4 *Ezra* it would seem to be reasonable to suggest that even in the absence of an explicit identification of Messiah and "mystery," the complex and substantive connection between the Messiah and the hidden heavenly realities encourages a view of the "pre-existent" Messiah himself as one of the mysteries. In sum: the Messiah and/or Son of Man figures prominently in relation to the eschatological mysteries which, though presently concealed, are already existent in heaven and await their imminent manifestation.

Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery*, 37–38

21 Bousset postulates that the hypostases

sind wie die Engel Mittelwesen zwischen Gott und Welt, die sein Wirken auf die Welt ermöglichen. Sie sind nur abstrakter, schemenhafter, schwerer zu fassen, als die derben und anschaulichen Gestalten des volkstümlichen Engelglaubens. Sie erscheinen als Mitteldinge zwischen Personen und abstrakten Wesen, nicht so losgelöst von Gott wie die konkreten Engelgestalten, mehr mit seinem Wesen verschmolzen und

zu ihm gehörig, aber doch wieder gesondert gedacht, seltsame Zwitterbildungen eines kindlichen, zur vollen Abstraktion noch unfähigen Denkens.

Bousset and Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums in späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, 342–343

- 22 Mowinckel defines hypostasis as “eine halb selbständige, halb als Offenbarungsform einer höheren Gottheit betrachtete göttliche Wesenheit, die eine Personifizierung einer Eigenschaft, einer Wirksamkeit, eines Gliedes usw. einer höheren Gottheit darstellt.” S. Mowinckel, “Hypostasen,” in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1928) 2.2065.
- 23 Oesterley and Box interpret hypostasis as “a quasi-personification of certain attributes proper to God, occupying an intermediate position between personalities and abstract beings.” W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue: An Introduction to the Study of Judaism from the New Testament Period*, 2nd ed. (London: Pitman, 1911) 195.
- 24 H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East* (Lund: Håkan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1947).
- 25 Regarding Jewish traditions about personified Wisdom, James Dunn upholds Oesterley and Box’s definition of hypostasis by affirming that “Wisdom is a hypostasis – that is, a ‘quasi-personification of certain attributes proper to God, occupying an intermediate position between personalities and abstract beings.’” J. D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (London: SCM, 1980) 168.
- 26 Gieschen explicates hypostasis as “an aspect of the deity that is depicted with independent personhood of varying degrees.” C. A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*, AGAJU, 42 (Leiden: Brill, 1998) 45. In another part of his study, he notes that it “is valid to speak of hypostases as aspects of God that have degrees of distinct personhood.” Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 122. He further states that:

our modern ways of conceptualization often resist giving a degree of personhood to these divine attributes or aspects. In spite of this, the textual evidence leads us to understand a world view that is based much more on tangible forms than abstract concepts. Thus, Name, Glory, Wisdom, Word, Spirit, and Power are not primarily abstract concepts in this world view; they are realities with visible forms.

Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 122

- 27 Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 8.
- 28 Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 8.
- 29 Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 113.
- 30 Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 104.
- 31 Saul Olyan reflects on the problematic nature of the term “hypostasis,” noting that

many reputable scholars up to the present time have utilized the terms “hypostatization” and “hypostasis” in discussions of the special figurative treatment accorded divine attributes in certain Israelite and Near Eastern contexts. In my view, these expressions are best avoided on account of the history of their use and abuse in biblical scholarship. Scholars following the lead of Bousset et al. continue to use these terms, often indiscriminately, to describe such phenomena as the Memra of the targumim and the Shekinah of rabbinic lore. The expressions “hypostatization” and “hypostasis” have come to be closely associated with the rather ill-conceived notion of an increasingly distant and inaccessible God emerging during the period of the Second Temple, and a resulting need for intermediary figures between God and Israel.

S. Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism*, TSAJ, 36 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993) 89–91

For discussions about the misuse of “hypostasis,” see also R. Marcus, “On Biblical Hypostases of Wisdom,” *HUCA* 23 (1950–51) 157–171.

- 32 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 36.

- 33 Gieschen notes that “hypostasis (ὑπόστασις) in the philosophical context has the basic meaning of ‘a reality’ and in practice often means ‘an individual’ reality or thing.” Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 36–37. On this, see also C. Stead, *Divine Substance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977) ix.
- 34 On the personified attributes of God as the divine agents, see L. W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) 41ff.
- 35 Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza comments that the “concept of Wisdom as a heavenly, preexistent figure is at first glance something strange and enigmatic in Judaism and it cannot be quite harmonized with Jewish theology and thought.” E. Schüssler Fiorenza, “Wisdom Mythology and the Christological Hymns of the New Testament,” in *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. R. L. Wilken (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1975) 17–41 at 27. Schüssler Fiorenza further argues that:

two major hypotheses have been suggested to explain the concept of Wisdom as a preexistent heavenly figure within Jewish theology: Wisdom as a poetic personification of a divine function or wisdom as a myth in its own right. The first suggests that the notion of personal Wisdom developed as a poetic personification or hypostatization of a divine function. Its parallel developments within Israelite theology would be the progressive hypostatization of the Word, of Truth, or of steadfast Love. Yet Wisdom appears less to be a hypostatization of an abstract concept than a real personal being. Since most of the characterizations and descriptions of Wisdom use the language of myth, Wisdom cannot be explained merely as a metaphorical personification of certain attributes of Yahweh. The recognition of the employment of mythic language has led historians of religion to reject the hypothesis of personification and to suggest that the figure of Wisdom has its explanation in reference to a foreign mythical goddess, e.g., Ishtar, Maat, Isis, Aphrodite, Psyche, Demeter, and Kore. Since a single myth or goddess could not be named as standing behind the Wisdom figure in Jewish writings, a second hypothesis was suggested. It sought to reconstruct an older single myth of Wisdom behind the partial expressions and fragments of the myth which are found in the diverse Wisdom writings. Attempting a reconstruction, Rudolf Bultmann describes the myth of Wisdom as follows: Wisdom is preexistent, was a companion of God before creation, and actively participated in the creation of the world. She seeks a dwelling on earth among men but does this in vain since her message is rejected. She comes to her own possession but men do not receive her. She returns therefore to heaven and remains hidden there. God alone knows the way to her. The hiddenness of Wisdom, however, is not absolute. She reveals herself to the elect, to the friends of God, and to the prophets. This basic wisdom myth can be most clearly seen in the section of *1 Enoch* 42 where we find a direct reference to the futile descent of heavenly Wisdom and her return to heaven. . . . In sum, we are faced with two hypotheses concerning the mythical character of Wisdom. Either Wisdom is seen as having her own myth and this myth stands in the background of both Jewish and gnostic speculations about wisdom, or the figure of Wisdom is understood as derived from some authentic mythic deity.

Schüssler Fiorenza, “Wisdom Mythology and the Christological Hymns of the New Testament,” 27–29

- 36 Ringgren notes that “the doctrine of personal Wisdom has not been entirely uniform and that the various authors differ considerably as to their conception of this Wisdom.” Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 89.
- 37 In his reflections on key passages about personified Wisdom in early Jewish texts, including Job 28, Prov 8:22–31, Sir 24, Bar 3:9–4:4, Wis 6:12–11:1, *1 Enoch* 42, and various references to Wisdom in Philo, James Dunn asks the question what or who is Wisdom in all these passages? In his opinion

the principal options held out to us are as follows: (1) Wisdom is a divine being, an independent deity, as in the near parallels in Egyptian and Mesopotamian religions;

(2) Wisdom is a hypostasis – that is, a quasi-personification of certain attributes proper to God, occupying an intermediate position between personalities and abstract beings; (3) Wisdom is nothing more than a personification of a divine attribute; (4) Wisdom is the personification of cosmic order and is not thought of as divine until a relatively late stage, namely, the Wisdom of Solomon, where however, it remains uncertain whether a conceptually clear definition is achieved.

Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 168

38 Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 42.

39 The Lord created me at the beginning of his work, the first of his acts of long ago. Ages ago I was set up, at the first, before the beginning of the earth. When there were no depths I was brought forth, when there were no springs abounding with water. Before the mountains had been shaped, before the hills, I was brought forth – when he had not yet made earth and fields, or the world's first bits of soil.

The same tradition is attested to in the longer recension of 2 *Enoch* 33:3 where Wisdom appears to be envisioned as God's plan:

And now, Enoch, whatever I have told you, and whatever you have understood, and whatever you have seen in the heavens, and whatever you have seen on the earth, and whatever I have written in the books – by my supreme wisdom all these things I planned to accomplish.

F. Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985) 1.156

40 When he established the heavens, I was there, when he drew a circle on the face of the deep, when he made firm the skies above, when he established the fountains of the deep, when he assigned to the sea its limit, so that the waters might not transgress his command, when he marked out the foundations of the earth, then I was beside him, like a master worker; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing before him always, rejoicing in his inhabited world and delighting in the human race.

41 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 89. Regarding this creational aspect, Gieschen points out that Wisdom is “pictured as intimately involved in the act of creating the world, even having cosmogenic functions (Prov 8:27–31, cf. 3:19–20).” Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 90.

42 G. Scholem, “The Name of God and the Linguistic Theory of the Kabbalah,” *Diogenes* 79 (Fall 1972) 59–80 at 68.

43 Robert Hamerton-Kelly points out that Jewish apocalypticism entertains

the idea of things pre-existing in the mind of God. The idea that everything takes place according to God's plan is central to the apocalyptic outlook (1 *Enoch* 9:3; 39:11; *Ass. Mos.* 1:12–14; 12:4). The whole creation exists in the mind of God before it takes place. . . . The contents of God's plan is called “the mystery” or “mysteries” (1QM 14:4; Dan 2:19, 28–29), and the knowledge given the seer is a revealing of mysteries. These mysteries are sometimes thought of as written on heavenly tablets (1 *Enoch* 81:1–3; 93:2; 103:2–3). The idea of the plan of God written on heavenly tablets, could have contributed to the development of the later rabbinic idea of the (written) Torah as the pre-existent instrument or plan of creation; however, the main contributor to that development was the Wisdom tradition.

R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament*, SNTSMS, 21 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973) 18–19

44 In the shorter and longer recension of 2 *Enoch* 30:8, Wisdom is also responsible for the creation of the human being on the sixth day. The longer recension reads: “And on the sixth day I commanded my wisdom to create man out of the seven components.”

Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.150. The shorter recension reads: "When I had finished all this, I commanded my wisdom to create man." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.151.

45 Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 42.

46 This trend has persisted for centuries in the Jewish tradition. Solomon Schechter argues that:

as soon as the Torah was identified with the Wisdom of Proverbs, the mind did not rest satisfied with looking upon it as a mere condition for the existence of the world. Every connotation of the term Wisdom in the famous eighth chapter of Proverbs was invested with life and individuality. The Torah, by this same process, was personified and endowed with a mystical life of its own, which emanates from God, yet is partly detached from him. Even single letters of the alphabet are endowed with a separate life, enabling them to act the same part almost as the Torah. The whole later mystical theory which degenerated into the combinations of letters to which the most important meaning is attached, takes its origin from these personifications.

S. Schechter, *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology* (New York: Schocken, 1909) 129

On this subject, see also G. Boccaccini, "The Preexistence of the Torah: A Common-place in Early Judaism or a Later Rabbinic Development?" *Henoah* 17 (1995) 329–350.

47 Various reasons for this identification have been proposed. Ringgren suggests that:

this identification of Wisdom with the law is – as Ludin Jansen suggests – probably a polemic against some foreign doctrine of wisdom. The heavenly wisdom that these people profess is of no value; the true wisdom from Heaven is the law, *torah*.

Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 109–110

48 There is a scholarly consensus that by the second century B.C.E. the identification of Wisdom with Torah has been strongly established. See C. Mangan, "Wisdom, Torah and Creation in Targumic Literature," in *Biblical and Near Eastern Essays: Studies in Honor of Kevin J. Cathcart*, eds. C. McCarthy and J. F. Healey (London: T&T Clark, 2004) 143–153 at 143. Some scholars suggest that the identification may have been made even earlier. For example, Maher observes that "it seems that the Deuteronomic school of writers were influenced by the sages and that by presenting the Torah in the style that is reminiscent of wisdom literature the Book of Deuteronomy prepared the way for this identification." M. Maher, "Some Aspects of Torah in Judaism," *ITQ* 38 (1971) 310–325.

49 Hurtado reasons that:

this definition of Wisdom as Torah continues into the rabbinic literature in which the personification of Wisdom is replaced by the vivid personification of *torah*, which assumes much of the significance and role of Wisdom (e.g., *Midr. Ber. R.* 1:1, 4).

Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 44

Indeed, in later Jewish mysticism, the Torah was often understood as a hypostatic Wisdom or as the heavenly organism. Moshe Idel suggests that in Jewish mystical lore,

the Torah is conceived of as a name of God (or a series of divine names), and the Torah is conceived of as an organism. . . . In this conception, the Torah at its esoteric level, like God, has the form of a human being.

M. Idel, "Concepts of Scripture in Jewish Mysticism," in *Jewish Concepts of Scripture: A Comparative Introduction*, ed. B. D. Sommer (New York: New York University Press, 2012) 157–178 at 159

A more widespread view is that the Torah contains divine names. Idel notes that:

these two notions (the Torah as containing divine names, and the Torah as a divine name), viewed together, return us to the idea that the Torah is the body of God: the individual divine names found throughout the Torah are individual limbs; when combined, these individual limbs/names form the whole body of God, which is to say, form the Torah's text, which is one long and mysterious appellation for God.

Idel, "Concepts of Scripture in Jewish Mysticism," 161

50 Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 42.

51 The exact nature of Wisdom's personification in Sirach remains a debated issue. Answering an important question whether "Wisdom in Sirach is a hypostasis or not," Ringgren writes that:

several scholars, especially Catholic ones, answer the question in the negative, others in the affirmative. In order to solve this problem we must once more consider some passages concerning the relation of Wisdom to God. Man cannot acquire wisdom; God alone possesses it in full measure. In this case wisdom is a quality of God. Wisdom is further created by God before everything else; thus it is of divine origin (1:3, 4, 9; 24:9). She has gone forth from the mouth of God and may be compared with the word of God and with the spirit of God (24:3).

Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 113

52 Regarding the presentation of Sophia in Sirach 24, John Collins observes that:

Sirach 24:1–2 gives the setting for Wisdom's speech. Verse 2 clearly locates her in the heavenly council (cf. Ps. 82:1), with the implication that she is imagined as a heavenly, angelic being. It is possible that "her people" in v. 1 refers to this heavenly assembly, but it is more likely to refer to Israel, among whom Wisdom settles in vv. 8–12. She speaks, then, on both earthly and heavenly levels simultaneously.

J. J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997) 50

53 R. Murphy, "Israel's Wisdom: Dialogue Between the Sages," in *Light in a Spotless Mirror*, eds. J. H. Charlesworth and M. A. Daise (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003) 7–25 at 21. Although he suggests that "some of the latter may be doubtful." Murphy, "Israel's Wisdom," 21.

54 Bar 3:29–4:1 also identifies Wisdom with the Torah:

Who has gone up into heaven, and taken her, and brought her down from the clouds? Who has gone over the sea, and found her, and will buy her for pure gold? No one knows the way to her, or is concerned about the path to her. But the one who knows all things knows her, he found her by his understanding. The one who prepared the earth for all time filled it with four-footed creatures; the one who sends forth the light, and it goes; he called it, and it obeyed him, trembling; the stars shone in their watches, and were glad; he called them, and they said, "Here we are!" They shone with gladness for him who made them. This is our God; no other can be compared to him. He found the whole way to knowledge, and gave her to his servant Jacob and to Israel, whom he loved. Afterward she appeared on earth and lived with humankind. She is the book of the commandments of God, the law that endures forever. All who hold her fast will live, and those who forsake her will die.

55 A. Villeneuve, *Nuptial Symbolism in Second Temple Writing, the New Testament, and Rabbinic Writings*, AJEC, 92 (Leiden: Brill, 2016) 76. On the identification of Wisdom and Torah in Sirach, see also S. Burkes, "Wisdom and Law: Choosing Life in Ben Sira and Baruch," *JSJ* 30 (1999) 253–276; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, 54–56; M. Gilbert, "L'éloge de la Sagesse (Siracide 24)," *RTL* 5 (1974) 326–348 at 337–338; M. A. Jolley, *The Function of Torah in Sirach* (Ph.D. diss. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, 1993); J. Marböck, *Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira*, BZAW, 272 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999) 85–96; J. Marböck, "Gesetz und Weisheit: Zum Verständnis des Gesetzes bei Jesus Ben Sira," *BZ* 20 (1976) 1–21; L. G. Perdue, *Wisdom and Creation: The Theology of Wisdom Literature* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1994) 242–248; F. V. Reiterer, "The Interpretation of the Wisdom Tradition of the Torah Within Ben Sira," in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, eds. A. Passaro and G. Bellia; DCL, 1 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008) 209–231; J. Rogers, "'It Overflows Like the Euphrates with Understanding': Another Look at the Relationship Between Law and Wisdom in Sirach," in *Of Scribes and Sages*:

- Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*, ed. C. A. Evans; SSEJC, 9, 2 vols. (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004) 1.114–121; J. T. Sanders, “When Sacred Canopies Collide: The Reception of the Torah of Moses in the Wisdom Literature of the Second-Temple Period,” *JSJ* 32 (2001) 121–136; P. Schäfer, “Wisdom Finds a Home: Torah as Wisdom,” in *Light in a Spotless Mirror*, eds. J. H. Charlesworth and M. A. Daise (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003) 26–44; E. J. Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul*, WUNT, 16 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985); A. M. Sinnott, *Personification of Wisdom*, SOTSMS (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005) 137–138; B. Wright, “Torah and Sapiential Pedagogy in the Book of Ben Sira,” in *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of “Torah” in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*, eds. B. Schipper and D. Teeter; JSJSS, 163 (Leiden: Brill, 2003) 157–186.
- 56 Villeneuve, *Nuptial Symbolism in Second Temple Writings*, 76.
- 57 “Ἐγὼ ἀπὸ στόματος ὑψίστου ἐξῆλθον καὶ ὡς ὀμίχλη κατεκάλυσα γῆν.” Ringgren records that:
- in Chap. 24 Wisdom is a personal being, raising her voice in the council of God and praising herself (vv. 1f.) . . . Moreover, she is said to have come forth from the mouth of God and is thus identified with the word (v. 3a).
- Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 108
- 58 Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, 50.
- 59 Scholars argue that in the *Wisdom of Solomon*, Sophia is imagined as a hypostasis. Winston suggests that in this work Wisdom “is undoubtedly a ‘hypostasis’ as that term was very broadly defined by Oesterly and Box, i.e. ‘a quasi-personification of certain attributes proper to God, occupying an intermediate position between personalities and abstract beings.’” D. Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB, 43 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979) 34.
- 60 J. Jervell, *Imago Dei. Gen 1, 26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*, FRLANT, 76 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960) 49.
- 61 J. J. Collins, “Apocalyptic Eschatology in Philosophical Dress in the Wisdom of Solomon,” in *Shem in the Tents of Japhet: Essays on the Encounter of Judaism and Hellenism*, ed. J. L. Kugel; JSJSS, 74 (Leiden: Brill, 2002) 94.
- 62 Collins notes that “Wisdom mediates between God and the cosmos and between God and humanity.” Collins, “Apocalyptic Eschatology in Philosophical Dress in the Wisdom of Solomon,” 94–95.
- 63 Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 117. Winston writes “the most remarkable feature about the author’s description of Sophia is that he depicts her as an effluence or emanation of God’s glory.” Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, 38.
- 64 Wis 9:4: “give me the wisdom that sits by your throne, and do not reject me from among your servants” (δός μοι τὴν τῶν σῶν θρόνων πάρεδρον σοφίαν καὶ μὴ με ἀποδοκιμάσῃς ἐκ παίδων σου).
- 65 Wis 9:10: “Send her forth from the holy heavens, and from the throne of your glory send her.” (ἐξαπόστειλον αὐτήν ἐξ ἁγίων οὐρανῶν καὶ ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης σου πέμψον αὐτήν).
- 66 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 95.
- 67 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 97.
- 68 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 93–94. Gieschen reiterates this position later in his study, arguing that “the depiction of Wisdom as an enthroned angelomorphic figure in Wisdom of Solomon is a profound theological statement of her divinity.” Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 97.
- 69 Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.130. See also *1 Enoch* 84:3: “For you made, and you rule, everything, and nothing is too hard for you, and no wisdom escapes you; it does not turn away from your throne, nor from your presence.” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.194.
- 70 Wis 9:10: “καὶ ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης σου πέμψον αὐτήν.”
- 71 Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 119.

- 72 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 95.
 73 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 95.
 74 J. R. Dodson, *The "Powers" of Personification: Rhetorical Purpose in the Book of Wisdom and the Letter to the Romans*, BZNW, 161 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008) 109.
 75 "μύστις γάρ ἐστὶν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιστήμης καὶ αἰρετικὸς τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ."
 76 Dodson, *The "Powers" of Personification*, 110.
 77 Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 118.
 78 R. G. Hall, "Pre-Existence, Naming, and Investiture in the Similitudes of Enoch and in Hebrews," *Religion and Theology* 18 (2011) 311–333 at 314.
 79 Hall, "Pre-Existence, Naming, and Investiture in the Similitudes of Enoch and in Hebrews," 318–319.
 80 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 107–108.
 81 Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 45.
 82 D. T. Runia, "Logos," in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, eds. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst (Leiden: Brill, 1995) 528.
 83 A. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism*, SJLA, 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1977) 169.
 84 C. J. Davis, *The Name and Way of the Lord: Old Testament Themes, New Testament Christology*, JSNTS, 129 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) 53. One encounters such a tendency in *Somm.* 1.228–230:

for we read "I am the God that appeared to thee," not "in my place" but "in the place of God," as though it were another's. What, then, are we to say? He that is truly God is One, but those that are improperly so called are more than one. Accordingly the holy word in the present instance has indicated Him Who is truly God by means of the articles saying "I am the God," while it omits the article when mentioning him who is improperly so called, saying "Who appeared to thee in the place" not "of the God," but simply "of God." Here it gives the title of "God" to His chief Word, not from any superstitious nicety in applying names, but with one aim before him, to use words to express facts.

F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, *Philo*, LCL, 10 vols.
 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929–1964) 5.419

- 85 Runia, "Logos," 528.
 86 D. Winston, *Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1985) 49–50.
 87 Sterling notes that Philo "knew of more than one interpretation of the phrase 'the image of God.' He was aware of the identification of the image with the Logos, with the human mind, and with the idea of humankind." G. Sterling, "Different Traditions or Emphases? The Image of God in Philo's *De Opificio Mundi*," in *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity*, eds. G. Anderson et al., STDJ, 106 (Leiden: Brill, 2013) 55.
 88 G. Sterling, "'The Image of God': Becoming Like God in Philo, Paul, and Early Christianity," in *Portraits of Jesus: Studies in Christology*, ed. S. E. Myers, WUNT, 321 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012) 157–173 at 161.
 89 Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, 1.21.
 90 Jack Levison notes that:

in an attempt to demonstrate that the world is a copy of God's divine reason or logos, Philo appeals to Gen 1:27, interpreting the prepositional phrase, κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ, to mean, "according to God's image," that is, as a copy of the logos. The "image" does not refer to a human attribute but to the logos. Philo then proceeds by arguing that, if a part of the creation is a copy of God's image, the logos, then the whole of creation must be a copy as well.

J. R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism from Sirach to 2 Baruch*, JSPSS, 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988) 65–66

- 91 G. H. van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity*, WUNT, 232 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 55.
- 92 T. H. Tobin, "The Prologue of John and Hellenistic Jewish Speculation," *CBQ* 52 (1990) 252–269 at 257.
- 93 Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, 1.365–367.
- 94 *Her.* 231 reads:
 One is the archetypal reason above us, the other the copy of it which we possess. Moses calls the first the "image of God," the second the cast of that image. For God, he says, made man not "the image of God" but "after the image" (Gen 1:27).
 Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, 4.399
- 95 Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, 7.147.
- 96 M. Meye Thompson, *The God of the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001) 35.
- 97 R. Marcus, *Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis*, LCL (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953) 148–149.
- 98 Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 45.
- 99 Sterling, "'The Image of God,'" 165.
- 100 Sterling, "'The Image of God,'" 165.
- 101 Sterling, "'The Image of God,'" 165.
- 102 H. A. Wolfson, *Philo, Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947) 1.184.
- 103 Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, 4.207.
- 104 QG 4.140 reads: "the sacred scriptures are not monuments of knowledge and vision but are the divine commands and the divine words." Marcus, *Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis*, 421–422.
- 105 Wolfson, *Philo, Foundations of Religious Philosophy*, 2.190.
- 106 P. Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*, NovTSup, 86 (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 5. Francesca Calabi notes that "for Philo, the *topos* of the world of ideas, which is the object of thought, lies within the divine Logos (*Opif.* 20)." F. Calabi, *God's Acting, Man's Acting: Tradition and Philosophy in Philo of Alexandria*. Studies in Philo of Alexandria, 4 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008) 9. She further points out that:
 the Logos is presented as the sum of all ideas (*Somm.* 2.45), as a set of an infinite number of ideas (*Sacr.* 83), as the archetypal idea (*Spec.* 3.207), the idea of ideas (*Migr.* 103), and the archetypal seal we say is the intelligible world (*Opif.* 25).
 Calabi, *God's Acting, Man's Acting*, 10
- 107 D. T. Runia, "Philo, Alexandrian and Jew," in *Exegesis and Philosophy: Studies on Philo of Alexandria* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1990) 8–9.
- 108 Runia suggests that:
 in the most general terms it can be said that the Logos represents the face of God turned towards reality. Sometimes the Logos is talked about in terms of an independently existing entity (a "hypostasis"), sometimes he is more like an aspect of God, just like the powers mentioned above.
 Runia, "Philo, Alexandrian and Jew," 9
- 109 Hall, "Pre-Existence, Naming, and Investiture in the Similitudes of Enoch and in Hebrews," 320–321.
- 110 Tobin, "The Prologue of John," 260.

1 The divine image as the hypostasis of divine knowledge

Divine image and divine knowledge

In many biblical theophanies the deity appears in an anthropomorphic shape.¹ The distinct details of these portrayals and their immediate context suggest that the biblical authors understood these disclosures as the most important revelations about God ever given to humankind. Such revelations about God's form are also considered to be the pinnacle of divine knowledge in early extra-biblical Jewish accounts. In some apocalyptic texts, the visualisation of God was a unique mystical experience in which a seer not only obtains knowledge about the divine form, but this iconic knowledge is literally imbedded in his new celestial ontology as he acquires attributes and qualities of the divine form that he had just beheld. In this, the human adept's transformed body itself becomes a heavenly "tablet," revealed now as a deposit of the iconic divine knowledge. This understanding is deeply rooted in biblical traditions about humankind's creation after the image of God.² Elliot Wolfson suggests that "a critical factor in determining the biblical (and, by extension, subsequent Jewish) attitude toward the visualization of God concerns the question of the morphological resemblance between the human body and the divine."³ In the biblical priestly traditions, the deity creates humanity in his own image (Gen 1:27) and is, therefore, frequently described as possessing a human-like form (Ezek 1; Dan 7). This morphological resemblance signals that from the beginning the human form was intended to be a visual revelation of the deity's nature, attributes, and shape.

The divine image traditions have ancient cultic roots. The theophanic functions of the *imago Dei* and its human holder recall ancient Near Eastern traditions of cultic statues and images, which were thought to cultivate the divine presence⁴ and to communicate iconic knowledge about God.⁵ Michael Dick suggests that the Mesopotamian cult statue was "a special theophany or epiphany by which the deity's power and efficacy are made available to the iconodule" since it was considered to be "the main conduit of divine self-disclosure."⁶

In order to communicate the divine presence and truly become a theophany, the cultic statue must be "brought to life"⁷ through elaborate "activating" rituals,⁸ often performed with the help of a deity.⁹ Ancient Near Eastern ceremonies of the cultic statues' animations, known as the rite of the "washing of the

mouth” (*mīs pī*) and the “opening of the mouth” (*pīt pī*), provide important evidence for vivification ordeals.¹⁰ Some apocalyptic accounts also preserve memories of initiations used to bring some of the pseudepigraphical exemplars to eternal life.¹¹ It is worth noting that these rituals appear in apocalyptic stories where the heroes often regain the status of prelapsarian humanity.

Although idolatry was discouraged in the Jewish religious milieu, the idea of the cultic statue as a manifestation of the divine presence and a deposit of the iconic divine knowledge was paradoxically perpetuated in Israelite traditions about the *imago Dei*.¹² Andreas Schüle indicates that the prohibition of idolatrous cultic images in Israel

did not put an end altogether to the idea of the “image of God.” It is remarkable that very much at the same time when prophets like Deutero-Isaiah and Ezekiel poured scorn on the idols, the idea of the “image of God” was very much alive in another strand of biblical tradition that is probably about contemporaneous with these prophets: according to the priestly telling of creation in Gen 1:1–2:4a it is not lifeless matter, not a man-made statue, but humans as living beings that are envisioned to be indeed the true image of God.¹³

Schüle further suggests that:

we have strong reason to assume that the idea of Man as the “image of God” in Gen 1–9 has been developed on the background of this ancient view of divine presence in the shape of images. This view, however, has been so transformed that not a material object, a statue, but Man as a living being¹⁴ took on the role of the image.¹⁵

The replacement of cultic statues made by human hands with living icons made by God was not novel,¹⁶ but was nevertheless a significant development, because human bones and flesh became the materials used to construct a new cultic image.¹⁷ Mark Smith suggests that

perhaps the use of Biblical Hebrew *šelem* for idols hints at the meaning of the human person as being in the image and likeness of God: unlike the lifeless images of false deities, the image of the human person in Gen 1:26–27 is alive and attests to the living God of Israel.¹⁸

The deity’s construction of divine images in the form of the prelapsarian Adam and his eschatological counterparts – Enoch, Jacob, and Moses – constitutes a significant development for the hypostatisation of celestial knowledge because these figures mediate the deity’s power and efficacy to their audiences not only through their utterings and books but also through the medium of their transformed bodies.

Embodied divine knowledge in the form of the *imago Dei* was endowed with the power of God's presence and, as such, commanded obedience and reverence from the rest of creation. This submission is required from those residing on earth, such as animals, over whom Adam is established as a king, and also from celestial citizens – angels, who also must submit and bow down before this living manifestation of the divine presence.¹⁹

Furthermore, there are some other epistemological consequences of the resemblance. By virtue of being created in the image of God, prelapsarian humans are able to grasp the fullness of divine knowledge. This represents one of the foundational tenets of the *imago Dei* religious epistemology, which later Jewish and Christian accounts reiterate. These materials often connect the possession or loss of the divine image in humans with their ability to grasp the entirety of divine knowledge.²⁰ The image of God becomes a gateway to divine knowledge. In order to regain the access that was lost by humankind after their fall in the Garden of Eden, eschatological heroes must recover the fullness of the *imago Dei* by becoming this entity. Schüle notes that possession of the image of God makes humans “capable of approaching God in prayer, worship and sacrifice that come from its own creative powers, from its wisdom and from its deep devotion to what is made in its own likeness.”²¹

Because of this, early Jewish pseudepigraphical accounts often depict their heroes, represented by biblical exemplars, not merely as a reflection or a “likeness” of the *imago Dei*, but as the image of God itself, understanding them as icons of the deity who incapsulated the ultimate knowledge about God in their newly acquired ontology.

Indeed, through the eschatological transformation into the image of God, a pseudepigraphical exemplar became a conduit of iconic divine knowledge who mediates knowledge of the divine form not only to his earthly adepts but to citizens of heaven as well. This demonstrates that while some divine revelations can be transmitted via books or oracles, others can only be conveyed through the “tablet” of the adept's transformed body.

In many pseudepigraphical accounts, heavenly knowledge read from heavenly books and heard from angels was usually transmitted through the exemplar's writings which he copies from heavenly books or records from the instructions given by angels. Yet, the incomprehensible vision of the divine form and its embodied presence cannot be simply put on paper – it must be embedded in the adept's own body in order that the most recondite disclosure could be transmitted to others. So, this iconic knowledge was literally imprinted on the adept's changed physique, making him a replica of God's anthropomorphic extent, his visual representation through which he is able now to communicate the divine presence. Moses' shining face is one of the earliest biblical specimens of this endowment and, as such, a paradigmatic example for future transmissions of this type of iconic knowledge. However, the iconic epistemological dimension of Moses' shining face or Enoch's and Jacob's transformed bodies often escapes interpreters' attention. In order to better grasp these traditions of embodied

divine knowledge, we need to investigate early Adamic accounts which lay an important conceptual background for epistemological personifications.

Background: Adam's inauguration into the role of the divine icon

In order to better understand the complete pattern of the conceptual developments pertaining to the pseudepigraphical exemplar's initiation into his role as the divine image, we must carefully explore the induction ceremony found in the *Primary Adam Books*. Although the macroforms of these books represent products of later Christian milieus, these Christian compositions are important compilations of early Jewish²² Adamic traditions.²³

Despite the fact that many details of the initiation into the divine image appear in other early Jewish accounts – including the Book of Daniel, the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian, 2 *Enoch*, the *Prayer of Joseph*, and the *Ladder of Jacob* – the Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Primary Adam Books*²⁴ include the synopsis of the ritual's crucial elements.²⁵ Many details of Adam's inauguration into the *imago Dei* appear also in other Jewish, Christian, and Muslim materials, including the Slavonic version of 3 *Bar.* 4,²⁶ *Apoc. Sedr.* 5:1–3,²⁷ *Gos. Bart.* 4,²⁸ the Coptic *Enthronement of the Archangel Michael*,²⁹ the *Cave of Treasures* 2–3,³⁰ and *Qur'an* 2:31–39; 7:11–18³¹; 15:31–48³²; 17:61–65; 18:50; 20:116–123; 38:71–85.

Similar to the Near Eastern traditions of cultic images that include the “ritual of activation” for cultic divine images, Adam's introduction to the world also includes a ritual.³³ Some scholars see rudiments of this ritual element that parallels Mesopotamian “activation ceremonies” already in the biblical accounts of the protoplast's creation in the initial chapters of the Book of Genesis.³⁴

In the *Primary Adam Books*, after the protoplast's creation, the archangel Michael brings Adam into the divine presence and forces him to bow down before God. His initial veneration to the deity will become a crucial component of other Jewish descriptions of the ritual. The *Primary Adam Books* attest here to an ancient Jewish pattern. Adam's veneration of the deity implicitly indicates that God may also be present in the account. Several other references suggest the deity's presence, such as God's address to Adam after the ritual obeisance. In this address, as it appears in the Latin *Vita*, the deity tells Adam that his body was created in the likeness of the divine form: “Behold, Adam, I have made you in our image and likeness.”³⁵ In the Georgian version, God's address is directed to the archangel Michael: “And God told Michael, ‘I have created Adam according to (my) image and my divinity.’”³⁶

We also learn from the *Primary Adam Books* that all of the angels are ordered to bow down to Adam.³⁷ At this point, there is a paradigm shift in the understanding of Adam's true nature. Significantly, Michael, who summons the celestial citizens for the act of veneration, does not ask them to venerate Adam, who, according to biblical traditions and previous narration, was created *in* the image of God. Instead, Michael commands them to bow down before *the image and the likeness of God*. Adam, who previously was described as created after the

image of God, now is identified as the image of God. Here, humanity becomes an extension of the divine presence. Crispin Fletcher-Louis rightly observes that “Adam as God’s image is by no means an incidental detail of the Worship of Adam Story.”³⁸ It represents a striking departure from the biblical profile of the protoplast. George van Kooten notes that:

in the *Life of Adam and Eve*, the phrase “image of God” becomes wholly identical with Adam. The remark of Gen 1:26 that Adam is created in the image and after the likeness of God is passed over in silence. Adam simply is God’s image and, within this mindset, he is the object of worship by the angels.³⁹

In the Georgian version of the *Primary Adam Books*, Michael commands the angels to “bow down before the likeness and the image of the divinity.”⁴⁰ The Latin version also speaks of the divine image: “Worship the image of the Lord God, just as the Lord God has commanded.”⁴¹ Likewise in the Armenian version, although Adam’s name is not mentioned, he appears not only as being made after the divine anthropomorphic manifestation but as the divine manifestation itself: “then Michael summoned all the angels, and God said to them, Come, bow down to god whom I made.”⁴²

The results of Michael’s order to “activate”⁴³ the cultic image of the deity are mixed. Some angels agree to bow down before it, while others, including Satan, refuse to do obeisance. The Latin version reiterates the tradition of the image of God when Michael personally invites Satan to “worship the image of God Jehovah.”⁴⁴ In contrast to Michael’s command that does not name Adam, but instead refers to him as the “image of God,” Satan’s response specifically mentions Adam’s name. Satan sees Adam not as an icon of the divine presence but instead as a creature who is “younger” or “posterior” to the antagonist.⁴⁵ Satan’s refusal to venerate Adam introduces the theme of “opposition” to the divine image.

Both motifs – angelic veneration and angelic opposition⁴⁶ – play an equally significant role in the construction of Adam’s unique upper identity as the image of God,⁴⁷ which climaxes in his exaltation.⁴⁸ These pivotal events are comparable to the Mesopotamian rites of animation through which a new cultic image was brought to life in order to communicate the divine presence. In Adam’s story, like in the rites of the “washing of the mouth” and the “opening the mouth,” angelic veneration and angelic opposition test the authenticity of the new “statue” of God as a true witness to the divine presence. In eschatological versions of the ritual, angelic veneration and opposition will lead a human protagonist, such as Enoch, Jacob, or Moses, into his new supra-angelic ontology, when he will be fully embraced as the “image” of the deity. Silviu Bunta perceptively connects the tension between angelic veneration and opposition to the protoplast’s role as the *cultic* image of God. He suggests that:

the contrast emphasizes the twofold nature of the protoplast. Adam is both the living cultic statue of God and, as Satan stresses derisively, a “youth.” This dichotomy is situated entirely within Adam’s body. His body is a mixture of divine likeness and clay. The dichotomy reflects the ontology

of a [Mesopotamian] cultic statue of a deity,⁴⁹ which is a mixture of earthly material and divine likeness.⁵⁰

The *Primary Adam Books* accounts contain not only angelic reactions but also Adam's own veneration of the deity.⁵¹ Adam's own obeisance further establishes his intermediate position between God and the angels/the rest of creation in his role as God's cultic "icon," a revelatory and mediating entity, who incapsulates in his own anthropomorphic shape the most recondite knowledge about the deity.⁵² As a "living" religious artifact Adam can be understood as a cultic image, fashioned by God himself, to reveal his presence to celestial and earthly citizens.⁵³ Fletcher-Louis rightly points out that,

because the angels are commanded to respond to Adam as the image and likeness of God, the "worship" of Adam (if that is what it is) does not necessarily mean that God's singular, unique identity is now threatened by the worship of another figure.⁵⁴

Adam is presented "not as the ultimate object of veneration but rather as a representation or an icon of the deity through whom the angels are able to worship God."⁵⁵ The uniqueness of Adam as icon is underlined by the fact that he is made by God himself. Regarding Adam's role as the image of God, John Wortley argues that "the word *icon* refers to a unique act of creation and the exclusive prerogative of the deity: the projection of the divine likeness into creation. In this sense only God can make an icon, and that once only."⁵⁶ This illustrates an important epistemological dimension in which Adam, as the icon of God, is able to incapsulate the divine knowledge in his newly created "iconic" form. The theophanic power of this representation perplexes creatures. According to some later Jewish accounts, confused angels mistake the *imago Dei* for God.⁵⁷ This demonstrates the power of resemblance when Adam literally becomes an embodiment of the divine presence, through whom the theophanic knowledge about God is transmitted first to angels and then to the rest of creation.

The ritual of angelic veneration recalls the *Kavod* imagery, since in heaven the *Kavod* is often surrounded by angelic worship. However, questions remain about how the prelapsarian Adam's form relates to the divine Glory. Indeed, some features of the divine *Kavod*, including the divine radiance, are constant attributes of the protoplast in his role as the divine image, as well as other eschatological "Adams" like Enoch, Jacob, and Moses who acquire luminosity as a part of their *imago Dei* initiations. Furthermore, similar to the Mesopotamian concept of *melammu*,⁵⁸ radiance can be removed from the recipient as it was from Adam after his fall in Eden or from Enoch in *2 Enoch* when God ordered a "frozen angel" to cool the seventh patriarch's incandescent face before his missionary trip to the earth. For our study it is important that already in the Hebrew Bible, the *Kavod* imagery is closely associated with the aesthetics of Near Eastern cultic statues. Some scholars argue that in the biblical materials the *Kavod* "serves as the closest analog to the ancient Near Eastern cult image,"⁵⁹ becoming "a new and improved cult statue."⁶⁰

In the *Primary Adam Books*, both Adam and Eve are depicted using glory imagery.⁶¹ The Armenian version of the *Primary Adam Books* 10:1 mentions that “when Eve came forth from the water . . . the form of her glory remained brilliant.”⁶² Later, in 20:1 of the same version, the glory of the protoplasts is again mentioned when Eve narrates the moment when she lost her primordial garment: “at that hour I learned with my eyes that I was naked of the glory with which I had been clothed.”⁶³ The glory is again referenced in 21:1, this time, in connection with Adam: “then Adam came to me with his great glory.”⁶⁴ The Greek version of the *Primary Adam Books* 21:2 mentions the loss of glory after the protoplasts’ transgression: “I spoke to him words of transgression which have brought us down from our great glory.”⁶⁵ In 21:6 of the same version Adam blames Eve about this tragic event: “O wicked woman! What have you done to us? You have deprived me of the glory of God.”⁶⁶ These references illustrate that the authors of the *Primary Adam Books* might have understood Adam’s, and possibly Eve’s, original form as the image or the “icon” of the divine Glory, *Kavod*.⁶⁷ Indeed, in early Jewish biblical accounts there are attempts to depict Adam with the attributes of the divine *Kavod*. One of the earliest testimonies to the protoplast’s exalted condition is Ezek 28:12–17:

Mortal, raise a lamentation over the king of Tyre, and say to him, Thus says the Lord God: You were the signet of perfection, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. You were in Eden, the garden of God; every precious stone was your covering, carnelian, chrysolite, and moonstone, beryl, onyx, and jasper, sapphire, turquoise, and emerald; and worked in gold were your settings and your engravings. On the day that you were created they were prepared. With an anointed cherub as guardian I placed you; you were on the holy mountain of God; you walked among the stones of fire. You were blameless in your ways from the day that you were created, until iniquity was found in you. In the abundance of your trade you were filled with violence, and you sinned; so I cast you as a profane thing from the mountain of God, and the guardian cherub drove you out from among the stones of fire. Your heart was proud because of your beauty; you corrupted your wisdom for the sake of your splendor. I cast you to the ground; I exposed you before kings, to feast their eyes on you.

Scholars have previously proposed that this account cryptically conveys the protoplast’s story and his fall in the Garden of Eden. Daphna Arbel mentions that the setting is “evoked by references to ‘Eden, the garden of God’ (Ezek 28:13), an expression reminiscent of Genesis 2–3, as well as by indirect references to the creation of this figure by God at the beginning of time (Ezek 28:13, 15).”⁶⁸ The account appears to portray Adam’s exalted condition as the deity’s glorious icon before his transgression and eventual demise. Arbel suggests that “although the text does not depict the figure with certainty, the language applied emphasizes his position as YHWH’s vice-regent, or signet, who is expected to embody God’s essence and to implement his will.”⁶⁹ Some details of the account, including the protagonist’s placement on the “holy mountain

of God,” a *topos* which was often envisioned as the divine throne in some other early Jewish accounts, might suggest that Adam possesses attributes of the divine *Kavod*.

Furthermore, some interpreters see in the Cherub’s designation as the “signet of perfection” a possible reference to his role as the *imago Dei*. According to Christopher Morray-Jones,

behind this passage there lies a version of the primordial Paradise tradition which is independent of, and possibly older than, that preserved in Genesis 2–3. The description, then, referred originally to the primordial Adam, who is the embodiment of the divine Image or “seal of perfect proportion,” and is here identified with the golden, bejeweled Cherub whose outstretched wings overshadowed the Ark in the Holy of Holies of the Temple.⁷⁰

Another early Jewish testimony to Adam’s exalted status, 4Q504, also portrays him as the one who is fashioned in the image of the divine Glory: “[Adam,] our [fat]her, you fashioned in the image of [your] glory. . . [the breath of life] you [b]lew into his nostril, and intelligence and knowledge.”⁷¹ Van Kooten notes that

the “likeness of your glory” is a clear reference to Gen 1:26, which speaks of the image and likeness of God. 4Q504’s summary of this is remarkable, because it qualifies this likeness of God in terms of “glory,” a term never used in Gen 1.⁷²

Fletcher-Louis observes that the concept of the “likeness of God’s glory” clearly parallels Ezekiel 1:28, where the divine *Kavod* is depicted.⁷³ He further suggests that “it would be fair to say that in 4Q504 Adam is identified in some way with the Glory occupying God’s throne in Ezekiel 1.”⁷⁴ Supporting the plausibility of such an identification, Van Kooten adds that

it seems undeniable that in 4Q504 there is a fusion of man as “the image and likeness of God” (Gen 1:26) and “the likeness of the glory of YHWH” (Ezek 1:28), which . . . is synonymous with “something that seemed like a human form” (Ezek 1:26). The fusion of these terms from Gen 1 and Ezek 1 shows that, as early as the Dead Sea Scrolls, these passages were read together, and, in my understanding, are indeed part of the same worldview.⁷⁵

Van Kooten also calls attention to the epistemological dimension of this identification, noting that

despite the fragmentary state of 4Q504, it seems clear that the “likeness of God’s glory” also has something to do with “knowledge and understanding”: “[a breath of life] you blew into his nostril, and intelligence and

knowledge” (4Q504 frag. 8 5). This reminds us of a similar link in Sirach 17:7 where, in the context of a reference to God’s image, the author says that God filled man with “knowledge and understanding.”⁷⁶

Several other scrolls also expound on the glory of Adam.⁷⁷ One example is 1QS iv 22–23 which speaks about God’s elect whom “God has chosen for an everlasting covenant and to them shall belong all the glory of Adam.”⁷⁸ Van Kooten concludes that

the concept of “all the glory of Adam” in 1QS ties in nicely with the notion of Adam’s creation in “the likeness of God’s glory” in 4Q504. In the latter document, too, there is a hint that man’s primordial possession of God’s glory is restored within the community: “Your [i.e., God’s] glory in our midst.”⁷⁹

The elect’s inheritance of “the glory of Adam” is again referenced in 4Q269 2.⁸⁰ While the aforementioned Qumran materials do not connect Adam’s glorious condition with his possession of the *Kavod*’s attributes, early Jewish pseudepigraphical materials often provide theophanic details. Thus, an association of Adam with the divine *Kavod* is implied in Chapter 30 of 2 *Enoch* where this imagery is applied to Adam’s prelapsarian condition. In this text, the protoplast is named as “the second angel” and God assigns him four special stars. Jarl Fossum suggests that, in view of the imagery attested in early Enochic texts where stars often designate angels, the allotment to Adam of the “four special stars” might allude to the fact that Adam, like God, also has his own “Princes of the Presence” – the four angels who serve near the throne of Glory.⁸¹ This angelic imagery signals that 2 *Enoch*’s authors might understand Adam as an enthroned entity resembling God’s glorious anthropomorphic extent, his *Kavod*.⁸² The *Testament of Abraham* 11:4 (Recension A) also reveals a similar tradition when it offers a depiction of “the first-formed Adam” seated on the throne at the entrance to paradise at the end of time.⁸³ Here again, Adam’s portrayal resembles God’s *Kavod*, the divine form manifested on the seat of Glory.⁸⁴

The aforementioned testimonies establish that already in the earliest Jewish accounts Adam’s role as the deity’s icon was closely related to the symbolism of the divine *Kavod*. This connection brings us to the epistemological dimension of the inauguration ceremony, a dimension which has been rarely discussed. It is, however, clear that by presenting his human icon to the angels, God intends to reveal himself, or more precisely his anthropomorphic nature, to creation. In sum, the main function of an embodied divine image is to apodictically communicate the divine presence.⁸⁵ Some comparisons with the cultic images found in other ancient cultures help to illustrate this epistemological facet more clearly. Schüle suggests that the cultic image was

the medium of manifest divine presence and action in the world and as such part of the divine person. It is, to put it pointedly, “god on earth.”

According to a common motif of ancient mythology, human beings are destined to serve the gods who are present in the form of their images.⁸⁶ P, however, takes a different approach. Adam . . . does not occur in the role of a servant but is himself associated with the image. It is not for “pragmatic” reasons that humans are created, they rather assume divine dignity in that they represent God in the created world as the cultic image would do.⁸⁷

In this epistemological setting Adam can be understood as a hypostasis or a personification of the iconic divine knowledge by which the concealed God is revealed to creation. This explains why the punishment received by the angels for not worshipping the living “icon” of the deity is so harsh in the *Primary Adam Books*. By disrespecting the first human, who stands as the deity’s symbolic presence, Satan and his angels disrespect God himself.⁸⁸ In his unique form, for the first time actualised in creation, Adam as the visible manifestation of God’s hidden nature brings forward knowledge about God to the angels. This revelatory dimension of the inauguration ceremony will be reiterated again and again in stories about the eschatological *imago Dei* – Enoch, Jacob, and Moses.

In the Adamic story, there is a subtle parallelism between the presentation of the revelation and punishment for rejecting the revelation. Knowledge about God comes to Satan and his rebellious angels not merely as an utterance or a written admonition but as an ontological event manifested in the *living* icon of the deity. So, the punishment for their rejection of this ontological disclosure also is ontological – as a result of his refusal to venerate God’s image – Satan’s nature and his lofty habitat are radically altered: he loses his former glory, his special stand in the celestial realm, and is demoted from his formerly exalted position.

To conclude our analysis of the inauguration ceremony in the *Primary Adam Books*, we must outline several important elements of this “activation” ritual that reoccur in the stories of Enoch, Jacob, and Moses being endowed with the divine image:

- 1 The protagonist’s form resembles the deity’s form. Adam is first described as being created *in* the image of God and then later becomes understood *as* an icon of the deity – the image of God.
- 2 The motif of angelic veneration.
- 3 The motif of angelic opposition/rejection.
- 4 The glorious condition of the embodied image of God.

Now that we have outlined these four elements of the inauguration ceremony, we will proceed to investigate the afterlife of these conceptual developments in the stories of the main pseudepigraphical exemplars.

Enoch as the divine image

The appearance of the divine image as personified divine knowledge, that is eschatologically embodied in the biblical exemplar, is further developed

in Enochic lore where the seventh antediluvian patriarch acts as the chosen vessel for the most recondite mysteries of God. This development receives additional epistemological complexity in Enochic lore because of the hero's well-established affiliation with esoteric knowledge,⁸⁹ a trait which the seventh antediluvian patriarch inherits from his Mesopotamian antecedents.⁹⁰ Enoch's connection with the divine knowledge is attested in a plethora of Jewish pseudepigraphical accounts. In one of the earliest Enochic booklets, the *Astronomical Book*, the acquisition and revelation of cosmological and astronomical secrets becomes a major function of the elevated Enoch. The origin of this role in the Enochic traditions can be traced to *1 Enoch* 72:1, 74:2, and 80:1, which depict the patriarch as a recipient of angelic disclosures, detailing the celestial knowledge of astronomical, meteorological, and calendrical lore. He remains in this capacity in the majority of the materials associated with the early Enochic circle. In *1 Enoch* 41:1 Enoch is portrayed as the one who "saw all secrets of heaven."⁹¹ *Jub.* 4:17 reveals that Enoch "was the first of mankind . . . who learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom."⁹² The Cairo Genizah manuscript of *Sir* 44:16 defines Enoch as "the sign of knowledge for all generations." Because of these spectacular credentials interpreters argue that "in Jewish tradition Enoch is primarily portrayed as a primeval sage, the ultimate revealer of divine secrets."⁹³ Indeed, in the Jewish pseudepigrapha the seventh patriarch mediates heavenly knowledge through his writings, admonitions, and instructions.⁹⁴ The patriarch's prowess in the heavenly secrets is deeply embedded in the fabric of the Enochic myth and is set against the expertise in the celestial knowledge that the fallen Watchers once possessed.⁹⁵ This role of Enoch will be perpetuated in Jewish tradition for the millennia and in later Hekhalot materials he will be also known as the "Knower of Secrets." According to *Synopse* §14 (*3 Enoch* 11:2), Enoch-Metatron is able to behold "deep secrets and wonderful mysteries."⁹⁶ The same affirmations occur in the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials, where Enoch's heavenly persona – the supreme angel Metatron – is depicted as "the revealer of the most recondite secrets about Godhead."⁹⁷

Multiple studies have previously attempted to catalog Enoch's activities in his mediation of the divine knowledge, including his scribal and sapiential roles.⁹⁸ Yet, these scholarly probes have often neglected another important mediatorial dimension in which the seventh patriarch mediates the deity's nature by becoming a personification or a hypostasis of the iconic knowledge about God. One, therefore, would search in vain for scholarly reflections about this epistemological facet, despite the fact that already in early Enochic booklets the patriarch is closely identified with several manifestations of the divine Form.

Indeed, in early Jewish pseudepigraphical writings Enoch is refashioned as a visual icon of the deity – an image that served in Enochic accounts, like in Adamic lore, as a revelatory device. Like Adam, Enoch personifies the divine knowledge and is designed to embody the most recondite mysteries of God, especially those pertaining to the deity's anthropomorphic form. These developments occur in *2 Enoch* where a constellation of familiar motifs recall Adam's initiation into the office of the *imago Dei*. Here, however, the eschatological

setting replaces the original protological situation and a new hero, the patriarch Enoch, supplants the protoplast as the new embodiment of the divine image. The remediation of this process is meticulously documented in *2 Enoch*. The storyline of this text, which was probably written in the first century CE, before the destruction of the Second Jerusalem Temple,⁹⁹ narrates Enoch's heavenly journey to the throne of God. There, in the deity's sacred abode, the seventh antediluvian hero undergoes a luminous metamorphosis which turns him into a celestial being that is predestined to be the deity's new cultic icon. An important nexus of conceptual developments that are relevant to our study occurs in Chapters 21 and 22 which describe Enoch's transformation. Enoch's metamorphosis includes several features reminiscent of Adam's initiations in the Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Primary Adam Books*. The story depicts angels bringing Enoch to the edge of the seventh heaven. By God's command, the archangel Gabriel invites the seer to stand in front of the deity forever. Enoch agrees, and Gabriel takes him to the deity's Form where the patriarch does obeisance to God. God then personally repeats the invitation for Enoch to stand before him forever. Following this invitation, the archangel Michael brings the patriarch before God's face. The deity summons his angels with a resounding call: "Let Enoch join in and stand in front of my face forever!" In response, God's glorious ones do obeisance to Enoch saying, "Let Enoch yield in accordance with your word, O Lord!"¹⁰⁰

Michael Stone suggests that *2 Enoch* 21–22 recalls the account of Adam's elevation and angelic veneration that occur in the Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Primary Adam Books*. Stone interjects that along with the motifs of Adam's elevation and veneration, the author of *2 Enoch* also appears to be aware of the theme of angelic disobedience and refusal to venerate the first human. Stone draws the reader's attention to the phrase "sounding them out," found in *2 Enoch* 22:6, which another translator of the Slavonic text rendered as "making a trial of them."¹⁰¹ Stone argues that the expression "sounding them out" or "making a trial of them" implies that it is the angels' obedience that is being tested.¹⁰²

In his comparison of the similarities between Adamic and Enochic accounts, Stone proposes that the order of events in *2 Enoch* follows the exact order found in the *Primary Adam Books*, since both sources are familiar with the three steps of Adam's initiation¹⁰³:

- 1 *Primary Adam Books*: Adam is created and placed in heaven.
2 Enoch: Enoch is brought to heaven.
- 2 *Primary Adam Books*: The archangel Michael brings Adam before God's face. Adam does obeisance to God.
2 Enoch: The archangel Michael brings Enoch before the Lord's face. Enoch does obeisance to the Lord.
- 3 *Primary Adam Books*: God commands the angels to bow down. Some of the angels do obeisance. Satan and his angels disobey.

2 *Enoch*: “The rebellion . . . is assumed. God tests whether this time the angels will obey. The angels are said to bow down and accept God’s command.”¹⁰⁴

Stone concludes that the author of 2 *Enoch* 21–22 was aware of traditions similar to those found in the Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Primary Adam Books*.¹⁰⁵ He is confident that these traditions did not enter 2 *Enoch* from the Slavonic *Life of Adam and Eve* because the specific elements outlined earlier do not occur in the Slavonic recension of the *Primary Adam Books*.¹⁰⁶

Other scholars have followed Stone’s lead in this interpretation of the 2 *Enoch* traditions. Gary Anderson suggests that 2 *Enoch* “does contain a story that appears quite close to our narrative from the *Vita*,” since “the manner in which this glorification of Enoch proceeds is strikingly similar to the elevation of Adam in the *Vita*.”¹⁰⁷ Like Stone, Anderson also argues that both sources (2 *Enoch* and the *Primary Adam Books*) develop the inauguration ceremony in a tripartite manner:

- 1 Adam is created and situated in heaven, Enoch is brought to heaven;
- 2 An angel escorts Adam to God so as to render obeisance to God, and the same is true for Enoch;
- 3 The angels are exhorted to respond in kind to Adam, and likewise for Enoch.¹⁰⁸

Anderson rightly sees the story found in 2 *Enoch* as an *eschatological* version of the inauguration ceremony where the last Adam, represented by Enoch, is newly inducted into the office that the protoplast lost after his fall. The seventh human here replaces the first one. According to Anderson, “the *Vita* presents the opening scene of a tradition whose final act, at least according to one level of its development, takes place during the era of Enoch.”¹⁰⁹ The eschatological ritual is fashioned as an abbreviated version of the first (full) ceremony which, nevertheless, still preserves the memory of its crucial steps. In relation to these changes Anderson notes that

in the *Vita* the angels are commanded to venerate Adam but Satan and his host refuse. In 2 *Enoch*, the situation is slightly different. The striking motif here is God’s intention to test the angels by parading Enoch before them. The test appears to be that of examining what the angels’ reaction to this heavenly figure in the divine court will be. When the angels accord him the obeisance he is due, Enoch is then formally clothed with the garments of glory, anointed with the oil of joy and thereby fully transformed into an angel. By according Enoch the veneration that was his due, the angels passed their test. But is this not more than slightly odd? No command was given to venerate Enoch; the angels seem to know that this is what is implied by the action of God. How would they know this? The easiest solution would be

to presume that the angels (or a portion of them) failed such a test the first time and did not show honor toward the first man. With Enoch, the angels relent and accord the human figure the honor that he is due.¹¹⁰

Anderson concludes that “one cannot imagine that the tradition in the Enoch materials was created independently from the tradition found in the *Vita*.”¹¹¹

Similar to the Adamic story, the account of Enoch’s transformation into the divine image exhibits an epistemological dimension. Through his new visual icon, heavenly Enoch, God once again is able to reveal to his creation both the visible and invisible aspects of his nature. In this respect it is noteworthy that this icon is providentially situated, similar to the protoplast’s position between God and the rest of his creation. This spatial arrangement is underlined several times in *2 Enoch*. First, God places Enoch right before his very presence, asking him “to stand before his Face forever.” Enoch’s status as the servant of God’s Face, or, in later Jewish contexts as the divine Face itself, is closely linked to his status as the hypostasis of the divine knowledge. Connections between *panim* and *tselem* will be explored more closely later in our study, but for now we should reiterate that like the divine image which serves as the revelation of the divine nature and form, the personified divine Face also signals the disclosure of the divine presence to God’s creation.

Even more radically, Enoch’s role as a mediator of the divine Form and presence is underlined later in the story when the deity places Enoch closer to him than any other earthly or celestial creature, including the archangel Gabriel, in order to reveal his ultimate secrets. During this initiation Enoch becomes privy to the most recondite divine mysteries, which prepares him to be the perfect conduit of divine knowledge. Although in the *Primary Adam Books* the protoplast reveals the deity through his form, here Enoch literally becomes a complete representation of the divine revelation not merely through his outward appearance, as the reflection of God’s Form, but also through the deity’s verbal initiation. Enoch’s role as the embodiment and personification of divine secrets will be reaffirmed in later Hekhalot and *Shi’ur Qomah* accounts where Enoch–Metatron alone is allowed behind the celestial curtain *Pargod*. In these accounts the celestial mysteries are graphically heaped upon him and written on his accoutrement, including his glorious crown.

It is also not coincidental that in *2 Enoch*, God reveals to his new hypostasis the secrets of *creation*. We have already witnessed in our analysis of Wisdom and the Logos traditions that this type of revelation about creation is often posited as the pinnacle of divine knowledge, in which God reveals his hidden plan that is actualised in the created order.

An additional feature of the inauguration ritual in *2 Enoch* is the “authorization” of the eschatological image of God with the deity’s hand, which illustrates its divine authorship. This feature can be compared to the aforementioned ancient Near Eastern “vivification” rites in which the hands of the cultic statue’s human craftsmen are symbolically amputated and authorship of the cultic image is transferred to God’s hands.¹¹² We will encounter this motif later in

Jacob's and Moses' traditions. The biblical roots of this initiation can be traced to the formative Adamic developments in the second chapter of the Book of Genesis where "God formed man from the dust of the ground." Ps 119:73 understands this formation as the work of God's hands: "Your hands have made and fashioned me." Such an understanding is reflected also in the Greek version of the *Primary Adam Books* 33:5 where angels plead before God for Adam reminding him that "he is Your image, and the work of *Your holy hands*."¹¹³ *2 Enoch* 44:1 states that "the Lord with *his own two hands* created mankind, in the facsimile of his own face both small and great, the Lord created them."¹¹⁴ Like in the case of the first *imago Dei*, the eschatological image of God in the form of Enoch must also be brought to life by the deity's hands. In *2 Enoch* 39 the patriarch relates to his children that during his encounter with the divine Face, when Enoch acquired his new heavenly form, God "helped" him with his right hand.¹¹⁵ The text describes God's hand as having a gigantic size and filling heaven: "But you, my children, see the right hand of one who helps you, a human being created identical to yourself, but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, helping me and filling heaven."¹¹⁶

The motif of God's hand that is prominent in this early Enochic account reoccurs in a later Enoch-Metatron tradition, which announces that "the hand of God rests on the head of the youth, named Metatron."¹¹⁷ The motif of the divine hand authorizing a new *imago Dei* in the form of Enoch-Metatron receives further elaboration in *Sefer Hekhalot*. In *3 Enoch* 9:1 (*Synopse* §12) Metatron tells R. Ishmael that during the transformation of his body into the gigantic cosmic extent that matches the world in length and breadth, God "laid his hand" on the translated hero.¹¹⁸

Furthermore, the Adamic makeup of Enoch's inauguration and his role as the personification of iconic divine knowledge receives a new afterlife in the Hekhalot materials.¹¹⁹ It appears in the initial chapters of *3 Enoch*, where Enoch's transformation into the supreme angel Metatron is accompanied by the familiar motifs of angelic opposition and angelic veneration.¹²⁰ The fourth chapter of this composition portrays Enoch's appointment as a prince and a ruler among the celestial citizens, during which the hero encounters the hostile reaction of the ministering angels:

And the Holy One, blessed be he, appointed me (Enoch) in the height as a prince and a ruler among the ministering angels. Then three of the ministering angels, ʿUzzah, ʿAzzah, and ʿAzaʿel, came and laid charges against me in the heavenly height. They said before the Holy One, blessed be he, "Lord of the Universe, did not the primeval ones give you good advice when they said, do not create man!" The Holy One, blessed be he, replied, "I have made and I will sustain him; I will carry and I will deliver him." When they saw me they said before him, "Lord of the Universe, what right has this one to ascend to the height of heights? Is he not descended from those who perished in the waters of the Flood? What right has he to be in heaven?" Again the Holy One, blessed be he, replied and said to them, "What right

have you to interrupt me? I have chosen this one in preference to all of you, to be a prince and a ruler over you in the heavenly heights.” At once they all arose and went to meet me and prostrated themselves before me, saying, “Happy are you, and happy your parents, because your Creator has favored you.” Because I am young in their company and a mere youth among them in days and months and years – therefore they call me “Youth.”¹²¹

Interpreters have previously noted that the application of the Adamic motifs of the angelic veneration and angelic opposition to Enoch–Metatron is reminiscent of *2 Enoch* 22.¹²² Like in Adam’s inauguration, the angelic hostility here is provoked by the human origin of the protagonist because the celestial community sees him as a novice. However, the angels who initially opposed Enoch’s appointment are eventually persuaded by the deity to give obeisance to the human. The Adamic flavor of this *Hekhalot* account betrays connections both with the protoplast’s inauguration ritual and Enoch’s initiation. Gary Anderson suggests that if “we remove those layers of the tradition that are clearly secondary . . . we are left with a story that is almost identical to the analog we have traced in the Adam and Eve literature and *2 Enoch*.”¹²³ According to Anderson, the acclamation of Enoch as the “Youth” in *Sefer Hekhalot* serves as another link to Adam’s inauguration, since the reason *3 Enoch* supplies for this title is deceptively simple and straightforward: “Because I am young in their company and a mere youth among them in days and months and years – therefore they call me ‘Youth.’” This explanation for the epithet “Youth” recalls the reason for the angels’ refusal to worship Adam in the *Vita* on the basis of the protoplast’s inferiority to the angels because of his age.¹²⁴

Unlike in the *Primary Adam Books*, in *2* and *3 Enoch* angelic opposition comes before angelic veneration. This underlines the difference between the initial induction of the protoplast and its later eschatological counterparts, in which the angels are already cognisant of the first inauguration. *2 Enoch* alludes to their prior knowledge through God’s testing of the angelic hosts. In *3 Enoch* the ministering angels themselves mention the initial angelic opposition to humanity: “They said before the Holy One, blessed be he, ‘Lord of the Universe, did not the primeval ones give you good advice when they said, do not create man!’”¹²⁵ Anderson suggests that “the angels remind God of their prior opinion about Adam.”¹²⁶

Enoch–Metatron’s title “Youth” might also have an epistemological significance since it fashions our protagonist as a personalised eschatological revelation which, as with Adam, poses a challenge for God’s angelic servants. In order to explain the significance of this disclosure to his servants God himself must now become an exegete of the new *imago Dei* story. Regarding Enoch’s role as the eschatological image of God, Philip Alexander observes that:

Enoch, having perfected himself, in contrast to Adam, who sinned and fell, re-ascends to his heavenly home and takes his rightful place in the heights of the universe, above the highest angels. . . . Enoch thus becomes a redeemer figure – a second Adam through whom humanity is restored.¹²⁷

Jacob as the divine image

Another biblical exemplar that many early Jewish pseudepigraphical accounts fashion as a personified image of God is the patriarch Jacob. These materials, which underwent multiple translations in foreign cultural and ideological milieus, often render Jacob's role as the eschatological *imago Dei* through rather obscure depictions. In order to better grasp the original meaning of these cryptic portrayals, a short excursus into later rabbinic interpretations of Jacob's role as the divine image will be useful.

Miscellaneous rabbinic materials dramatically expand the biblical account of Jacob's vision of the ladder to include the engraving of the patriarch's celestial image on the throne of the divine Glory. Various rabbinic corpora attest to this refashioning of the patriarch's story. Rachel Neis points out that "the notion that Jacob's features were engraved on God's throne is found in midrashic sources, targumim, and liturgical poetry (*piyyutim*)."¹²⁸ *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, for example, offers the following description of the patriarch's celestial image being engraved on the celestial throne:

He [Jacob] had a dream, and behold, a ladder was fixed in the earth with its top reaching toward the heavens . . . and on that day they (angels) ascended to the heavens on high, and said, "Come and see Jacob the pious, whose image is fixed (engraved) in the throne of Glory, and whom you have desired to see."¹²⁹

Another Palestinian text, *Targum Neofiti* also offers a similar portrayal:

And he dreamed, and behold, a ladder was fixed on the earth and its head reached to the height of the heavens; and behold, the angels that had accompanied him from the house of his father ascended to bear good tidings to the angels on high, saying: "Come and see the pious man whose image is engraved in the throne of Glory, whom you desired to see." And behold, the angels from before the Lord ascended and descended and observed him.¹³⁰

Additionally, the Palestinian text, the so-called *Fragmentary Targum* is also cognisant of Jacob's heavenly image fixed upon the throne of Glory:

And he dreamt that there was a ladder set on the ground, whose top reached towards the heavens; and behold the angels that had accompanied him from his father's house ascended to announce to the angels of the heights: "Come and see the pious man, whose image is fixed to the throne of Glory."¹³¹

These accounts depict the patriarch not only as the heavenly *imago Dei* but also as a personification of theophanic knowledge that is being revealed to the

angels. The theophany, thus, is radically reshaped through the presentation of the exemplar's heavenly image as the center of the epiphanic event. The tradition of Jacob's image on the throne illustrates that God's theophany is not a rigid entity frozen in eternity. It is an everchanging, fluid event and a specific epistemological situation in which the theophany is conditioned by the story of the exemplar as he is transformed from a human seer to an embodiment of the divine manifestation.¹³² This theophany has the "face" of Jacob's image which perplexes the angels. Regarding the rabbinic depiction of Jacob's ladder where the patriarch sleeps on earth while his image is affixed on the divine throne, Christopher Rowland and Christopher Morray-Jones note that "the significance of this passage is that it reflects the belief that the secret things of God hidden even from the angels (1 *Enoch* 14:21; cf. 1 Pet 1:12) were now public in the features of the patriarch."¹³³

Additionally, these targumic passages engrave Jacob's heavenly identity on a special celestial entity – the throne of God's Glory. Engraving on the divine throne associates Jacob with the *Kavod*, since the throne represents the central part of the *Kavod* imagery – the seat of the anthropomorphic Glory of the deity. Here again, similar to Adamic and Enochic accounts, the revelation of God's eschatological image is conveyed using the *Kavod* symbolism. Some rabbinic materials suggest an even more radical identification of Jacob's image with the *Kavod*.¹³⁴ It has been previously noted¹³⁵ that in some rabbinic accounts, Jacob's image is not simply engraved on the heavenly throne but seated upon the throne of Glory.¹³⁶ David Halperin draws attention to a targumic reading of Ezekiel 1:26 that interprets the expression "the appearance of a human being" as Jacob's image.¹³⁷ Elliot Wolfson proposes that in this interpretation

the image of Jacob serves as a symbol for the human form of the glory. . . . In other words, the aggadic image of Jacob engraved upon the throne replaces the biblical image of the human form seated upon the throne.¹³⁸

Yet, this concept is not limited to Jacob. We also witness the enthronement of God's image on the *Merkava* in the *Testament of Abraham* where the eschatological Adam assumes the heavenly seat. Furthermore, we will encounter a similar enthronement of Moses in his role as *imago Dei* later in our study.

The association between Jacob's heavenly image and the deity's throne was widely circulated in rabbinic literature.¹³⁹ What is significant for our study is that some of these materials describe Jacob's heavenly identity as the deity's icon. Rachel Neis states that "the rabbinic texts set up a visual symmetry, between an earthly Jacob and a divine iconic Jacob."¹⁴⁰ The possibility that Jacob's celestial persona might appear in some materials as an "icon" deserves closer attention. In this respect, two rabbinic passages are especially noteworthy. The first passage, found in *Genesis Rabbah* 82:2, details the following tradition:

R. Isaac commenced: An altar of earth shalt thou make unto me . . . in every place where I cause My name to be mentioned I will come unto

thee and bless thee (Exod 20:24). If I bless him who builds an altar in My name, how much the more should I appear to Jacob, whose features are engraved on My throne, and bless him. Thus it says, And God appeared unto Jacob . . . and blessed him. R. Levi commenced: And an ox and a ram for peace offerings . . . for today the Lord appeared unto you (Lev 9:4). If I appear to him who offered a ram in My name and bless him, how much the more should I appear to Jacob whose features are engraved on My throne, and bless him. Thus it says, And God appeared unto Jacob . . . and blessed him.¹⁴¹

Second, *Lamentation Rabbah* 2:2 is also cognisant of Jacob's heavenly identity as a celestial image:

Similarly spoke the Holy One, blessed be He, to Israel: Do you not provoke Me because you take advantage of the likeness of Jacob which is engraved upon My throne? Here, have it, it is thrown in your face! Hence, He hath cast down from heaven unto the earth the beauty of Israel.¹⁴²

These rabbinic passages portray Jacob's engraved identity as a cultic image or an "icon" of the deity in a manner that is similar to how the *Primary Adam Books* depict the prelapsarian Adam. Neis suggests that in *Lamentations Rabbah* 2:2 "God accuses Israel of taking advantage of the presence of this icon and provoking him with their behavior. He threatens to cast down the icon of Jacob from his throne."¹⁴³ This motif also appears in *Numbers Rabbah* 4:1 where angels worship the deity through Jacob's name and image:

The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Jacob: Jacob, thou art exceedingly precious in my sight. For I have, as it were, set thine image on My throne, and by thy name the angels praise Me and say: Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, from everlasting and to everlasting.¹⁴⁴

Jacob's ladder vision in Gen 28 provides the context for his role as a cultic image in the rabbinic sources.¹⁴⁵ These texts reinterpret the ladder vision so that Jacob is literally reshaped into a cultic object in order to become the deity's icon. The cultic context of the divine image's manufacturing may be alluded to even in Genesis 28. There, immediately after his vision of the angelic ladder, Jacob constructs what appears to be a cultic statue, pouring oil over the top of it.¹⁴⁶ Benjamin Sommer notes that:

the ritual use of oil is significant. . . . In Israelite religion, to pour oil on an object or person is to change its status; for example, one becomes king or high priest when one is anointed with oil. Is it possible that, in these passages, anointing transforms the stele and thus functions in a manner comparable to the *mīš pī* ritual in Mesopotamia? If so, what had been a mere stone becomes a *maššebah* or *betyl*, a place of divine dwelling; or, if we may

borrow the language of Philo of Byblos cited in the previous chapter, once Jacob anointed the stone, it was endowed with life.¹⁴⁷

The biblical text, however, does not specify how the manufacturing of this cultic image relates to Jacob's vision.

Another important motif is the "authorization" of heavenly Jacob into a new image of God with God's hands. This development appears in Enochic lore and has roots in the biblical and pseudepigraphical Adamic traditions. In *Hekhalot Rabbati* (*Synopse* §164) there is also a close interaction between God and his image which involves the deity's hands:

And testify to them. What testimony? You see Me – what I do to the visage of the face of Jacob your father which is engraved for Me upon the throne of My glory. For in the hour that you say before Men "Holy," I kneel on it and embrace it and kiss it and hug it and My hands are on its arms three times, corresponding to the three times that you say before Me, "Holy," according to the word that is said, Holy, holy, holy (Isa 6:3).¹⁴⁸

Here, the interaction is more obvious than in Enochic and Adamic traditions. God not only embraces his beloved icon with his hands, he even kisses it. Neis notices that:

God directs his amorous affections towards the face of Jacob. He drapes himself over it, hugs it, kisses it, fondles it, and, in one manuscript, places his hands on its arms. Even without the attribution of arms to the "face," it is apparent from the actions expressed by the series of verbs, that Jacob's image is sufficiently embodied to receive God's physical attentions.¹⁴⁹

Neis also notes that "God's full-on embrace of Jacob is reinforced by his placement of his hands over Jacob's arms."¹⁵⁰

Some rabbinic traditions about Jacob's role as *imago Dei* also reveal the motifs of angelic veneration and angelic opposition to the image of God. For example, *Genesis Rabbah* 68:12 presents the following description of the angelic reactions:

R. Hiyya the Elder and R. Jannai disagreed. One maintained: They were ascending and descending on the ladder; while the other said: They were ascending and descending on Jacob. The statement that they were ascending and descending on the ladder presents no difficulty. The statement that they were ascending and descending on Jacob we must take to mean that some were exalting him and others degrading him, dancing, leaping, and maligning him. Thus it says, Israel in whom I will be glorified (Isa 49:3); it is thou, whose features are engraved on high; they ascended on high and saw his features and they descended below and found him sleeping. It may be compared to a king who sat and judged in a [basilica]; people ascend to

the basilica and find him [judging], they go out to the chamber and find him [sleeping].¹⁵¹

Like in the formative Adamic blueprint, here the image of God receives both support and enmity from the angelic hosts. The text reports that some angelic servants “were exalting him,” while others opposed Jacob’s heavenly image by “degrading . . . and maligning him.” The theme of angelic opposition in rabbinic literature is reflected already in the talmudic corpora which constitute the background for the midrashic passages. Thus, *b. Hul.* 91b contains the following tradition:

A Tanna taught: They ascended to look at the image above and descended to look at the image below. They wished to hurt him, when Behold, the Lord stood beside him (Gen 28:13). R. Simeon b. Lakish said: Were it not expressly stated in the Scripture, we would not dare to say it. [God is made to appear] like a man who is fanning his son.¹⁵²

Elliot Wolfson notes that in these rabbinic sources the motif of the patriarch’s image

is placed in the context of another well-known motif regarding the enmity or envy of the angels toward human beings. That is, according to the statements in *Genesis Rabbah* and *Bavli Hullin* the angels, who beheld Jacob’s image above, were jealous and sought to harm Jacob below.¹⁵³

He suggests that “the influence of the talmudic reworking of this motif is apparent in several later midrashic sources as well.”¹⁵⁴

By comparing these rabbinic developments with the Adamic accounts, it becomes clear that the traditions about Jacob’s heavenly image were not merely later rabbinic inventions, rather they are developments with ancient roots in early pseudepigraphical accounts. It is to these pseudepigraphical testimonies which we now turn.

One of the early pseudepigraphical Jewish sources which explores Jacob’s role as the *imago Dei* is the *Prayer of Joseph*.¹⁵⁵ Although Richard Hayward argues that “the extant portions of the *Prayer of Joseph* . . . do not describe Jacob-Israel as the image of God,”¹⁵⁶ some traditions found in these materials might classify Jacob as an image. Only three fragments of the *Prayer* are currently extant.¹⁵⁷ The original composition most likely represents “a midrash on the Jacob narrative in Genesis.”¹⁵⁸ The pseudepigraphon is usually dated to the first century CE¹⁵⁹ The surviving materials contain the following portions:

Fragment A

I, Jacob, who is speaking to you, am also Israel, an angel of God¹⁶⁰ and a ruling spirit.¹⁶¹ Abraham and Isaac were created before any work. But, I,

Jacob, who men call Jacob but whose name is Israel am he who God called Israel which means, a man seeing God because I am the firstborn of every living thing to whom God gives life.¹⁶² And when I was coming up from Syrian Mesopotamia, Uriel, the angel of God, came forth and said that “I (Jacob-Israel) had descended to earth and I had tabernacled among men and that I had been called by the name of Jacob.” He envied me and fought with me and wrestled with me saying that his name and the name that is before every angel was to be above mine. I told him his name and what rank he held among the sons of God. “Are you not Uriel, the eighth after me? And I, Israel, the archangel of the power of the Lord and the chief captain among the sons of God? Am I not Israel, the first minister before the face of God? And I called upon my God by the inextinguishable name.”

Fragment B

For I have read in the tablets of heaven all that shall befall you and your sons.

Fragment C

[Origen writes] Jacob was greater than man, he who supplanted his brother and who declared in the same book from which we quoted “I read in the tablets of heaven” that he was a chief captain of the power of the Lord and had, from of old, the name of Israel; something which he recognizes while doing service in the body, being reminded of it by the archangel Uriel.¹⁶³

These fragments demonstrate several important details that relate to Jacob’s role as the image of God. First, in one fragment Jacob mentions his unique place in God’s creation by uttering:

I, Jacob, who is speaking to you, am also Israel, an angel of God and a ruling spirit. Abraham and Isaac were created before any work (*προεκτίσθησαν*).¹⁶⁴ But . . . I am the firstborn (*πρωτόγονος*) of every living thing to whom God gives life.¹⁶⁵

Jacob’s self-designation as *πρωτόγονος*¹⁶⁶ is intriguing and likely illustrates his role as the image of God, the same office that the protoplast occupies in the Adamic pseudepigraphical accounts. According to Howard Schwartz, the expression “suggests that Jacob was a kind of proto-human, an Adam-like figure.”¹⁶⁷ Jarl Fossum offers another key parallel, previously noticed by other experts as well,¹⁶⁸ namely, a possible connection with Col 1:15, where Christ’s role as “the image of the invisible God” (*εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου*) is tied to his designation as *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως* (“the firstborn of all creation”). According to Fossum, “the closest parallel to the phrase in Col 1:15b is found in a fragment of the *Prayer of Joseph* preserved by Origen.”¹⁶⁹

A second detail that suggests the presence of the *imago Dei* concept in the *Prayer of Joseph* is the motif of angelic opposition which often played a pivotal part in the inauguration rituals found in Adamic and Enochic lore. In the *Prayer*, Jacob mentions that the angel Uriel envied him, wrestled with him, and argued that his name was above Jacob's.¹⁷⁰ Although the *Prayer of Joseph* draws on the biblical story of Jacob's struggle with a supernatural opponent at the river Jabbok, angelic jealousy and the angel's arguments about his superiority are new additions. As Richard Hayward observes,

the Bible gives no motive for the supernatural attack on Jacob [at Jabbok] The *Prayer*, however, attributes the attack to jealousy, and adds something entirely foreign to both the Bible and Philo: what is at issue between the two combatants is their relative status as angels, and their exact positions within the celestial hierarchy.¹⁷¹

Uriel's jealousy and arguments about his superiority recall the angels' opposition to Adam as the divine image in the inauguration story in the *Primary Adam Books*. There, as we recall, the chief antagonist Satan also expresses similar feelings of jealousy¹⁷² that justify his refusal to worship Adam because of Adam's inferior celestial status in comparison with his own, more exalted, position.¹⁷³ The appearance of angelic jealousy and resistance affirms the presence of the *imago Dei* in these traditions. In view of these connections, it is possible that the *Prayer of Joseph* envisions Jacob's heavenly identity as the eschatological image of God.

Another early witness to Jacob's role as God's icon is the *Ladder of Jacob*. Like with other Jewish accounts, the inauguration into the deity's likeness conveys a soteriological significance and acts as an eschatological reinterpretation of Adam's protological endowment. While in the *Prayer of Joseph* the whole process is only vaguely implied, here it is narrated in great detail. *Lad. Jac.* 1:3–10 offers the following description of the eschatological ritual:

And behold, a ladder was fixed on the earth, whose top reaches to heaven. And the top of the ladder was the face as of a man, carved out of fire.¹⁷⁴ There were twelve steps leading to the top of the ladder, and on each step to the top there were two human faces, on the right and on the left, twenty-four faces (or busts) including their chests. And the face in the middle was higher than all that I saw, the one of fire, including the shoulders and arms, exceedingly terrifying, more than those twenty-four faces. And while I was still looking at it, behold, angels of God ascended and descended on it. And God was standing above its highest face, and he called to me from there, saying, "Jacob, Jacob!" And I said, "Here I am, Lord!" And he said to me, "The land on which you are sleeping, to you will I give it, and to your seed after you. And I will multiply your seed."¹⁷⁵

As in 2 *Enoch*, *panim* imagery is present, which in this text stands as the conceptual cognate for the "image." We will explore this connection more closely in the

next chapter of our study. The *Ladder* relates that the seer beholds on the heavenly staircase twenty-four human faces with their chests, two of them on each step of the ladder. At the top of the ladder, the seer also beholds another human face “carved out of fire”¹⁷⁶ with its shoulders and arms.¹⁷⁷ In comparison with the previous countenances, this highest fiery face is described as “exceedingly terrifying.” Experts have suggested that in the *Ladder of Jacob* the blazing face not only exemplifies God’s Glory¹⁷⁸ but also represents the heavenly identity of Jacob as the divine image.¹⁷⁹ Thus, while dealing with the terminological peculiarities found in the first chapter of the text, James Kugel argues that the authors of the text were familiar with Jewish traditions about Jacob’s image or *iqonin* installed in heaven.¹⁸⁰ Responding to Horace Lunt, who suggested that “no other Slavonic text has *lice*, ‘face,’ used to mean ‘statue’ or ‘bust’ (1:5 etc.), and there is no Semitic parallel,”¹⁸¹ Kugel advances the idea that such a Semitic parallel can indeed be found, embodied in the Greek loan word into Mishnaic Hebrew – *iqonin*, which in some rabbinic texts did in fact come to mean “face.”¹⁸² In fact, the basic meaning of *iqonin* as “portrait” or “bust”¹⁸³ is preserved in a number of rabbinic usages.¹⁸⁴ Because of this, Kugel concludes that

there is little doubt that our pseudepigraphon, in seeking to “translate” the biblical phrase “his/its head reached to Heaven,” reworded it in Mishnaic Hebrew as “his [Jacob’s] *iqonin* reached Heaven,” and this in turn gave rise to the presence of a heavenly bust or portrait of Jacob on the divine throne.¹⁸⁵

Some other interpreters also affirm¹⁸⁶ the presence of the *iqonin* tradition in the *Ladder*, arguing that “in the fiery bust of the terrifying man we are probably correct to see the heavenly ‘image’ of Jacob.”¹⁸⁷

If the fiery bust indeed attests to Jacob’s role as the divine image, it is noteworthy that the *Ladder* depicts this entity as a radiant fiery extent that terrifies its beholder. Here, as in the Adam and Enoch traditions, the eschatological *imago Dei* is endowed with divine radiance. We will encounter something similar in the Mosaic tradition.

Another important element of the *Ladder of Jacob* connected with the inauguration into the *imago Dei* is angelic opposition – a motif often found in many other early Jewish versions of this ritual. As one recalls, in later rabbinic accounts, the motif frequently appears in the context of the stories about Jacob’s heavenly image being engraved or installed on the throne of Glory. Angelic opposition occurs in Chapter 5 of the *Ladder of Jacob*, which offers the following interpretation of the protagonist’s vision of the heavenly staircase:

Thus he [*angelus interpres*] said to me [Jacob]: “You have seen a ladder with twelve steps, each step having two human faces which kept changing their appearance. The ladder is this age, and the twelve steps are the periods of this age. But the twenty-four faces are the kings of the ungodly nations of this age. Under these kings the children of your children and the

generations of your sons will be interrogated. These will rise up against the iniquity of your grandsons. And this place will be made desolate by the four ascents . . . through the sins of your grandsons. And around the property of your forefathers a palace will be built, a temple in the name of your God and of (the God) of your fathers, and in the provocations of your children it will become deserted by the four ascents of this age. For you saw the first four busts which were striking against the steps . . . angels ascending and descending, and the busts amid the steps. The Most High will raise up kings from the grandsons of your brother Esau, and they will receive all the nobles of the tribes of the earth who will have maltreated your seed.¹⁸⁸

In this description, the twelve steps of the ladder signify the twelve periods of “this age,” while the twenty-four “minor” faces denote the twenty-four kings of the ungodly nations. The ascending and descending angels on the ladder symbolise the guardian angels of the nations hostile to Jacob and his descendants. The angelic locomotions, or “ascents,” are construed in the passage as sets of arrogations against Israel. This revelation is influenced by the fourfold scheme of the antagonistic empires in the Book of Daniel through the reference to the “four ascents” and through shared features of the Danielic empires (specifically the last of the four kingdoms, Rome, represented by Esau).¹⁸⁹

Although the description found in the *Ladder* has been obscured by the text’s long journey in various ideological milieus, more lucid presentations of the same motif can be found in later rabbinic accounts.¹⁹⁰ One of them, reflected in *Lev. Rab.* 29:2, provides the following description:

R. Nahman opened his discourse with the text, Therefore fear thou not, O Jacob My servant (Jer 30:10). This speaks of Jacob himself, of whom it is written, And he dreamed, and behold, a ladder set up on the earth . . . and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it (Gen 28:12). These angels, explained R. Samuel b. Nahman, were the guardian Princes of the nations of the world. For R. Samuel b. Nahman said: This verse teaches us that the Holy One, blessed be He, showed our father Jacob the Prince of Babylon ascending seventy rungs of the ladder, the Prince of Media fifty-two rungs, the Prince of Greece one hundred and eighty, while the Prince of Edom ascended till Jacob did not know how many rungs. Thereupon our father Jacob was afraid. He thought: Is it possible that this one will never be brought down? Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to him: Fear thou not, O Jacob My servant. Even if he ascend and sit down by Me, I will bring him down from there! Hence it is written, Though thou make thy nest as high as the eagle, and though thou set it among the stars, I will bring thee down from thence. R. Berekiah and R. Helbo, and R. Simeon b. Yohai in the name of R. Meir said: It teaches that the Holy One, blessed be He, showed Jacob the Prince of Babylon ascending and descending, of Media ascending and descending, of Greece ascending and descending, and of Edom ascending and descending.¹⁹¹

A similar understanding of the descending and ascending angels as political entities that are hostile to Israel is attested also in *Midrash on Psalms* 78:6:

R. Berechiah, R. Levi, and R. Simeon ben Jose taught in the name of R. Meir that the Holy One, blessed be He, let Jacob see a ladder upon which Babylon climbed up seventy rungs and came down, Media climbed up fifty-two rungs and came down, Greece climbed up a hundred and eighty rungs and came down. But when Edom climbed higher than these, Jacob saw and was afraid. The Holy One, blessed be He, said to him, Therefore fear thou not, O Jacob My servant (Jer 30:10). Even as the former fell, so will the latter fall.¹⁹²

In these rabbinic passages, the similarities with the Danielic account are even more apparent than in the *Ladder*. There the familiar fourfold structure is now represented by Babylon, Media, Greece, and Edom, the empires which are often associated in the history of interpretation with the four beasts of Daniel 7.¹⁹³ Kugel notes that in these materials, like in the *Ladder of Jacob*, “the four beasts [of Daniel’s vision] are transformed into ‘angels of God’ said to go up and down Jacob’s ladder.”¹⁹⁴

This distinctive theme of the hostile angels on the heavenly ladder, which arrogate against Jacob and his progeny by their ascents and descents, provides corroborative evidence that the authors of the *Ladder* were cognisant of the motif of angelic opposition that played a pivotal “activating” role in several versions of the *imago Dei* ritual.

Moses as the divine image

Although Adam’s inauguration lacks any explicit references to the hero’s endowment with knowledge, stories of other exemplars’ induction into the *imago Dei* coincide with this gift. This occurs, for example, in *2 Enoch*. Another early example appears in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian where Moses’ inauguration into the divine image coincides with his ability to observe “the whole earth all around and saw beneath the earth and above the heavens.” Verses 67–90 contain some traces of the *imago Dei* ritual. Given its quotation by Alexander Polyhistor (ca. 80–40 BCE), the *Exagoge*’s account can be taken as a witness to traditions of the second century BCE.¹⁹⁵ Preserved in fragmentary form by several ancient sources,¹⁹⁶ *Exagoge* 67–90 reads:

Moses: I had a vision of a great throne on the top of Mount Sinai and it reached till the folds of heaven. A noble man was sitting on it, with a crown and a large scepter in his left hand. He beckoned to me with his right hand, so I approached and stood before the throne. He gave me the scepter and instructed me to sit on the great throne. Then he gave me a royal crown and got up from the throne. I beheld the whole earth all around and saw beneath the earth and above the heavens. A multitude of

stars fell before my knees and I counted them all. They paraded past me like a battalion of men. Then I awoke from my sleep in fear.

Raguel: My friend, this is a good sign from God. May I live to see the day when these things are fulfilled. You will establish a great throne, become a judge and leader of men. As for your vision of the whole earth, the world below and that above the heavens – this signifies that you will see what is, what has been and what shall be.¹⁹⁷

In this account, like in Enoch's and Jacob's inaugurations, Moses becomes the new "face" of the divine theophany. Over the course of the adept's transformation, the divine theophany itself undergoes a radical reshaping when the former occupant of the divine throne, a "noble man," hastily departs from his celestial seat and leaves it to his new owner – the son of Amram. This shows how fluid the divine theophany is when a beholder moves to the center of the event.

The *Exagoge's* description recalls several details of the protoplast's induction in the *Primary Adam Books*. Moses assumes the role of the prelapsarian Adam by supplanting him as the eschatological image of God.¹⁹⁸ Silviu Bunta convincingly advances this argument in his dissertation, "Moses, Adam and the Glory of the Lord in Ezekiel the Tragedian." Bunta sees the unnamed enthroned figure, who Moses replaces, as having emblematic Adamic features that echo the protoplast's association with the *Kavod* in the Jewish pseudepigrapha and Qumran materials.¹⁹⁹ One of the crucial Adamic allusions, in Bunta's opinion, is the fact that the *Exagoge* defines the enthroned figure as φῶς. Jewish theophanic traditions often use φῶς to designate the deity's glorious manifestations as well as his anthropomorphic human "icons," who radiate the luminosity of their newly acquired celestial bodies. These traditions often play on the ambiguity of the term which, depending on the accent, can designate either "a man" (φῶς) or "light" (φῶς), indicating both the luminous and the anthropomorphic nature of the divine or angelic manifestations.²⁰⁰ Luminosity is also an essential attribute of the *imago Dei* theophanic complex. Bunta observes that "Adam is particularly associated in late Second Temple Judaism with the polyvalent term φῶς."²⁰¹

Moses' exaltation in the *Exagoge* entails two major developments. First, Moses replaces the "noble man" on the throne while being endowed with an exalted status. Second, a multitude of stars react to him by falling before his knees and by parading before the prophet "like a battalion of men." These two elements are reminiscent of the two pivotal stages of Adam's inauguration in the *Primary Adam Books*. As we recall, there, first the protagonist is created in the image of God and becomes God's icon. Then he is venerated by the angelic hosts. It is possible that the *Exagoge* depicts Moses as entering into the initiatory ritual of endowment with the divine image.²⁰² Adam's induction in the *Primary Adam Books* coincides with angelic veneration, which is likely also present in the *Exagoge*.²⁰³ The account describes a "multitude of stars" falling down before Moses.²⁰⁴ This prostration is rendered through the Greek verb πίπτω, a term also used in some synoptic gospels accounts, where Jesus is portrayed as the eschatological *imago Dei*. In Enochic literature the stars often designate angelic

beings.²⁰⁵ Because of the Enochic influence on the *Exagoge*, the multitude of stars kneeling before the seer likely refers to angelic veneration. Indeed, some scholars consider the kneeling stars to represent the angelic hosts. Larry Hurtado, for example, suggests that the obeisance of the stars

may represent the acceptance by the heavenly hosts of Moses' appointed place as God's chief agent. Stars are a familiar symbol for angelic beings in Jewish tradition (e.g., Job 38:7) and are linked with divine beings in other religious traditions as well.²⁰⁶

Fletcher-Louis presses further by comparing the astral prostration in the *Exagoge* with the angelic veneration found in the *Primary Adam Books*.²⁰⁷

In the *Exagoge* the stars not only fall down before the protagonist but also parade before Moses. This parallels a version of Adam's inauguration ritual in the *Cave of Treasures*, where creation parades before Adam during his inauguration into the office of the *imago Dei*. The *Cave of Treasures* 2:12–25 transmits the following rendering of the ceremony:

God formed Adam with his holy hand in his image according to his likeness. When the angels beheld his glorious appearance they were agitated from the first sight because they saw *the appearance of his face* flashing with glorious beauty like the fiery orb, the light of his eyes like the sun, and the figure of his body like shining crystal. When he stretched himself and rose in the middle of the earth he put his feet on that place where the cross of our savior would be erected, because Adam was created in Jerusalem. At that place he wore the gown of kingship, and the crown of glory was put upon his head; there he was made king, priest and prophet, and there God made him sit upon the throne of his glory. There God also put all creatures under his dominion: All the wild animals, cattle and birds gathered before Adam, and while they passed by he named them and they bowed their heads. All beings worshipped him and submitted themselves before him. Then the angels heard Gods voice speaking to him: "Adam, behold, I made you king, priest and prophet, lord, chief and leader, so that everything made and created may be subservient unto you and belong to you. To you I give dominion over every created thing." When the angels heard this heavenly voice they all bent their knees and worshipped him.²⁰⁸

Gary Anderson notes that:

the *Cave of Treasures* shows a slight divergence from the *Vita* as to the moment in time when Adam was to be venerated by all of creation. In the *Cave*, the prostration scene does not occur at the moment of Adam's animation (Gen 2:7), but at that time when the animals are paraded before him to receive their names (Gen 2:19–20).²⁰⁹ . . . In other words, the

moment of name-giving becomes the occasion for Adam's elevation as king over all creation.²¹⁰

It is possible that the author of the *Exagoge* was aware of this version, which would imply that the stars parading before the protagonist "like a battalion of men" is an additional component of the eschatological induction ritual.

If the *Exagoge* contains the veneration motif, it is possible that here, as in other accounts where angelic veneration occurs, Moses is implicitly envisioned as personifying the divine image.²¹¹

Another important motif is the authorisation of the new *imago Dei* with God's hand. We encountered this motif in Enochic lore when God places his hand on Enoch-Metatron and in Jacob's traditions when God embraces Jacob's image with his hands. As we suggested, this motif of authorisation can be ultimately traced to its biblical Adamic roots. Something similar occurs in the *Exagoge* during the prophet's initiation into the *imago Dei* role when a noble man sitting on the throne beckons him with his right hand.²¹² The heavenly hand as a tool for the authorisation of the eschatological image of God may be present in the biblical account when the deity promises Moses that he will protect the prophet during his encounter with the divine Form, the glorious Extent. For many pseudepigraphical accounts, this biblical narrative serves as a blueprint for the creation of the eschatological *imago Dei*.

Additionally, some targumic accounts interpret Moses' shining face as his image, *iqonin*. For instance, in rendering the account of Moses' shining visage from Exod 34:29, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* adds to the biblical narrative the *iqonin* terminology:

At the time that Moses came down from Mount Sinai, with the two tables of the testimony in Moses' hand as he came down from the mountain, Moses did not know that the splendor of the *iqonin* of his face shone because of the splendor of the Glory of the Shekinah of the Lord at the time that he spoke with him.²¹³

The next verse (34:30) also uses the *iqonin* formulae: "Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses, and behold, the *iqonin* of his face shone; and they were afraid to go near him."²¹⁴ Finally, verses 33–35 speak about Moses' veil, again demonstrating the appropriation of the *iqonin* symbolism:

When Moses ceased speaking with them, he put a veil on the *iqonin* of his face. Whenever Moses went in before the Lord to speak with him, he would remove the veil that was on the *iqonin* of his face until he came out. And he would come out and tell the children of Israel what he had been commanded. The children of Israel would see Moses' *iqonin* that the splendor of the *iqonin* of Moses' face shone. Then Moses would put the veil back on his face until he went in to speak with him.²¹⁵

In these targumic renderings of the biblical passages about Moses' shining face, there is a creative interplay between the *panim* and *tselem* symbolism. Linda Belleville links these Mosaic traditions about the prophet's image with "Paul's concept of transformation into the 'same image.'"²¹⁶ The application of "image" terminology to Moses' story here has a profound anthropological significance. Moses' luminosity eventually materialises as the restoration of Adam's original *tselem*, which, according to some traditions, was itself a luminous reality.²¹⁷ This Adamic connection appears in a few non-biblical accounts which describe Moses' luminous face. The Samaritan *Memar Marqah* links the shining face of Moses with the luminosity of Adam's image. Belleville notices that several passages of this Samaritan collection associate Moses' light with the primordial light with which Adam was first invested but later lost.²¹⁸ Later rabbinic midrashim also betray a similar connection by placing the protoplast's glorious image in parallel with the radiant *panim* of the great prophet.²¹⁹ This correlation occurs, for instance, in *Deut. Rab.* 11:3:

Adam said to Moses: "I am greater than you because I have been created in the image of God." Whence this? For it is said, And God created man in His own image (Gen 1:27). Moses replied to him: "I am far superior to you, for the honor which was given to you has been taken away from you, as it is said, But man (Adam) abideth not in honor (Ps 49:13); but as for me, the radiant countenance which God gave me still remains with me."²²⁰

Another example appears in *Midrash Tadshe* 4, where the creation of Adam in God's image is compared with the bestowal of luminosity on Moses' face: "In the beginning: 'and God created man in his image,' and in the desert: 'and Moses knew not that the skin of his face shone.'"²²¹ As observed by Belleville, "*Midrash Tadshe* 4 associates Moses' glory with being created in the image of God, stating that God created man in his own image, first in the beginning and then in the wilderness."²²² Also, later rabbinic materials often speak of the luminosity of Adam's face,²²³ a feature which likely illustrates an Adam–Moses connection. For example, in *Lev. Rab.* 20:2, the following correlation can be found:

Resh Lakish, in the name of R. Simeon the son of Menasya, said: The apple of Adam's heel outshone the globe of the sun; how much more so the brightness of his face! Nor need you wonder. In the ordinary way if a person makes salvers, one for himself and one for his household, whose will he make more beautiful? Not his own? Similarly, Adam was created for the service of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the globe of the sun for the service of mankind.²²⁴

In a similar tradition, *Genesis Rabbah* 11 does not focus on Adam's luminous garments, but rather on his glorious face:

Adam's glory did not abide the night with him. What is the proof? But Adam passeth not the night in glory (Ps 49:13). The Rabbis maintain: His

glory abode with him, but at the termination of the Sabbath He deprived him of his splendor and expelled him from the Garden of Eden, as it is written, Thou changest his countenance, and sendest him away (Job 14:20).²²⁵

The initial roots of the preceding rabbinic trajectories can be traced to documents of the Second Temple period. The motif of Moses' superiority over Adam can be detected already in Philo. Wayne Meeks draws attention to a similar tradition from the *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum* 2.46, which identifies the ascendant Moses with the heavenly man²²⁶ created in God's image on the seventh day²²⁷:

But the calling above of the prophet is a second birth better than the first. . . . For he is called on the seventh day, in this (respect) differing from the earth-born first molded man, for the latter came into being from the earth and with body, while the former (came) from the ether and without body. Wherefore the most appropriate number, six, was assigned to the earth-born man, while to the one differently born (was assigned) the higher nature of the hebdomad.²²⁸

I previously argued that an interpretation of Moses' shining visage as the luminous *imago Dei* stands behind the symbolism of Jesus' luminous face in the synoptic versions of the transfiguration account.²²⁹ These narratives are permeated with a panoply of biblical and extra-biblical Mosaic motifs. Indeed, in the distinct theophanic context of the transfiguration account, with its postulation of God's invisibility, the famous Pauline dictum about Christ as the image of the invisible God can be seen in an entirely new light.

Transformations of the adepts

As we have witnessed in the course of our study, the acquisition and transmission of the theophanic knowledge by the pseudepigraphical exemplars is not merely an introspective mental enterprise, but instead, it is an endeavor laden with profound changes to the adept's ontology. In many Jewish pseudepigraphical accounts, the reception of divine mysteries, and especially theophanic knowledge, coincides with the visionary's dramatic metamorphosis. The ontological nature of divine knowledge embodied in the divine Form pre-determines the specific conditions of its transmission by a human adept whose inferior nature must undergo changes so that s/he will be able to receive and carry the revelation. Michael Stone identifies the link between epistemology and ontology in Jewish apocalyptic accounts when he remarks that "what a human or an angel can know is a function of his measure of righteousness."²³⁰

This is especially significant, since, for the ancient believers, when an overwhelming majority of the population was illiterate, the most accessible knowledge about God was iconic knowledge. The proclivity for iconic knowledge persisted for millennia. Even now believers receive their knowledge about God not only through the sermons and reading their sacred scriptures but also via

visualisation of the divine images in their places of worship. In religious cultures, which, like Judaism, openly prohibit the manufacture of God's visible cultic image, the deity's theophanic descriptions are transmitted in oral and written modes which allow listeners to visualise iconic knowledge.²³¹ Visualisations of the deity are often rooted explicitly or implicitly in the theology of the *imago Dei*. Furthermore, for ancient and modern believers, iconic divine knowledge is an ontological reality which can be personified into a celestial figure – an angel, or other type of mediator, such as a saint, a translated patriarch or prophet – who becomes the cultic icon that embodies divine mysteries.

Divine knowledge in its personified form represents not only an embodied revelation but also a power which enables future adepts to properly receive the disclosure through an adjustment of their own ontology. Some pseudepigraphical accounts indicate that the divine theophany cannot be fully apprehended by a human adept in his or her postlapsarian, fallen condition. In order to grasp a theophanic event, the adept's ontology must be changed to its prelapsarian, glorious state. Often, this kind of transformation occurs during a vision. This appears in the *Book of the Similitudes*, *2 Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, *Joseph and Aseneth* and other Jewish pseudepigraphical accounts. While carrying the theophanies that are etched in their bodies to the lower realms, the exemplars will also carry with them an algorithm of power that allows their human adepts to perceive iconic mysteries properly. The process of the divine knowledge's personification in the biblical patriarchs and prophets includes both the content of the theophany itself and the power to experience it. This is detectable in the mediatorial trends already mentioned in this study, including Enochic and Mosaic traditions.

In early Enochic lore, the translated Enoch stands as the eschatological image of God, as well as an entity who is able to transform humans to their prelapsarian state. This reversal is laden with the profound epistemological potential because it enables human beings to fully comprehend the divine knowledge. In Chapter 64 of the longer recension of *2 Enoch*, an "astounding encomium" can be found which, in the view of one of *2 Enoch's* translators, "could hardly please a Christian or a Jew."²³² The chapter depicts a prostration of the elders and all the community before Enoch at the place of his second departure to heaven. The people who came to bow down before the patriarch delivered to Enoch the following address:

O our father, Enoch! May you be blessed by the Lord, the eternal king! And now, bless your [sons], and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today. For you will be glorified in front of the face [of the Lord for eternity], because you are the one whom the Lord chose in preference to all the people upon the earth; and he appointed you to be the one who makes a written record of all his creation, visible and invisible, and the one who carried away the sin of mankind (*2 Enoch* 64:4–5).²³³

An important detail in this address is Enoch's designation as "the one who carried away the sin of humankind." This depiction of the patriarch as a redeemer

is startling and puzzling to many interpreters. In these scholarly debates a question often raised is: what kind of sin was Enoch able to carry away? The emphasis on the accomplishment of the redemptive act provides an important clue to understanding the kind of sin Enoch was able to erase. The focus here is not on the individual sins of Enoch's descendants and adepts but on the primeval sin of humankind.²³⁴ Therefore, it becomes apparent that the redeeming functions of the patriarch are not related to his possible intercession for the sins of his children or the elders of the earth. Rather, they pertain to the sin of the protoplast which the patriarch was able "to carry away."

Enoch's response to the people's address in Chapter 65 provides additional support for interpreting the sin as the transgression of the protoplast. The patriarch starts his response by paraphrasing the account of Adam's creation, telling his listeners that God "constituted man in his own form, in accordance with a similarity."²³⁵ He further relates that the deity gave the protoplast "eyes to see, and ears to hear, and heart to think, and reason to argue."²³⁶ Some elements of this paraphrase allude to details of the protoplast's marvelous creation found in 2 *Enoch* 30:9, namely to some of the properties (seeing, hearing, reasoning) given to Adam at his creation. Enoch concludes his reply to the people with the theme of humanity's restoration to its prelapsarian paradisaical condition which indicates that the account revolves around the patriarch's role in the removal of Adam's sin. It is logical, therefore, that this message of hope comes from the patriarch's mouth whose transformation resulted in his assumption of the eschatological *imago Dei*. The embodied divine knowledge in the form of Enoch is able to bring other humans to their prelapsarian, glorified state so they can properly experience the image of God's theophany in the translated exemplar.

Similar developments occur also in the Mosaic lore. In the Qumran fragment 4Q374, also known as the *Discourse on the Exodus/Conquest Tradition*,²³⁷ there is a clause that connects Moses' shining countenance at the Sinai encounter²³⁸ with the motif of healing: "[But] he (Moses) had pity with . . . and when he let his face shine for them for healing, they strengthened [their] hearts again."²³⁹ The motif of "healing" can be understood as the restoration of the former Adamic glory. If so, the shining face of Moses not only reflects the theophany that the son of Amram acquired on the great mountain but also provides the means to perceive the theophanic event by changing the ontology of its earthly beholders.

Notes

1 Hundley notes that:

anthropomorphisms render deities understandable, sentient, and approachable. Using approximate human terms to describe them renders them more understandable than would any other descriptors. Since humans are the most sentient beings in their natural environments, the human model is the only sensible archetype for depicting sentient deities. Since they are conceived of as like humans, deities also may be approached and communicated with far more than with an animal, a river, or a storm, and may even be persuaded to provide divine assistance. . . . Divine anthropomorphisms likewise render the cosmos more understandable and consistent, and

60 *Divine image as the hypostasis of knowledge*

thus more secure. When human-like divine beings control it, people may begin to understand it, predict and even influence its behavior, rendering the world a safer and more comprehensible place.

M. B. Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings: Temple and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East*, WAWSSBL, 3 (Atlanta: SBL, 2013) 145

2 This tendency was not unique to Judaism. Hundley writes that

as attested in Egypt and Mesopotamia, humanity was conceived of as theomorphic. In other words, rather than imagining gods as like us, the gods crafted us like them. By bearing a likeness to the supreme deities, humans thus garnered greater dignity and perhaps warranted more of the gods' concern than, e.g., a squirrel.

Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*, 145

3 E. R. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) 20.

4 Thorkild Jacobsen suggests that in Mesopotamian traditions the divine image "remained a promise, a potential, and an incentive to a divine theophany, to a divine presence." T. Jacobsen, "The Graven Image," in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*, eds. P. D. Miller et al. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 15–32 at 29.

5 Hundley notes that

in the past, scholars have denigrated ancient Near Eastern perceptions and practice as primitive, largely derived from a particular reading of the biblical prophets and from the different way of conceptualizing the divine. Recently, a scholarly vogue has been to correct this extreme portrait, and rightly so, yet in the process some have gone to the other extreme. In their efforts to rehabilitate iconic worship, some scholars have idealized it.

Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*, 144

6 M. B. Dick, "The Mesopotamian Cult Statue: A Sacramental Encounter with Divinity," in *Cult Image and Divine Representation in the Ancient Near East*, ed. N. H. Walls; ASOR, 10 (Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2005) 43–67 at 43. See also K. van der Toorn, "The Iconic Book," in *The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, ed. K. van der Toorn; CBET, 21 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997) 235.

7 Richard Middleton observes that the ritual "is understood as efficaciously vivifying the image, so that its various orifices are opened and it may speak, hear, see, and even (in a certain sense) walk." J. R. Middleton, *The Liberating Image: The Imago Dei in Genesis 1* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2005) 128.

8 Hundley states that

for example, at the beginning of the mouth-washing ritual in Mesopotamia, before any ritual manipulation, the divine cult statue was already addressed as a god, yet did not become a fully functioning locus of divine presence until the end of the ritual.

Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*, 150

9 Benjamin Sommer writes that "the texts that describe these rituals maintained that not only human artisans but the gods themselves participated in the fashioning (or 'birth') of the statue." B. D. Sommer, *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) 19.

10 Regarding ancient rituals of the washing of the mouth and the opening of the mouth of cultic statues, see I. Baldermann et al., eds., *Die Macht der Bilder*, JBTh, 13 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1999); G. K. Beale, *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2008); A. Berlejung, *Die Theologie der Bilder: Herstellung und Einweihung von Kultbildern in Mesopotamien und die alttestamentliche Bilderpolemik*, OBO, 162 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1998); P. J. Boden, *The Mesopotamian Washing of the Mouth (Mis Pt) Ritual* (Ph.D. diss. Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, 1998); M. B. Dick, ed., *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth: The Making of the Cult Image*

- in the Ancient Near East (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1999); V. A. Hurowitz, "The Mesopotamian God Image, from Womb to Tomb," *JAOS* 123 (2003) 147–157; V. A. Hurowitz, "What Goes In Is What Comes Out: Materials for Creating Cult Statues," in *Text, Artifact, and Image; Revealing Ancient Israelite Religion*, eds. G. M. Beckman and T. J. Lewis; BJS, 346 (Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2006) 3–23; M. J. Lundberg, "The *Mis-Pi* Rituals and Incantations and Jeremiah 10:1–16," in *Uprooting and Planting: Essays on Jeremiah for Leslie Allen*, ed. J. Goldingay; LHBOTS, 459 (London: T&T Clark, 2007) 210–227; M. Schneider, "Animation of the Cultic Statues, the Magic of Memory and the Pupil's Initiation," *Judaica Petropolitana* 3 (2015) 49–66; M. S. Smith, *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010); C. Walker et al., eds., *The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Mesopotamian *Mis Pi* Ritual: Transliteration, Translation, and Commentary*, SAALT, 1 (Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 2001); N. H. Walls, ed., *Cult Image and Divine Representation in the Ancient Near East*, ASOR, 10 (Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2005).
- 11 One example can be found in *Joseph and Aseneth*, where Aseneth's partaking of the celestial food is reminiscent of certain ritual practices through which cultic images are given life by placing the divine Name in their mouths. We will explore these traditions later in our study.
 - 12 On humans as cultic images in the Hebrew Bible, see S. L. Herring, "A 'Transubstantiated' Humanity: The Relationship Between the Divine Image and the Presence of God in Genesis i 26f.," *VT* 58 (2008) 480–494; S. L. Herring, *Divine Substitution: Humanity as the Manifestation of Deity in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Ph.D. diss. University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, 2011); S. L. Herring, "Moses as Divine Substitute in Exodus," *CTR* 9 (2012) 53–68; S. L. Herring, *Divine Substitution: Humanity as the Manifestation of Deity in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*, FRLANT, 247 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013).
 - 13 A. Schüle, "Made in the 'Image of God': The Concepts of Divine Images in Gen 1–3," *ZAW* 117.1 (2005) 1–20 at 2.
 - 14 Although we should mention here that in Mesopotamia and Egypt, the cultic statues were also considered by their makers as "living" entities. Stephen Herring observes that "in Mesopotamia, the ontological life of the image is not only aesthetic. Indeed, the distinction between what is 'real' and what is 'representation' becomes blurred, so that the image is, itself, treated as a living thing." Herring, *Divine Substitution*, 18.
 - 15 Schüle, "Made in the 'Image of God'," 11.
 - 16 In the ancient Near Eastern sources *šalmu* was used to designate the relationship between deity and kings. On this, see Herring, "Divine Substitution," 25ff; E. M. Curtis, *Man as the Image of God in Genesis in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Parallels* (Ph.D. diss. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1984).
 - 17 Herring notes that "the priestly use of *tselem* ('image') in the Hebrew Bible shares a similar conceptualization of presence with the Akk. *šalmu*." Herring, "A 'Transubstantiated' Humanity," 489.
 - 18 M. Smith, "Divine Form and Size in Ugaritic and Pre-exilic Israelite Religion," *ZAW* 100 (1988) 424–427 at 427.
 - 19 Schüle explains that

being the image of God determines Adam's role and place within the cosmos. It is one of the most highlighted aspects of the *imago Dei* that it is linked with the *dominium terrae* in Gen 1:28. Being the image puts Adam in a position that installs him as ruler over all other creatures.

Schüle, "Made in the 'Image of God'," 5
 - 20 Regarding Adam's creation in Sirach, Van Kooten notes that

the broader context in Sirach suggests that man as God's image also has something to do with the "knowledge and understanding" which God imparted to them:

62 *Divine image as the hypostasis of knowledge*

ἐπιστήμην συνέσεως ἐνέπλησεν αὐτοῦς (17:7; no extant Hebrew text). Although this is no more than a hint, and remains merely implicit, it seems that the author is reflecting on the possible meaning of the image of God in terms of knowledge and understanding. We shall also encounter this interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls. . . . This understanding of the image of God in terms of knowledge and understanding is strengthened in the expanded Greek translation of Sirach which also comprises Sirach 17:5, enumerating the various faculties which God bestowed on man, including the gift of mind and reason. . . . This spiritual or intellectual coloring of the image of God would appear to be part of a general tendency in the interpretation of this notion in ancient Jewish and early Christian sources.

Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology*, 9

21 Schüle, "Made in the 'Image of God,'" 19.

22 Van Kooten suggests that

although the *Life of Adam and Eve* is probably Christian, the motifs of the exaltation of Adam and of the command to worship him do also occur in Jewish literature. Despite the fact that this Jewish literature is probably later than the *Life of Adam and Eve*, this does suggest that the motif is already Jewish and that the Christian author of the *Life of Adam and Eve* did not invent this topic, but drew on existing Jewish traditions to this effect.

Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology*, 31

23 Defending the ancient provenance of this story, Fletcher-Louis notes that

besides its appearance in the Latin, Georgian, and Armenian versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*, the Worship of Adam Story is attested in both Jewish and Christian sources in a way that suggests a nonsectarian provenance and wide circulation in the first century of the Christian era (if not earlier). In the Christian environment, the story is attested in diverse pseudepigraphical sources, but the church fathers themselves do not quote from it. Because their theology was Christocentric, not anthropocentric, it is unsurprising that they did not make direct use of it. This also means it is unlikely that early Christians created the story, even if they found it useful when appropriated through a Christological lens. We know that the rabbis were aware of it because they preserve a similar story that says when the angels began to worship the first human being, God took steps to ensure that in the future they would not mistake Adam for his Creator. This is clearly designed to refute the Worship of Adam Story and is best taken as evidence that certain people in the first centuries CE maintained that Adam, although created, was a divine or at least semi-divine being who deserved to be worshipped, and the rabbis vehemently opposed such a "heretical" idea. It is possible that the rabbis are reacting to a story dear to Christians, but several considerations make this unlikely. At no point do the rabbinic texts explicitly polemicize against Christians for believing that Adam was worshipped as a divine being. And given the way the Adam story is marginalized in mainstream patristic theology, it is more likely that the rabbis are reacting to a story that had been doing the rounds in their own Jewish environment.

C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *Jesus Monotheism, vol. 1, Christological Origins: The Emerging Consensus and Beyond* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2015) 259–260

24 Although the story is not found in the Greek version of the *Primary Adam Books*, interpreters argue that its author "must have known it in some form, but he has chosen not to narrate it." For example, Johannes Magliano-Tromp points out that

in the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve* 16:3, it is told that the devil invited the serpent to be his companion in seducing Adam to sin, "so that he will be cast out of paradise, just as we have been cast out by him." This must be a reference to the story of the

devil's fall from heaven, a story that is narrated at length in the Armenian, Georgian and Latin versions of the writing. The author of the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve* must have known it in some form, but he has chosen not to narrate it.

J. Magliano-Tromp, "Adamic Traditions in 2 Enoch and in the Books of Adam and Eve," in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*, eds. A. A. Orlov, G. Boccaccini, and J. Zurawski; SJS, 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2012) 283–304 at 298

Fletcher-Louis explains the absence of the story in some versions as the result of Christian censorship. He argues that

because the story does not fit well with the belief that it is Jesus Christ who is the image of God, the fact that it is fully told in the Latin, Armenian, and Georgian, but not in the extant Greek and the Slavonic is best explained as textual evidence for its suppression in Christian transmission. Either the Greek and Slavonic tradents disapproved of the story altogether or they were concerned that it should only be handled with extreme care, and it should not be widely known among the uneducated or the laity, who might misunderstand it. The fact that some Greek manuscripts refer to the story, but do not lay it out fully, suggests this second explanation.

Fletcher-Louis, *Jesus Monotheism*, 260

25 Fletcher-Louis also detects the memory of these motifs in Philo's treatise *On the Creation of the World* and 4Q381 frag. 1, lines 10–11. On this, see C. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ, 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002) 98–100; Fletcher-Louis, *Jesus Monotheism*, 262–263.

26 The Slavonic version of 3 *Baruch*:

And he said to Michael, Sound the trumpet for the angels to assemble and bow down to the work of my hands which I made. And the angel Michael sounded the trumpet, and all the angels assembled, and all bowed down to Adam order by order. But Satanael did not bow down and said, To mud and dirt I will never bow down. And he said, I will establish my throne above the clouds and I will be like the highest. Because of that, God cast him and his angels from his face just as the prophet said, These withdrew from his face, all who hate God and the glory of God.

H. Gaylord, "How Satanael Lost His 'el'," *JJS* 33 (1982) 303–309 at 305

27 *Apoc. Sedr.* 5:1–3:

Sedrach said to him, "It was by your will that Adam was deceived, my Master. You commanded your angels to worship Adam, but he who was first among the angels disobeyed your order and did not worship him; and so you banished him, because he transgressed your commandment and did not come forth (to worship) the creation of your hands."

S. Agourides, "Apocalypse of Sedrach," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983–85) 1.610

28 *Gos. Bart.* 4:52–55:

But the devil said: Allow me to tell you how I was cast down here, and how God made man. I wandered to and fro in the world, and God said to Michael: Bring me earth from the four ends of the world and water out of the four rivers of paradise. And when Michael had brought them to him, he formed Adam in the east, and gave form to the shapeless earth, and stretched sinews and veins, and united every thing into a harmonious whole. And he showed him reverence for his own sake, because he was his image. And Michael also worshipped him. And when I came from the ends of the world, Michael said to me: Worship the image of God which he has made in his own likeness. But I said: I am fire of fire, I was the first angel to be formed, and shall I worship clay and matter? And Michael said to me: Worship, lest

God be angry with you. I answered: God will not be angry with me, but I will set up my throne over against his throne, and shall be as he is. Then God was angry with me and cast me down, after he had commanded the windows of heaven to be opened.

W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 2 vols. (Cambridge and Louisville, KY: James Clarke & Co., Westminster: John Knox Press, 1991) 1.549

29 *Enthronement of the Archangel Michael* (Sahidic Ms. 593) reads:

Mein Vater sprach zu den Engeln und allen Erzengeln und den Cherubim und den Seraphim und den 24 Presbytern und dem ganzen englischen Heer: "Kommt, verehrt Adam, welcher Mein Gleichnis und Mein Bild ist." Alle antworteten und sprachen: "Wir werden ihn verehren, Unser Herr und Unser König." Sofort regneten die Himmel einen schönen Geruch auf den Leib Adams. Sie verehrten ihn, indem sie sprachen: "Glücklich sind wir, da(ss) wir würdig sind, Dich zu sehen, o Bild Unseres Königs, Amen." Es geschah, als sie nun alle verehrten, kamen wir zu dem ersten Engel, den Wir geschaffen hatten. Mein Vater sprach zu ihm: "Komm, verehere den ersten Menschen, den wir nach Meinem Gleichnis und Meinem Bilde geschaffen haben und das Werk Meiner Hände." Der Erstgeschaffene antwortete: "Ich werde ihn nicht verehren, denn er ist ein Mensch – und ich bin früher als er, und ich bin grösser als alle Engel." Als der Erstgeschaffene sagte: "Ich werde ihn nicht verehren"; verführte er sofort viele andere Engel und liess sie nicht Adam verehren. Mein Vater sprach zu ihm: "Komm"; verehere Mein Gleichnis und Mein Bild." Er antwortete aber: "Ich werde ihn nicht verehren, und diese übrigen Engel werde ich ihn nicht verehren lassen." Mein Vater sprach zu ihm: "Was ist Dir widerfahren wegen seiner, weil Du ihn nicht verehren wirst?" Der Erstgeschaffene sprach zu Ihm: "Ich werde niemals den verehren, der geringer ist als ich." Mein Vater antwortete: "Komm, verehere ihn – bringe nicht über Dich allein ein Verderben, und dass Dein Übeltun über die Mitte Deines Hauptes käme." Er antwortete: "Ich werde ihn nicht verehren." Mein Vater sprach zu ihm: "Das Übel ist heute über Dir erfüllt, O böser Mastema. Siehe, Mein Zeugnis ist vollendet über Dich – dieses, das in Ewigkeit bleiben und zum Gesetz allen kommenden Geschlechtern werden wird."

C. D. G. Müller, *Die Bücher der Einsetzung der Erzengel Michael und Gabriel*, CSCO, 225–226; *Scriptores Coptici*, 31–32 (Louvain: Secretariat du CorpusSCO, 1962) 2.13–15

30 *The Cave of Treasures* 2:12–3:7 reads:

God formed Adam with his holy hand in his image according to his likeness. When the angels beheld his glorious appearance they were agitated from the first sight because they saw the appearance of his face flashing with glorious beauty like the fiery orb, the light of his eyes like the sun, and the figure of his body like shining crystal. When he stretched himself and rose in the middle of the earth he put his feet on that place where the cross of our savior would be erected, because Adam was created in Jerusalem. At that place he wore the gown of kingship, and the crown of glory was put upon his head; there he was made king, priest and prophet, and there God made him sit upon the throne of his glory. There God also put all creatures under his dominion: All the wild animals, cattle and birds gathered before Adam, and while they passed by he named them and they bowed their heads. All beings worshipped him and submitted themselves before him. Then the angels heard God's voice speaking to him: "Adam, behold, I made you king, priest and prophet, lord, chief and leader, so that everything made and created may be subservient unto you and belong to you. To you I give dominion over every created thing." When the angels heard this heavenly voice they all bent their knees and worshipped him. When the chief of that lowest rank saw what greatness had been bestowed upon Adam he envied him from this day on. He did not want to worship him and spoke to his army: "Let us not worship and glorify him together with the angels. It is meet that

he worships me who am fire and spirit and not that I worship dust formed from dirt." As soon as the rebel conceived this and was disobedient as regards the wish of his soul and volition he separated himself from God. He was cast down and fell, he and his whole rank, on Friday, the sixth day, and their fall from heaven lasted for three hours. The garments of their glory were taken from them and he was called "Satan" because he set himself apart, and "Sheda" because his glory had been shed and he had forfeited the garment of his glory. Behold, since that day until now they are naked and bare and of despicable look, he and all his hosts.

A. Toepel, "The Cave of Treasures," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures*, eds. R. Bauckham, J. R. Davila, and A. Panayotov (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013) 531–584 at 541–542

31 *Qur'an* 7:11–13:

We created you, We gave you shape, and then We said to the angels, "Bow down before Adam," and they did. But not Iblis: he was not one of those who bowed down. God said, "What prevented you from bowing down as I commanded you?" and he said, "I am better than him: You created me from fire and him from clay." God said, "Get down from here! This is no place for your arrogance. Get out! You are contemptible!"

Qur'an, trans. M. A. S. Abdel Haleem (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) 95

32 *Qur'an* 15:26–34:

We created man out of dried clay formed from dark mud – the jinn We created before, from the fire of scorching wind. Your Lord said to the angels, "I will create a mortal out of dried clay, formed from dark mud. When I have fashioned him and breathed My spirit into him, bow down before him," and the angels all did so. But not Iblis: he refused to bow down like the others. God said, "Iblis, why did you not bow down like the others?" and he answered, "I will not bow to a mortal You created from dried clay, formed from dark mud." "Get out of here!" said God. "You are an outcast, rejected until the Day of Judgement."

Abdel Halem, *The Qur'an*, 163

- 33 Michael Hundley notes that "the Mesopotamian statue functions much like a newborn, who must mature and be instructed and empowered to fulfill its intended role." M. Hundley, "Divine Presence in Ancient Near East," *Religion Compass* 9.7 (2015) 203–215 at 208.
- 34 Schüle, "Made in the 'Image of God,'" 1–20; C. L. Beckerleg, *The "Image of God" in Eden* (Ph.D. diss. Harvard University, Cambridge, 2009).
- 35 G. Anderson and M. E. Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve: Second Revised Edition*, EJL, 17 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1999) 16E.
- 36 Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 16E.
- 37 The Latin version of the *Primary Adam Books* 13:2–14:1 reads: "The Lord God then said: 'Behold, Adam, I have made you in our image and likeness.' Having gone forth Michael called all the angels saying: 'Worship the image of the Lord God, just as the Lord God has commanded.'" The Armenian version of the *Primary Adam Books* 13:2–14:1 reads: "God said to Michael, 'Behold I have made Adam in the likeness of my image.' Then Michael summoned all the angels, and God said to them, 'Come, bow down to god whom I made.'" Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 16E.
- 38 Fletcher-Louis, *Jesus Monotheism*, 265. Fletcher-Louis further writes that:

indeed, this is clear even at a cursory reading of the Greek and Latin versions of the *Primary Adam Books*. Later on in the story of Adam's life, when Seth and Eve go in search of healing oil to help Adam, Seth is attacked by a wild animal (*Synopsis* §12). He is able to rebuke and overcome the beast because he is the image of God to

whom the animal creature should submit. That story would not work quite so well if Seth were made according to God's image.

Fletcher-Louis, *Jesus Monotheism*, 265

39 Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology*, 29.

40 Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 16E.

41 Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 16E.

42 Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 16E. Corrine Patton observes that "Adam's role as the effective symbol of God's presence in heaven is the result of a divine command." C. Patton, "Adam as the Image of God," *SBLSP* 33 (1994) 294–300 at 299. She goes on to say that "because this image of God was created and ordained as such by God, Satan's refusal to worship Adam is paramount to Satan's refusal to worship God." Patton, "Adam as the Image of God," 300.

43 I suggest that here the angelic veneration activates or vivifies the divine image, a ritual which is known in ancient Egyptian and Mesopotamian milieus. In these traditions "each image had to undergo a ritual of consecration and without such a rite, the inanimate, manmade object could not be imbued with life. With animation, the statue becomes 'activated.'" B. J. Collins, "Cult Images in Hittite Anatolia," in *Cult Image and Divine Representation in the Ancient Near East*, ed. N. H. Walls; ASOR, 10 (Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2005) 29.

44 "*adora imaginem dei Jehova*." Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 16–16E. See also the Latin *Vita* 15:2: "Worship the image of God. If you do not worship, the Lord God will grow angry with you." Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 17E.

45 The Latin version of the *Primary Adam Books* 14:2–15:1 reads:

Michael himself worshipped first then he called me and said: "Worship the image of God Jehovah." I answered: "I do not have it within me to worship Adam." When Michael compelled me to worship, I said to him: "Why do you compel me? I will not worship him who is lower and later than me. I am prior to that creature. Before he was made, I had already been made. He ought to worship me." Hearing this, other angels who were under me were unwilling to worship him.

The Armenian version of the *Primary Adam Books* 14:2–15:1 reads:

Michael bowed first He called me and said "You too, bow down to Adam." I said, Go away, Michael! I shall not bow [down] to him who is posterior to me, for I am former. Why is it proper [for me] to bow down to him? The other angels, too, who were with me, heard this, and my words seemed pleasing to them and they did not prostrate themselves to you, Adam.

Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 16E–17E

46 The motif of angelic opposition has been regularly marginalised in previous studies, while the motif of angelic worship has been exaggerated. This is evident in the specific labeling of the account as "Worship of Adam Story" (Fletcher-Louis, *Jesus Monotheism*, 256) or "Exaltation of Adam" (G. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," in *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays*, eds. G. Anderson, M. E. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15 [Leiden: Brill, 2000] 83–110).

47 Fletcher-Louis argues for an early pre-Christian provenance of this motif by noting that

Philo is almost certainly a witness to it in his treatise *On the Creation of the World*, where he says that when man was created the other creatures were so amazed at the sight of him that they worshipped (*proskynein*) him as one by nature ruler and master (§83).

Fletcher-Louis, *Jesus Monotheism*, 262

48 The deification of Adam is especially evident in the Armenian version of the *Primary Adam Books* 14:1: "Then Michael summoned all the angels, and God said to them,

‘Come, bow down to god whom I made.’” Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 16E.

49 While reflecting on the Latin version of the *Primary Adam Books*, Patton notes that

the specific terms used in the *Vita* to describe Adam, *imago* and *similitudo*, are the exact terms used by the translators of the Vulgate to describe the central anthropomorphic or zoomorphic objects of non-Israelite religions. The Vulgate of the Wisdom of Solomon 13:10–19, for instance, describes the idols of foreigners as the likenesses of animals (*similitudines*, v. 10), and the image of a human (*imagini*, v. 13). The text describes the installation of the “image” (*imago*, v. 14) relatively accurately for such a polemical piece. Chapter 14 uses similar language to describe the pointless reliance of sailors on “images” and “likenesses.” While these terms can mean things other than a central cult object, when this terminology is used of an object as the recipient of worship within sacred space, it is hard to see these terms as meaning anything other than that this object is the central cult object of a temple. This is the exact context for the language describing Adam in the *Vita*. What is surprising, in light of the polemic against “idol worship” in the Hebrew Bible, is that the imagery plays such a positive role in the *Vita*.

Patton, “Adam as the Image of God,” 299

50 S. N. Bunta, “The Likeness of the Image: Adamic Motifs and *Tselem* Anthropology in Rabbinic Traditions about Jacob’s Image Enthroned in Heaven,” *JSJ* 37.1 (2006) 55–84 at 68–69.

51 David Steenburg suggests that “the worship of the image of God, insofar as it is a visible or physical manifestation of God, is within the bounds of Torah.” D. Steenburg, “The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God,” *JSNT* 39 (1990) 95–109 at 95.

52 Van Kooten argues that

his remarkable view – that Adam, in his capacity as the image of God, was to be worshipped as an idol by angels – could be taken as the most radical consequence of the extraordinary position accorded to man in the Priestly Source, and of a kind of divine anthropology also expressed in the Dead Sea Scrolls. It highlights the potential of a divine anthropology already implicit in the view of the Priestly Source that man, as a living being, fulfils the role of the image of God.

Van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology*, 31–32

53 Michael Dick notes that “attitudes (positive or negative) toward the concretization of the deity represented by the cult image reveal significant positions about the divine presence, about immanence and transcendence, about the very nature of the deity.” Dick, *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth*, ix.

54 Fletcher-Louis, *Jesus Monotheism*, 270. Later he notices that “the story does not portray Adam as a thoroughly separate, individuated, divine being. He is not ‘a God’ or ‘demi-god.’ He exists solely at the service of God; as God’s image and likeness.” Fletcher-Louis, *Jesus Monotheism*, 271.

55 A. A. Orlov, *Dark Mirrors: Azazel and Satanael in Early Jewish Demonology* (Albany: SUNY, 2011) 105.

56 J. Wortley, “Icons and Relics: A Comparison,” *GRBS* 43.2 (2002–2003) 161–174 at 164.

57 See, for example, *Gen. Rab.* 8:10:

R. Hoshaya said: When the Holy One, blessed be He, created Adam, the ministering angels mistook him [for a divine being] and wished to exclaim “Holy” before him. What does this resemble? A king and a governor who sat in a chariot, and his subjects wished to say to the king, “*Domine!* (Sovereign)!” but they did not know which it was. What did the king do? He pushed the governor out of the chariot, and so they knew who was the king. Similarly, when the Lord created Adam, the angels

mistook him [for a divine being]. What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do? He caused sleep to fall upon him, and so all knew that he was [but mortal] man; thus it is written, Cease ye from man, in whose nostrils is a breath, for how little is he to be accounted.

H. Freedman and M. Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 10 vols. (London: Soncino, 1961) 1.61

- 58 On *melammu* and other similar concepts in the ancient Near Eastern texts, see A. Annus, “The Mesopotamian Precursors of Adam’s Garment of Glory and Moses’ Shining Face,” in *Identities and Societies in the Ancient East-Mediterranean Regions: Comparative Approaches. Henning Graf Reventlow Memorial Volume*, ed. T. R. Kämmerer (Münster: Ugarit, 2011) 1–17; S. Z. Aster, *The Phenomenon of Divine and Human Radiance in the Hebrew Bible and in Northwest Semitic and Mesopotamian Literature: A Philological and Comparative Study* (Ph.D. diss. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 2006) 512–513; S. Z. Aster, *The Unbeatable Light: Melammu and Its Biblical Parallels*, AOAT, 384 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2012); E. Cassin, *La splendeur divine: Introduction à l’étude de la mentalité mésopotamienne*, Civilisations et Sociétés, 8 (Paris and La Haye: Mouton, 1968); F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973) 152, note 30; M. B. Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth: Safeguarding the Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle*, FAT, 2.50 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011) 41–43; L. Oppenheim, “Akkadian *pul(u)h(t)u* and *melammu*,” *JAOS* 63 (1943) 31–34; S. Sanders, “Old Light on Moses’ Shining Face,” *VT* 52 (2002) 400–407; N. M. Waldman, “The Imagery of Clothing, Covering, and Overpowering,” *JNES* 19 (1989) 162–163; M. Weinfeld, “*kabod*,” in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, eds. G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H. J. Fabry, 15 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974–2006) 7.22–38.
- 59 Hundley, “Divine Fluidity?,” 29.
- 60 Hundley, “Divine Fluidity?,” 29.
- 61 Greek version 20–21: “And I [Eve] wept saying, Why have you done this to me, that I have been estranged from my glory . . . [Adam to Eve:] —You have estranged me from the glory of God.” See also the Armenian version of this passage: “At that hour I learned with my eyes that I was naked of the glory with which I had been clothed!” Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 46–47.
- 62 Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 12E.
- 63 Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 58E.
- 64 Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 60E.
- 65 Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 60E.
- 66 Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 61E.
- 67 Some scholars detect Adam’s divine features already in biblical accounts. Thus, Schüle points out that
- there was almost always a certain suspicion present in the exegetical and theological discussion that on a deeper level Gen 1:26–28 could mean something questionable at least in most Western Christian traditions: that, being the *imago Dei*, humans are not only like God, but that this includes them in the divine life itself.
- Schüle, “Made in the ‘Image of God’,” 5
- 68 D. Arbel, “‘Seal of Resemblance, Full of Wisdom, and Perfect in Beauty’: The Enoch/Metatron Narrative of 3 Enoch and Ezekiel 28,” *HTR* 98 (2005) 121–142 at 128.
- 69 Arbel, “Seal of Resemblance, Full of Wisdom, and Perfect in Beauty,” 130.
- 70 C. R. A. Morray-Jones, “The Temple Within: The Embodied Divine Image and Its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources,” *SBLSP* 38 (1998) 400–431 at 422.
- 71 F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 1008–1009.
- 72 Van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology*, 16.

- 73 Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 93.
- 74 Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 93.
- 75 Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology*, 16.
- 76 Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology*, 16.
- 77 For later Christian connections, see A. Golitzin, "Recovering the 'Glory of Adam': 'Divine Light' Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Ascetical Literature of Fourth-Century Syro-Mesopotamia," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St Andrews in 2001*, ed. J. R. Davila; STDJ, 46 (Leiden: Brill, 2003) 275–308.
- 78 García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 78–79.
- 79 Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology*, 19.
- 80 "Those who remained steadfast in it will acquire eternal life, and all the glory of Adam is for them." García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 554–555. On these traditions see Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 88–135.
- 81 J. Fossum, "The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebittals of the Rabbis," in *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer, 3 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996) 1.535, n. 39.
- 82 Another hint of Adam's enthronement is found in 2 *Enoch* 31:2, where God creates an open heaven in order that Adam might look upon the angels singing the triumphal song. This detail again recalls the traditional *Kavod* imagery where the angelic hosts sing the triumphal song before the enthroned Glory.
- 83 "And outside the two gates of that place, they saw a man seated on the golden throne. And the appearance of that man was terrifying, like the Master's." E. Sanders, "Testament of Abraham," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985) 1.888.
- 84 On the traditions of Adam's enthronement, see P. Munoa III, *Four Powers in Heaven. The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham*, JSPSS, 28 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 87–90.
- 85 Schüle remarks that "another point that seems crucial for a full-fledged account of the *imago Dei* is its cultic meaning." Schüle, "Made in the 'Image of God'," 6.
- 86 Some interpreters see behind the angelic veneration of Adam an affirmation of his role as a cultic statue of the deity. Silviu Bunta states that

the tradition associates the angelic worship of Adam with the protoplast's identity as the image of God. As John R. Levison emphasizes, "the image consists of physical similarity to God." This physical resemblance enables Adam to function as a cultic statue of God. The connection between Adam's physical resemblance to God and the angelic worship of Adam is evident in Michael's command to Satan: *adorate imaginem domini dei* in Latin, and "prosternez vous devant le semblable et l'image de la divinité" in Georgian. *Astowac*, which the Armenian version uses for Adam's iconic function, means both "god" and "idol." Given the latter connotation, the Armenian version better reflects the early Second Temple conception of Adam as the equivalent of a pagan cult statue or idol.

Bunta, "The Likeness of the Image," 67

- 87 Schüle, "Made in the 'Image of God'," 6.
- 88 Patton recalls that "because this image of God was created and ordained as such by God, Satan's refusal to worship Adam is paramount to Satan's refusal to worship God." Patton, "Adam as the Image of God," 300.
- 89 A. Y. Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); A. Y. Reed, *Jewish Christianity and the History of Judaism: Collected Essays*, TSAJ, 171 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018); A. Y. Reed, *Demons, Angels, and Writing in Ancient Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).

- 90 A. A. Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, TSAJ, 107 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 23–39.
- 91 Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.128.
- 92 J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, CSCO, 510–511; *Scriptores Aethiopiici*, 87–88, 2 vols. (Louvain: Peeters, 1989) 1.24; 2.25–26. In relation to this tradition, Michael Stone notes that
- from the summary statement in *Jubilees* we learn that Enoch is an agent of the revelation of heavenly secrets and teachings, parallel to Moses. Moreover, from the sources it emerges that the tradents were highly conscious of the need to authenticate the transmission of the tradition and that they regarded it as containing saving knowledge. The far-reaching claims made about the actual mode of revelation include direct revelation by God. These claims, we maintain, are not to be taken lightly. The teaching is seen as redemptive, adding yet another dimension of significance to the phenomenon.
- Stone, “Pseudepigraphy Reconsidered,” 7
- 93 H. S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*, WMANT, 61 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 27.
- 94 See Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 59–69.
- 95 Pierre Grelot observes that “Enoch is the originator of prophecy understood as revelation of divine secrets.” P. Grelot, “La légende d’Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification,” *RSR* 46 (1958) 5–26, 181–210 at 15.
- 96 Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.264; P. Schäfer, M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhaloth-Literatur*, TSAJ, 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981) 8–9.
- 97 M. S. Cohen, *The Shi’ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983) 127.
- 98 Grelot, “La légende d’Hénoch,” 5–26, 181–210; Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*; H. Ludin Jansen, *Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Oslo: Dybwad, 1939); O. Neugebauer, “The ‘Astronomical’ Chapters of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (72–82),” in *The Book of Enoch, or I Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*, eds. M. Black with J. C. VanderKam, and O. Neugebauer; SVTP, 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1985) 386–419 at 387; J. C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, CBQMS, 16 (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984); H. Zimmern, “Urkönige und Uroffenbarung,” in *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, ed. E. Schrader, 2 vols. (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1902–1903) 2.530–543.
- 99 On the date of 2 *Enoch*, see R. H. Charles and W. R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896) xxvi; R. H. Charles and N. Forbes, “The Book of the Secrets of Enoch,” in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ed. R. H. Charles, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913) 2.429; Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 114; C. Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, JSHRZ, 5 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995) 813; Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 323–328; A. A. Orlov, “The Sacerdotal Traditions of 2 Enoch and the Date of the Text,” in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*, eds. A. A. Orlov, G. Boccaccini, and J. Zurawski; SJS, 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2012) 103–116.
- 100 Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.138.
- 101 Charles and Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, 28.
- 102 M. E. Stone, “The Fall of Satan and Adam’s Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*,” in *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays*, eds. G. Anderson, M. E. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2000) 43–56 at 47.
- 103 Stone, “The Fall of Satan and Adam’s Penance” 48.
- 104 Stone, “The Fall of Satan and Adam’s Penance,” 48.
- 105 Stone, “The Fall of Satan and Adam’s Penance,” 48.

106 Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance," 48. For Stone

the conclusion seems quite clear. The author of *2 Enoch* 21–22 knew a story of the rebellion of Satan that strongly resembled that which is found in chaps. 11–17 of the *Primary Adam Books*, in its Latin, Armenian, and Georgian forms. It is particularly interesting that this form of the tradition does not occur in the Slavonic recension of the *Primary Adam Books*. This situation seems to invite us to conclude that this material entered *2 Enoch* in Greek. Certainly, the story of Satan's rebellion did not enter *2 Enoch* from the Slavonic *Vita*.

Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance," 48

107 Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," 100.

108 Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," 100.

109 Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," 101.

110 Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," 101.

111 Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," 101.

112 On this ritual, see A. Berlejung, "Washing the Mouth: The Consecration of Divine Images in Mesopotamia," in *The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, ed. K. van der Toorn; CBET, 21 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997) 46.

113 Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 79E. See also Georgian version of the *Primary Adam Books* 33:5: "God, forgive Adam for he is your image and the work of your hands." Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 79E.

114 Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.170.

115 The *Cave of Treasures* 2:2–12 tells about Adam's creation with God's *right hand*:

On the sixth day, that is, Friday of the first week, when silence lay upon all the ranks of powers, God spoke: "Let us make man in our image, according to our likeness," thus indicating the blessed persons (of the Trinity). When the angels heard this heavenly voice they said in fear and trembling to each other: "A great miracle is being shown to us today, the image of our God and maker." They beheld the *right hand* of God stretching forth and spreading out upon the whole world, and all creatures were gathered within the palm of his hand. Then they beheld him taking from the whole earth one grain of dust, from the whole essence of the waters one drop of water, from the whole air above one breeze of wind and from the whole nature of fire a little flame of heat. The angels beheld these four elements being put together within the palm of his *right hand*, that is, cold and heat, moisture and dryness, and God formed Adam. . . . God formed Adam with his holy hand in his image according to his likeness.

Toepel, "The Cave of Treasures," 541

116 *2 Enoch* 39:5. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.162.

117 *Synopse* §384.

118 "The Holy One, blessed be he, laid his hand on me and blessed me with 1,365,000 blessings. I was enlarged and increased in size until I matched the world in length and breadth." Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.263.

119 Regarding the formation of the Hekhalot corpus as a distinct class of texts, Ra'anan Boustán observes that,

this loose body of texts, written primarily in Hebrew and Aramaic with a smattering of foreign loan words, took shape gradually during Late Antiquity and early Middle Ages (c. 300–900), and continued to be adapted and reworked by Jewish scribes and scholars throughout the Middle Ages and into the early Modern period (c. 900–1500). While Heikhalot literature does contain some material that dates to the "classic" rabbinic period (c. 200–500 CE), this literature seems to have emerged as

a distinct class of texts only at a relatively late date, most likely after 600 CE and perhaps well into the early Islamic period.

R. S. Boustan, "The Study of Heikhalot Literature: Between Mystical Experience and Textual Artifact," *CBR* 6.1 (2007) 130–160 at 130–131

Later, Boustan elaborates on this further:

Heikhalot literature – and its constituent parts – cannot simply be divided into stable “books” or “works,” but must be studied within the shifting redactional contexts reflected in the manuscript tradition. In particular, the dynamic relationships among single units of tradition as well as the relationships of those units to the larger whole should be considered. In light of this complex transmission–history, scholars have not always been able to agree on a single definition of what constitutes a Heikhalot text or on how the corpus might best be delimited.

Boustan, “The Study of Heikhalot Literature,” 139

- 120 For a comprehensive analysis of the rabbinic texts and traditions dealing with the angelic opposition to humanity, see P. Schäfer, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorsestellung*, SJ, 8 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975). Schäfer’s research demonstrates that the idea of angelic opposition was expressed explicitly in rabbinic literature on three decisive occasions: at the creation of Adam, at the moment of the giving of the Torah, and at the descent of the Shekinah in the Sanctuary. On all three occasions, angels speak enviously against humanity in an attempt to prevent God from creating humanity, giving the Torah to Israel, or coming to dwell among humans. Schäfer, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen*, 219.
- 121 Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.258–259; Schäfer et al., *Synopse*, 6–7.
- 122 Anderson, “The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan,” 83–110. On the Adamic traditions in rabbinic literature, see also A. Altmann, “The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends,” *JQR* 35 (1945) 371–391; B. Barc, “La taille cosmique d’Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois premiers siècles après J.-C.,” *RSR* 49 (1975) 173–185; Fossum, “The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis,” 1.529–539; G. Quispel, “Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition,” *Erfb* 22 (1953) 195–234; G. Quispel, “Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis,” *VC* 34 (1980) 1–13; Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 108–115.
- 123 Anderson, “The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan,” 107.
- 124 Anderson, “The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan,” 108.
- 125 Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.259.
- 126 Anderson, “The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan,” 105.
- 127 P. Alexander, “From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch,” in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, eds. M. E. Stone and T. A. Bergren (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 102–111 at 111.
- 128 R. Neis, “Embracing Icons: The Face of Jacob on the Throne of God,” *Images: A Journal of Jewish Art and Visual Culture* 1 (2007) 36–54 at 43.
- 129 M. Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*, ArBib, 1B (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992) 99–100.
- 130 M. McNamara, *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis*, ArBib, 1A (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992) 140.
- 131 M. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to Their Extant Sources*, AnBib, 76, 2 vols. (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980) 1.57 and 2.20.
- 132 We can see these tendencies in Mesopotamian traditions where the representation of the divine presence conditions the deity. On the connection between the deity and his statue, Hundley notes that:

not only was the deity present in the image, but the well-being of the image also seems to have been connected to that of the deity. Thus, it follows logically that how

the worshipers treated their deity in the form of its image determined how the deity treated them and their nation.

Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*, 140–141

Later in his study, Hundley reiterates this view by arguing that “in addition, the entity was frequently linked to its image in such a way that what affected the image affected the entity as well.” Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*, 150.

- 133 C. Rowland and C. Morray-Jones, *The Mystery of God: Early Jewish Mysticism and the New Testament*, CRINT, 12 (Leiden: Brill, 2009) 127.

- 134 *Zohar* I.71b–72a offers the following striking reinterpretation of Ezekiel’s vision of the Chariot:

And above the firmament that was over their heads was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone (Ezek 1:26). This alludes to the “foundation stone,” which is the central point of the universe and on which stands the Holy of Holies. “The likeness of a throne,” i.e. the supernal holy throne, possessing four supports, and which is symbolic of the Oral Law. “And upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man upon it above;” this symbolizes the Written Law. From here we learn that copies of the Written Law should rest on copies of the Oral Law (and not vice versa), because the latter is the throne to the former. “As the appearance of a man” refers to the image of Jacob, who sits on it.

H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, 5 vols. (London and New York: Soncino, 1933) 1.242

Here, the formative Ezekielian account is refashioned as the vision of Jacob’s image enthroned on the celestial Seat. Another passage from *Zohar* II.241a offers a similar reading of Isaiah’s theophanic vision:

R. Simeon prefaced his reply with the verse: “Thus saith the Lord: The heaven is my throne, etc.” (Isa 66:1). Observe, he said, that the Holy One, blessed be He, found delight in Israel as His inheritance and portion, brought them near to Himself, and divided them into certain grades after the celestial model, so as to bring into one complete whole all the worlds, both the upper and the lower. Thus “the heaven is my throne” indicates the firmament wherein Jacob dwells, an exalted image, as it were, of the most high divine throne.

Sperling and Simon, *The Zohar*, 4.319

In this passage, the exalted image of Jacob dwells on the divine throne.

- 135 J. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995) 140–141.

- 136 Fossum illustrates that this tradition is already observable in some versions of the Fragmentary Targum which do not contain the verb “engraved” or “fixed.” Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 141. He also points to a certain baraita (*b. Hul.* 91b) that seems to attest to the same tradition. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 139–140.

- 137 Halperin suggests that

targumic Tosefta to Ezekiel 1:26 introduces a striking interpretation of that verse at the same time that it sidesteps its anthropomorphism. According to the Hebrew text, the prophet sees the form of a sapphire throne, “and upon the form of the throne a form like the appearance of a human being, upon it from above.” Most Targum manuscripts leave “the appearance of a human being” in Hebrew; *Codex Reuchlinianus* and the printed editions translate it literally. But one manuscript (Montefiore H.116) records a variant: “the form of Jacob our father upon it from above.” When we read Ezekiel 1:26 we normally assume that the appearance of a “human being” is sitting on the throne. But it is just as possible to understand the Hebrew to mean that

it is engraved on the throne. Both Palestinian and Babylonian rabbinic sources (*Gen. Rab.* 68:12; *b. Hull.* 91b) speak of Jacob's image as being engraved on God's throne, but do not give any satisfactory exegetical basis for it. This Tosefta suggests that the idea derives from an anti-anthropomorphic interpretation of Ezekiel 1:26, developed in the synagogue. Of course, we still do not know why the "form" is identified as Jacob's; this is probably connected with the belief that a celestial embodiment of Israel (Jacob) is perpetually in God's sight. An Aramaic hymn for *Shabū'ot*, of uncertain date, connects Jacob's image with a heavenly ascension: Moses sees "the image of Jacob rising up opposite him" when he ascends to receive the Torah.

D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Response to Ezekiel's Vision*, TSAJ, 16 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988) 121

Wolfson also observes that "this notion too is clearly reflected in the *piyyut* literature, for example, the *qerovah* of Qallir." E. R. Wolfson, "The Image of Jacob Engraved upon the Throne," in *Along the Path: Studies in Kabbalistic Myth, Symbolism, and Hermeneutics* (Albany: SUNY, 1995) 1–62 at 8. See also *Zohar* I.72a: "'As the appearance of a man' refers to the image of Jacob, who sits on it." Sperling and Simon, *The Zohar*, 1.242.

138 Wolfson, "The Image of Jacob Engraved upon the Throne," 8.

139 James Kugel comments that

this particular motif is widely distributed in rabbinic texts. Thus, for example, in *Numbers Rabba* (*Bemidbar* 4:1) the verse from Isaiah 43:4, "Because you are precious in my eyes, you have been honored" is explained: "God said to Jacob: Jacob, you are so precious in my eyes that I have, as it were, fixed your portrait (*iqonin*) on the heavenly throne." Similarly, one reads concerning the opening verse of chapter 2 of Lamentations: "How the Lord in his anger has beclouded." Said God to Israel: "Do you truly aggravate me? It is only the fact that the portrait (*iqonin*) of Jacob is engraved on my throne. Here then, take it! And he threw it in their faces." And likewise in *Genesis Rabbah* 78:3, on the verse "For you have wrestled with God and with men and have prevailed" (*Gen* 32:28) we read: "You are the one whose portrait is engraved on high."

J. Kugel, *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1990) 113

For an in-depth discussion about the traditions of Jacob's image engraved on the throne in rabbinic literature see Wolfson, "The Image of Jacob Engraved upon the Throne," 1–62, 111–186.

140 Neis, "Embracing Icons," 46.

141 Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 2.752.

142 Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 7.151.

143 Neis, "Embracing Icons," 45.

144 Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 5.95.

145 *Gen* 28:11–17 reads:

He came to a certain place and stayed there for the night, because the sun had set. Taking one of the stones of the place, he put it under his head and lay down in that place. And he dreamed that there was a ladder set up on the earth, the top of it reaching to heaven; and the angels of God were ascending and descending on it. And the Lord stood beside him and said, "I am the Lord, the God of Abraham your father and the God of Isaac; the land on which you lie I will give to you and to your offspring; and your offspring shall be like the dust of the earth, and you shall spread abroad to the west and to the east and to the north and to the south; and all the families of the earth shall be blessed in you and in your offspring. Know that I am with you and will keep you wherever you go, and will bring you back to this land; for I will not leave you until I have done what I have promised you." Then Jacob

woke from his sleep and said, “Surely the Lord is in this place – and I did not know it!” And he was afraid, and said, “How awesome is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven.”

- 146 Gen 28:18 reads: “So Jacob rose early in the morning, and he took the stone that he had put under his head and set it up for a pillar and poured oil on the top of it.”
- 147 Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 49.
- 148 J. Davila, *Hekhalot Literature in Translation: Major Texts of Merkavah Mysticism*, SJJTP, 20 (Leiden: Brill, 2013) 86; Schäfer et al., *Synopse*, 72.
- 149 Neis, “Embracing Icons,” 42.
- 150 Neis, “Embracing Icons,” 48.
- 151 Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 2.626.
- 152 Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud. Hullin*, 91b.
- 153 Wolfson, “The Image of Jacob Engraved upon the Throne,” 4.
- 154 Wolfson, “The Image of Jacob Engraved upon the Throne,” 4.
- 155 On the role of Jacob as the image of God in rabbinic literature and Jewish mysticism, see A. A. Orlov, *The Greatest Mirror: Heavenly Counterparts in the Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (Albany: SUNY, 2017) 61–118. On the Adamic background of this Jacob’s role, see Bunta, “The Likeness of the Image,” 55–84.
- 156 C. T. R. Hayward, *Interpretations of the Name Israel in Ancient Judaism and Some Early Christian Writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) 198.
- 157 A total of nine Greek sentences of this pseudepigraphon were preserved in the writings of Origen (c.185 – c.254 CE). Fragment A is quoted in Origen’s *In Ioannem* II.31.25. Fragment B, a single sentence, is cited in Gregory and Basil’s compilation of Origen, the *Philokalia*. This fragment is also quoted in Eusebius, *The Preparation of the Gospel* and in the Latin *Commentary on Genesis* by Procopius of Gaza. Fragment C, which is also found in the *Philokalia*, quotes Fragment B and paraphrases Fragment A. J. Z. Smith, “Prayer of Joseph,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983–85) 2.699. Pieter van der Horst and Judith Newman note that “according to the ancient *Stichometry* of Nicephorus, the text originally contained 1100 lines. The extant portions totaling only nine Greek sentences or 164 words thus reflect a small fraction of the original composition.” *Early Jewish Prayers in Greek*, eds. P. W. van der Horst and J. H. Newman, CEJL (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008) 249.
- 158 J. Z. Smith, “The Prayer of Joseph,” in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*, ed. J. Neusner; SHR, 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1968) 253–293 at 255.
- 159 Jonathan Smith proposed that “the *Prayer* is most likely to be situated within. . . [the] first-century Jewish groups, both in Palestine and in the Diaspora, both before and after the destruction of the Temple.” Smith, “Prayer of Joseph,” 2.701. This proposal fits with the judgment of van der Horst and Newman that “the composition must likely have been in circulation for a good period for Origen to have recognized it by title.” Van der Horst and Newman, *Early Jewish Prayers in Greek*, 249.
- 160 Wolfson observes that

the notion of an angel named Jacob-Israel is also known from Jewish Christian texts, as reported mainly by Justin, and appears as well in Gnostic works such as the Nag Hammadi treatise *On the Origin of the World*, and in Manichaean texts.

He further suggests that “such a tradition, perhaps through the intermediary of Philo, passed into Christian sources wherein the celestial Jacob or Israel was identified with Jesus who is depicted as the Logos and Son of God.” Wolfson, “The Image of Jacob Engraved upon the Throne,” 5.

- 161 The *Book of Jubilees* also appears to be cognizant of Jacob’s heavenly identity. *Jubilees* 35:17 reads: “Now you are not to be afraid for Jacob because Jacob’s guardian is greater and more powerful, glorious, and praiseworthy than Esau’s guardian.” VanderKam, *The*

Book of Jubilees, 2.235–236. On this tradition, see also *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on Gen 33:10:

And Jacob said, “Do not speak thus, I pray; if now I have found mercy in your eyes, you must accept my gift from my hand; because it is for this I have seen your countenance, and it seems to me like seeing the face of your angel; and behold, you have received me favorably.”

Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*, 116

- 162 This verse appears to allude to the demiurgic role of Jacob-Israel. References to the demiurgic quality of Jacob may be found also in a number of rabbinic passages, including *Lev. Rab.* 36:4 and *Gen. Rab.* 98:3. Cf. *Gen. Rab.* 98:3: “R. Phinehas interpreted it: Your father Israel is as a god: as God creates worlds, so does your father create worlds; as God distributes worlds, so does your father distribute worlds.” Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 2.947–948. *Lev. Rab.* 36:4: “R. Phinehas in the name of R. Reuben explains this to mean that the Holy One, blessed be He, said to His world: ‘O My world, My world! Shall I tell thee who created thee, who formed thee? Jacob has created thee, Jacob has formed thee’; as is proved by the text, ‘He that created thee is Jacob and he that formed thee is Israel.’” Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 4.460.
- 163 Smith, “Prayer of Joseph,” 2.713–714. For the primary texts, see A.–M. Denis, *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca*, PVTG, 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1970) 61–64; A. Resch, *Grapha: Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1906) 295–298; C. Blanc, *Origène, Commentaire sur Saint Jean. Tome I (Livres I-V)*, ed. C. Blanc; SC, 120 (Paris: Cerf, 1966) 334–337; J. A. Robinson, *Origen, Philocalia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893); K. Mras, *Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica*, GCS, 43:1–2 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1954–56).
- 164 Peter van der Horst and Judith Newman note that
- the word used for “pre-created,” προεκτίσθησαν, is a prefixed form of the more frequently appearing κτίζω. The word is used to emphasize the idea that Jacob existed before the creation of the world and its order. The Greek term is found in later Christian literature to refer to the status of Christ as pre-existent, yet the idea resonates with rabbinic traditions that posit the preexistence of certain items before creation, variously among them the Torah, the temple, the heavenly throne, repentance, and wisdom.
- van der Horst and Newman, *Early Jewish Prayers in Greek*, 250–251
- 165 van der Horst and Newman note that
- the LXX of Exod 4:22 speaks of Israel as God’s πρωτότοκος, “first-born son.” This word is not found elsewhere in scripture, but Philo uses the term to refer both to the Logos (*Conf.* 63, 146; *Somm.* 1.215) and to Israel as a first-born (*Post.* 63; *Fug.* 208), or to Israel in the character of the Logos (*Agr.* 51). This idea of Jacob being “the firstborn” is also mentioned in the *Prayer of Joseph* in which Jacob is . . . the “firstborn of all living.”
- van der Horst and Newman, *Early Jewish Prayers in Greek*, 256
- 166 Richard Hayward notes that “Philo uses this word only six times in his writings, always to speak of the Logos (*Conf.* 63, 146; *Somm.* 1.215), Israel as a first-born (*Post.* 63; *Fug.* 208), or Israel in the character of the Logos (*Agr.* 51).” Hayward, *Interpretations of the Name*, 200. He further suggests that “when Philo calls Israel πρωτόγονος therefore, it may be that he has in mind once again a being who belongs both on earth and in heaven.” Hayward, *Interpretations of the Name*, 200.
- 167 H. Schwartz, *Tree of Souls: The Mythology of Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) 366.
- 168 H. Windisch, “Die göttliche Weisheit der Juden und die paulinische Christologie,” in *Neutestamentliche Studien für G. Heinrici*, eds. A. Deissmann and H. Windisch; UNT, 6 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1914) 225, n. 1.
- 169 Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 24.

170 “He envied me and fought with me and wrestled with me saying that his name and the name that is before every angel was to be above mine.” Smith, “Prayer of Joseph,” 2.713.

171 Hayward, *Interpretations of the Name*, 205.

172 The Latin version of the *Primary Adam Books* 12:1 reads:

Groaning, the Devil said: “O Adam, all my enmity, jealousy, and resentment is towards you, since on account of you I was expelled and alienated from my glory, which I had in heaven in the midst of the angels. On account of you I was cast out upon the earth.”

Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 15E

173 The Latin and the Armenian versions of the *Primary Adam Books* 14:2–15:1.

174 With regard to this verse, James Kugel emphasizes that

anyone who knows the Hebrew text of Gen 28:12 will immediately recognize the source of this image. For though the Bible says that in his dream Jacob saw a ladder whose top reached to the Heavens, the word for “top,” in Hebrew, *rosh*, is the same word normally used for “head.” And so our Slavonic text – or, rather, the Hebrew text that underlies it – apparently takes the biblical reference to the ladder’s “head” as a suggestion that the ladder indeed had a head, a man’s head, at its very top. The fact, then, of this biblical text’s wording – “a ladder set up on the earth, and its head reached to heaven” – engendered the heavenly “head” in our pseudepigraphon.

Kugel, *In Potiphar’s House*, 118

175 H. G. Lunt, “Ladder of Jacob,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983–85) 2.407.

176 Lunt, “Ladder of Jacob,” 2.406.

177 Elliot Wolfson points to a possible connection of this imagery with the conceptual developments found in the targumim:

it is worthwhile to compare the targumic and midrashic explanation of Gen 28:12 to the words of the apocryphal text the *Ladder of Jacob* “And the top of the ladder was the face as of a man, carved out of fire.”

Wolfson, “The Image of Jacob Engraved upon the Throne,” 114

178 Alexander Kulik and Sergey Minov argued for the connection of the face with the *Kavod* imagery by noting that “the theophanic associations of the fiery face in 1:4–7 are strengthened even more by the fact that in several rabbinic sources the vision of the ladder of Jacob is explicitly linked to the notion of God’s glory.” A. Kulik and S. Minov, *Biblical Pseudepigrapha in Slavonic Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) 301.

179 Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 135–151, esp. 143.

180 On these traditions, see Orlov, *The Greatest Mirror*, 61–72.

181 Lunt, “The Ladder of Jacob,” 2.403.

182 Kugel, *In Potiphar’s House*, 119.

183 Rachel Neis observes that

it is conceivable that the “face of Jacob” is used in a more generic sense for Jacob’s image or likeness and could include a representation of his entire figure or bust. The bust, or portrait medallion, was ubiquitous in civic, funerary and religious art in Late Antiquity and Byzantine periods, and while emphasizing the face of the person portrayed could portray the upper torso and arms.

Neis, “Embracing Icons,” 42

184 Kugel, *In Potiphar’s House*, 119.

185 Kugel, *In Potiphar’s House*, 119.

186 See also C. C. Rowland, “John 1:51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition,” *NTS* 30 (1984) 498–507; C. H. von Heijne, *The Messenger of the Lord in Early Jewish Interpretations of Genesis*, *BZAW*, 42 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010) 177–178.

- 187 Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 143, n. 30. For my early arguments about such possibility, see A. A. Orlov, "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic Ladder of Jacob," in *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*, ed. C. A. Evans; SSEJC, 10, 2 vols. (London: T&T Clark, 2004) 2.59–76; Orlov, *The Greatest Mirror*, 93–104.
- 188 Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob," 2.409.
- 189 In relation to these connections, Kugel observes that

the same motif [of four empires] apparently underlies the *Ladder of Jacob*. Here too, it is Jacob's vision of the ladder that serves as the vehicle for a revelation of the "kings of the lawless nations" who will rule over Israel, and if this text does not specifically mention how many such nations there will be, it does go on to speak (as we have seen) of four "ascents" or "descents" that will bring Jacob's progeny to grief. Indeed, the continuation of our text alludes specifically to the last of the four empires, Rome: "The Most High will raise up kings from the grandsons of your brother Esau, and they will receive the nobles of the tribes of the earth who will have maltreated your seed." As is well known, Esau frequently represents Rome in Second Temple writings.

J. Kugel, "The Ladder of Jacob," *HTR* 88 (1995) 214

- 190 Kugel, "The Ladder of Jacob," 214.

- 191 Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 4.370. See also *Exod. Rab.* 32:7:

God showed Jacob the guardian angels of every empire, for it says, And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth (Gen 28:12). He showed him how many peoples, governors, and rulers would arise from each kingdom, and just as He displayed their rise, so he showed their fall, as it says, And behold, the angels of God ascending and descending on it.

Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 3.411

- 192 W. G. Braude, *The Midrash on Psalms*, YJS, 13, 2 vols. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1959) 2.26–27. *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana* 23 contains an almost identical tradition:

R. Nahman applied it to the episode in Jacob's life when He dreamed, and beheld a ladder . . . and angels of God (Gen 28:12). These angels, according to R. Samuel bar R. Nahman, were the princes of the nations of the earth. Further, according to R. Samuel bar Nahman, this verse proves that the Holy One showed to our father Jacob the prince of Babylon climbing up seventy rungs the ladder, then climbing down; the prince of Media climbing up fifty-two rungs and no more; the prince of Greece, one hundred and eighty rungs and no more; and the prince of Edom climbing and climbing, no one knows how many rungs. At the sight of Edom's climbing our father Jacob grew afraid and said: Is one to suppose that this prince will have no come-down? The Holy One replied: Be not dismayed, O Israel (Jer 30:10). Even if-as though such a thing were possible!-thou were to see him seated next to Me, I would have him brought down thence."

W. G. Braude and I. J. Kapstein, *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana. R. Kahana's Compilation of Discourses for Sabbaths and Festal Days* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975) 353

See also *Zohar* I.149b:

And behold, the angels of God ascending and descending on it; this alludes to the Chieftains who have charge of all the nations, and who ascend and descend on that ladder. When Israel is sinful, the ladder is lowered and the Chieftains ascend by it; but when Israel are righteous, the ladder is removed and all the Chieftains are left below and are deprived of their dominion. Jacob thus saw in this dream the domination of Esau and the domination of the other nations. According to another explanation, the angels ascended and descended on the top of the ladder; for when the top

was detached, the ladder was lowered and the Chieftains ascended, but when it was attached again, the ladder was lifted and they remained below.

Sperling and Simon, *The Zohar*, 2.79–80

- 193 On this, see J. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998) 363.
- 194 Kugel, “The Ladder of Jacob,” 215.
- 195 W. Meeks, *The Prophet-King. Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*, NovTSup, 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1967) 149.
- 196 The Greek text of the passage was published in several editions including: Denis, *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca*, 210; B. Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta I* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) 288–301; H. Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) 54; C. R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, SBLTT, 30; Pseudepigrapha Series, 12, 3 vols. (Atlanta: Scholars, 1989) 2.362–366.
- 197 Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, 54–55.
- 198 Bogdan Bucur notes that “such traditions about Moses grew in constant interaction with similar traditions about the luminous face, garment, and crown of the protoplast.” B. G. Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned: Christophanic Exegesis and the Making of a Christian Bible*, BAC, 13 (Leiden: Brill, 2019) 18.
- 199 S. N. Bunta, *Moses, Adam and the Glory of the Lord in Ezekiel the Tragedian: On the Roots of a Merkabah Text* (Ph.D. diss. Marquette University, Milwaukee, 2005) 89–92.
- 200 On the $\varphi\omega\varsigma$ traditions, see Quispel, “Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis,” 6–7; J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord. Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*, WUNT, 36 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985) 280; J. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 16–17; Bunta, *Moses, Adam and the Glory of the Lord*, 92ff.; S. N. Bunta, *The Lord God of Gods: Divinity and Deification in Early Judaism*. Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and its Contexts, 35 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2021) 225ff.
- 201 Bunta, *Moses, Adam and the Glory of the Lord*, 86.
- 202 Moses’ enthronement can also be read as an Adamic motif. In this respect, Fletcher-Louis reminds us that “in the *Testament of Abraham* A 11:4–12, the first formed Adam sits on a gilded throne at the gate of heaven, most marvelous and adorned with glory, with a form like that of God himself (‘the Master’).” Fletcher-Louis, *Jesus Monotheism*, 252.
- 203 On the possibility of angelic veneration of Moses in the *Exagoge*, see Bunta, *Moses, Adam and the Glory of the Lord*, 167–183. Bunta presents four similarities between the portrayal of Moses in the *Exagoge* and traditions about the angelic veneration of Adam:
1. In both traditions the human heroes are appropriately venerated by angels;
 2. In both traditions the veneration reflects the human’s attainment of a privileged status within the divine entourage;
 3. Both traditions reflect an ironic polemic against angels;
 4. Within this imagery, both traditions construct a complex dialectic of identity which emphasizes the dichotomous condition of humanity. On one hand, humanity is reminded of its earthliness, its mortal substance, and on the other hand, the body’s divine likeness deserves angelic veneration.
- Bunta, *Moses, Adam and the Glory of the Lord*, 183
- 204 Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, 54–55.
- 205 As John Collins explains,

the stars had long been identified with the angelic host in Israelite tradition. . . . Ultimately this tradition can be traced back to Canaanite mythology where the stars appear as members of the divine council in the Ugaritic texts.

J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*, HSM, 16 (Missoula: Scholars, 1977) 136

80 *Divine image as the hypostasis of knowledge*

See, for example, Judg 5:20: “The stars fought from heaven, from their courses they fought against Sisera”; Job 38:7: “When the morning stars sang together and all the heavenly beings shouted for joy?”; Dan 8:10: “It grew as high as the host of heaven. It threw down to the earth some of the host and some of the stars, and trampled on them”;

1 *Enoch* 86:3–4:

And again I saw in the vision and looked at heaven, and behold, I saw many stars, how they came down and were thrown down from heaven to that first star, and amongst those heifers and bulls; they were with them, pasturing amongst them. And I looked at them and saw, and behold, all of them let out their private parts like horses and began to mount the cows of the bulls, and they all became pregnant and bore elephants and camels and asses.

Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.197

1 *Enoch* 88:1:

And I saw one of those four who had come out first, how he took hold of that first star which had fallen from heaven, and bound it by its hands and its feet, and threw it into an abyss; and that abyss was narrow, and deep, and horrible, and dark.

Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.198

1 *Enoch* 90:24:

And the judgment was held first on the stars, and they were judged and found guilty; and they went to the place of damnation, and were thrown into a deep (place), full of fire, burning and full of pillars of fire.

Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.215

206 Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 59. See also L. W. Hurtado, *At the Origins of Christian Worship: The Context and Character of Earliest Christian Devotion* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 73.

207 Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 7, 70, 101, 344.

208 Toepel, “The Cave of Treasures,” 541–542.

209 See also St. Ephrem, *Commentary on Genesis* II.15:

For Adam, who had been set in authority and control over animals, was wiser than all the animals, and he who gave names to them all was certainly more astute than them all. For just as Israel could not look upon the face of Moses, neither were the animals able to look upon the radiance of Adam and Eve: at the time when they received names from him they passed in front of Adam with their eyes down, since their eyes were incapable of taking in his glory.

S. Brock, *St. Ephrem the Syrian, Hymns on Paradise* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1990) 207

210 Anderson, “The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan,” 88.

211 It is possible that Moses’ coronation in the *Exagoge* also represents his endowment with the divine image. Wayne Meeks points out that in some Jewish and Samaritan traditions, Moses’

crown of light was nothing less than the visual symbol for the image of God. Jacob Jervell, moreover, has shown that in Jewish Adam-speculation the image of God was typically regarded as “gerade auf dem Antlitz eingepägt.” Jervell argues that this conception of the *imago* was especially connected with the notion that Adam had been God’s vice-regent, the first “king of the world.” When the *imago* is identified with Moses’ divine crown of light, it is quite clear that the same kind of connection is implied. The similarity is not accidental, for further examination of the enthronement traditions about Moses shows that these stories link Moses very closely with Adam.

W. Meeks, “Moses as God and King,” in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*, ed. J. Neusner; SHR, 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1968) 354–371 at 363

- On this tradition, see also M. Smith, "The Image of God: Notes on the Hellenization of Judaism, with Especial Reference to Goodenough's Work on Jewish Symbols," *BJRL* 40 (1958) 473–512; Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 45.
- 212 Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, 54.
- 213 M. McNamara et al., *Targum Neofiti 1 and Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*, ArBib, 2 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1994) 260.
- 214 McNamara et al., *Targum Neofiti 1 and Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*, 261.
- 215 McNamara et al., *Targum Neofiti 1 and Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*, 261.
- 216 L. L. Belleville, *Reflections of Glory: Paul's Polemical Use of the Moses-Doxa Tradition in 2 Corinthians 3.1–18*, JSNTSS, 52 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 29.
- 217 On this, see Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned: Christophanic Exegesis and the Making of a Christian Bible*, 25.
- 218 See Belleville, *Reflections of Glory*, 50.
- 219 See W. Davies and D. Allison, Jr., *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988) 2.705.
- 220 Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 7.173. I previously argued that in 4Q504 the glory of Adam and the glory of Moses' face were already creatively juxtaposed. The luminous face of the prophet serves in this text as an alternative to the lost luminosity of Adam and as a new symbol of God's glory once again manifested in the human body. On this, see A. A. Orlov, "Vested with Adam's glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Macarian Homilies," *Christian Orient* 4.10 (2006) 498–513.
- 221 A. Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HTR* 87 (1994) 171–195 at 183. Speaking about this passage, Linda Belleville observes that "Midrash Tadshe 4 associates Moses' glory with being created in the image of God, stating that God created man in his own image, first in the beginning and then in the wilderness." Belleville, *Reflections of Glory*, 65.
- 222 Belleville, *Reflections of Glory*, 56.
- 223 According to Jewish sources, the image of God was especially reflected in the radiance of Adam's face. On this, see Fossum, *The Name of God*, 94.
- 224 Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 4.252.
- 225 Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 1.81.
- 226 Meeks observes that in the early Mosaic accounts,

Moses' elevation at Sinai was treated not only as a heavenly enthronement, but also as a restoration of the glory lost by Adam. Moses, crowned with both God's name and his image, became in some sense a "second Adam," the prototype of a new humanity.

Meeks, "Moses as God and King," 365

- 227 Meeks, "Moses as God and King," 364–365.
- 228 R. Marcus, *Philo, Questions and Answers on Exodus*, trans. R. Marcus; LCL (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: Heinemann, 1949) 91–92.
- 229 A. A. Orlov, *The Glory of the Invisible God: Two Powers in Heaven Traditions and Early Christology*, JCTCRS, 31 (London: Bloomsbury, 2019) 123–128.
- 230 M. E. Stone, "Enoch and The Fall of the Angels: Teaching and Status," *DSD* 22 (2015) 342–357 at 354.
- 231 On these practices in later Jewish traditions, see E. R. Wolfson, "Iconic Visualization and the Imaginal Body of God: The Role of Intention in the Rabbinic Conception of Prayer," *Modern Theology* 12.2 (1996) 137–162. In another publication, Wolfson notes that

the experience of union, which is so often designated as the distinctive mark of mystical experience, is affirmed in the relevant kabbalistic sources only to the extent that one cleaves to the form of God that one has visualized in one's imagination. In this state of consciousness, the phenomenal boundaries of inside and outside

dissolve, for only by means of the internal image does one experience the divine as external.

E. R. Wolfson, "Iconicity of the Text: Reification of the Torah and the Idolatrous Impulse of Zoharic Kabbalah," *JSQ* 11 (2004) 215–242 at 224

232 Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.190.

233 Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.190.

234 Another important hint that Enoch was able to take away the sin of the protoplast is that the MSS of the longer recension speak not about many sins but about only one sin, "the sin of humankind." In contrast, the reading of the shorter recension, which uses a plural form – "our sins," is clearly secondary.

235 Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.190.

236 Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.190.

237 On 4Q374, see C. Fletcher-Louis, "4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christianity," *DSD* 3 (1996) 236–252; C. A. Newsom, "4Q374: A Discourse on the Exodus/Conquest Tradition," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, eds. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ, 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1992) 40–52. On Moses pseudepigrapha in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see J. Strugnell, "Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, ed. L. H. Schiffman; JSPSS, 8 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990) 221–256.

238 Fletcher-Louis rightly observes that there is ample evidence that the passage from 4Q374 was concerned with the revelation at Sinai. Cf. Fletcher-Louis, "4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christianity," 238.

239 García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2.740–741.

2 The divine Face as the hypostasis of divine knowledge

Divine Face and divine knowledge

We have learned in the previous chapter that several Jewish accounts depict their heroes as the eschatological *imago Dei*. These characters embody and transmit theophanic knowledge, revealing God's Form and attributes to earthly adepts. This embodied deposit of heavenly mysteries often stands at the center of the revelatory experience. In Enoch's, Jacob's, and Moses' materials, we also encountered repeated correspondences between the divine image and the divine Face which shares a close association with God's Glory, *Kavod*. Some scholars argue that in many early pseudepigraphical accounts "image" and "face" could be viewed as synonymous concepts. Yet, it is crucial for our study to also see important differences between these two notions. This is because the divine Face's imagery brings an additional theophanic dimension into the complex process of the divine knowledge's personification by accentuating ties between the exemplar's body of iconic knowledge and the divine Visage.

Scholars previously noted that in many Jewish accounts the divine Countenance is a crucial conduit of divine presence. Choon Leong Seow argues that

in quite a number of biblical texts the *Panim* of YHWH is YHWH's hypostatic presence [which serves] . . . the same function as *Shem* (Name) in the Deuteronomic theology, *Kavod* (Glory) in the Priestly tradition, and *Shekinah* in later Jewish writings.¹

Even the earliest Jewish apocalyptic accounts portray the divine Face's theophany as the apex of the visionary experience. In later Hekhalot materials, the divine Face plays a similar role, being understood as the "center of the divine event" and the teleological objective for the ascension of the *yorde merkavah*. Scholars often trace this tendency by drawing attention to *Hekhalot Rabbati* which considers God's Countenance as "the goal of *yored merkavah* and simultaneously revokes this statement in a paradoxical way by stressing at conclusion that one cannot 'perceive' this Face."² Peter Schäfer observes that for a visionary in the Hekhalot tradition, the Countenance of God was an example "not only

of overwhelming beauty, and therefore of a destructive nature,³ but at the same time the center of the divine event.”⁴ God’s Face thereby becomes the consummation of the heavenly journey since, according to Schäfer, “everything God wishes to transmit to the *yored merkavah* . . . is concentrated in God’s Countenance.”⁵ In these accounts, like in their pseudepigraphic counterparts, the adept serves as a mediator of the theophanic event. Rachel Neis states that “the *yored* is urged to transmit what he sees back to the sons of Jacob down below; this conveyance of visual information seems to be vital to the efficacy of the whole operation.”⁶ This *visual* access to the divine Form is important for both apocalypticists and mystics. Beholding the divine Form is the pivotal heavenly or eschatological way of acquiring the divine knowledge, because according to Jewish lore, angels are sustained through their vision of the divine Glory. This epistemological dimension was expressed in later Jewish traditions through the metaphor of “feeding upon the splendor of the Shekinah,”⁷ expressed, for example, in *b. Ber.* 17a:

A favorite saying of Rab was: The future world is not like this world. In the future world there is no eating nor drinking nor propagation nor business nor jealousy nor hatred nor competition, but the righteous sit with their crowns on their heads feasting on the brightness of the divine presence, as it says, And they beheld God, and did eat and drink.⁸

Although in *b. Ber.* 17a the motif of the divine knowledge’s acquisition through a vision is rather veiled whereas in *b. Baba Batra* 10a it comes to the forefront via a reference to the Torah:

What is the meaning of the words, I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness? R. Nahman b. Isaac said: This refers to the students of the Torah who banish sleep from their eyes in this world, and whom the Holy One, blessed be He, feasts with the resplendence of the divine presence in the future world.⁹

Early and late Jewish traditions imagine the divine Face, similar to the divine image, as the hypostasis of the divine knowledge. In many early pseudepigraphical accounts, speculations about the divine Face are unfolded in the midst of the exemplars’ inaugurations into their roles as the *imago Dei*. In view of these connections, we must now revisit some previously explored Jewish pseudepigraphical accounts in order to trace any conceptual connections between the divine image and the divine Face.

Adam’s image as the Face

We have explored Adam’s role as the image of God found in the *Primary Adam Books*. These materials also contain an important cluster of motifs pertaining to the protoplast’s face which are relevant to our study. In the Georgian and Latin

versions of Adam's inauguration ceremony there are additions to the biblical account in Genesis regarding Adam's face. The Georgian version recounts that God breathed a spirit onto *the face* of Adam.¹⁰ The same detail also appears in the Greek version of Gen 2:7. Though the Hebrew text does not mention Adam's *panim*, in the Septuagint's rendering of the passage, the deity breathes the breath of life into Adam's *face*.¹¹ In the Latin *Vita* 13:2 the face motif occurs again. This time it conveys a novel interpretation by declaring that the protoplast's countenance was made in God's image: "when God blew into you the breath of life and your countenance (*vultus*) and likeness were made in the image of God."¹² Some scholars see the "face" as the cognate of "image" in this passage. For example, David Steenburg argues that "the use of 'face' in this passage is an irregular departure from the standard idiom of 'image,' a departure occasioned by the concern to relate God's image in Adam directly to his physical shape or visible appearance."¹³ Crispin Fletcher-Louis follows Steenburg's suggestion, postulating that when the Latin version of the *Primary Adam Books* 13:3 defines Adam's countenance as made in the image of God, it "accentuates the focus on Adam's role as God's visible and physical presence."¹⁴ The Latin version, therefore, entertains a conceptual link between the protoplast's *panim* and the *tselem*. This link reappears in other Jewish stories about the eschatological *imago Dei*.

Enoch and the divine Face

The tendency to link the divine image and the divine Face occurs also in early Enochic materials. For example, in *2 Enoch*, the divine Face, like the divine image, is a pivotal archetype for the creation of the protagonist's upper identity. Scholars have argued that the divine Face symbolism in *2 Enoch* became closely related to the notion of the *imago Dei*.¹⁵ Unlike the *Primary Adam Books* and some other pseudepigraphical accounts, *2 Enoch* does not explicitly mention the divine image in the description of the creation of Enoch's heavenly identity. Instead, it uses its conceptual counterpart – the divine Face. The divine Face features prominently in the process of the seer's initiation into the role as the deity's icon. As we recall, the angelic veneration of the hero takes place in immediate proximity to the divine Face, the reality upon which the patriarch's metamorphosis is patterned.

It is likely that in *2 Enoch*, as in other Jewish accounts, the divine *Panim* performs the role of the divine *tselem*. The divine Face represents the cause and prototype after which Enoch's new celestial identity is formed. The new creation modeled after the divine Face signifies a return to the prelapsarian condition of Adam, who, according to *2 Enoch*, was also surprisingly molded in conformity with the Face of God. Support for this view can be found in *2 Enoch* 44:1, where we learn that the first human is indeed made after God's *Panim*. According to the text, "the Lord with his own two hands created humankind; *in a facsimile of his own face*, both small and great, the Lord created them."¹⁶ Here, *2 Enoch* departs from the conventional reading attested in Gen

1:26–27, where Adam was created not after God’s Face, but after his image (*tselem*).¹⁷ Francis Andersen comments that *2 Enoch*’s

idea is remarkable from any point of view. . . . This is not the original meaning of *tselem*. . . . The text uses *podobie lica* (in the likeness of the face), not *obrazu* or *videnje*, the usual terms for “image.”¹⁸

However, it is clear that this reading was not a novel interpretation by the text’s transmitters and translators. Rather it is an ancient tradition, which patterns the first human’s body after the deity’s Face. This corresponds to the similar eschatological creation of the seventh antediluvian patriarch’s heavenly form. These correspondences reaffirm the connection between the divine image and the divine Face.

Angels of the Face

Over the course of his luminous metamorphosis, Enoch also is inducted into the office of the divine Face’s servant. A century ago, Hugo Odeberg noticed this development¹⁹ and demonstrated in his synopsis of the parallel passages from *2* and *3 Enoch* that the phrase “stand before my face forever” found in the Slavonic apocalypse does not serve there merely as a typical Hebraism “to be in the presence,”²⁰ but it establishes the angelic status of Enoch–Metatron as the Prince of the Divine Presence.²¹ Later studies further reinforced Odeberg’s initial insight. Charles Gieschen also argues that Enoch’s standing in front of God’s Face forever conclusively indicates his status as a main angel. He further admits that “those who stand immediately before the throne are usually the principal angels, i.e., the Angels of the Presence.”²² Additionally, *2 Enoch* does not depict the protagonist as a seer with temporary access to the divine presence, but as an angelic servant permanently installed in the office of the *sar happanim*. Chapters 21–22 of *2 Enoch* develop Enoch’s new designation by describing the seer’s encounter with the divine Face. In these chapters, there are repeated affirmations spoken by the archangel Gabriel and the deity himself that Enoch will now stand forever in front of God’s Face.²³ This office is reminiscent of Enoch–Metatron’s role as *sar happanim* in the Hekhalot literature.²⁴ According to the Hekhalot lore, Enoch “was raised to the rank of first of the angels and *sar happanim* (literally, ‘Prince of the Divine Face,’ or ‘Prince of the Divine Presence’).”²⁵ *3 Enoch*, as well as other texts of the Hekhalot tradition, have a well-developed ideology connected with this title in which Enoch–Metatron is not only a visitor with temporary access to the divine presence, but also as an angel permanently installed in the office of the *sar happanim*. *2 Enoch* 67:2 underlines the permanent nature of the hero’s installation in front of God’s Face by recording that “the angels hurried and grasped Enoch and carried him up to the highest heaven, where the Lord received him and made him stand in front of his face for eternity.”²⁶

Scholars have often neglected the epistemological dimension of the *sar happanim* office. However, in many early and late Jewish accounts, servants of the divine Face are pivotal agents who are responsible for initiating human adepts into the intricacies of the divine knowledge.²⁷ These initiations encompass several channels of transmission, which in addition to direct angelic revelations also include the *sar happanim*'s instructions regarding how to copy heavenly tablets and books, teaching the adept celestial languages, or bringing him to the heavenly *loci* to learn the divine mysteries.

We encounter this important role of the angels of the Face in early Enochic materials where Uriel, an angel of the Presence or Face, serves as a principal heavenly guide and an “initiator” into the divine mysteries for Enoch. In one of the oldest Enochic booklets, the *Astronomical Book*, Uriel teaches the patriarch to write down the celestial knowledge, initiating him into the mysteries of meteorological and astronomical lore. In *2 Enoch* 22–23, Uriel, whose name is rendered as Vreveil, also plays an important role during Enoch's initiations near the throne of Glory.²⁸ He instructs Enoch on several subjects of esoteric knowledge in order to prepare him for his permanent celestial offices, including the office of the heavenly scribe. Another early Enochic booklet, *Book of the Similitudes*, also refers to the same angel and names him Phanuel. In the *Similitudes*, he occupies an important place among the four principal angels, namely the place usually assigned to Uriel. In fact, the angelic name “Phanuel” might be a title which stresses the celestial status of Uriel/Sariel²⁹ as one of the servants of the divine Face.³⁰ The title “Phanuel” is similar of the terminology found in accounts about Jacob. In Gen 32:31, Jacob names the place of his wrestling with God as Peniel (פניאל) – the Face of God.³¹ Scholars believe that the angelic name *Phanuel* and the place *Peniel* are etymologically connected.³² As we already witnessed in the previous chapter of our study, this angelic instructor plays an important role in the *Ladder of Jacob*. The *Ladder*, however, does not directly refer to him as Uriel or Phanuel but instead uses Sariel. Sariel interprets Jacob's dream and announces his new angelic status to him which results in the changing of the patriarch's name from Jacob to Israel. The second chapter of the *Ladder* portrays Jacob asking God for help in interpreting the dream. In the third chapter God responds to Jacob's prayer by commanding: “Sariel, leader of those who comfort, you who are in charge of dreams, go and make Jacob understand the meaning of the dream.” Sariel then comes to inform Jacob about his new angelic name and status.

The presentation of Sariel/Uriel as the angel who instructs/wrestles with Jacob and announces his new angelic name occurs in several other sources, including the *Prayer of Joseph*. In the *Prayer of Joseph*, Jacob attests that

Uriel, the angel of God, came forth and said that “I [Jacob-Israel] had descended to earth and I had tabernacled among men and that I had been called by the name of Jacob.” He envied me and fought with me and wrestled with me.³³

Furthermore, in later rabbinic accounts, Sariel/Uriel is also depicted as the angel who wrestled with Jacob and announced to him his new angelic name. *Targum Neofiti* to Gen 32:25–31 reads:

And Jacob was left alone; and the angel Sariel wrestled with him in the appearance of a man and he embraced him until the time the dawn arose. When he saw that he could not prevail against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh and the hollow of Jacob's thigh became benumbed in his wrestling with him. And he said: "Let me go because the rise of the dawn has arrived, and because the time of the angels on high to praise has arrived, and I am a chief of those who praise." And he said: "I will not let you go unless you bless me." And he said to him: "What is your name?" And he said: "Jacob." And he said: "Your name shall no longer be called Jacob but Israel, because you have claimed superiority with angels from before the Lord and with men and you have prevailed against them. And Jacob asked and said: "Tell me your name I pray" and he said: "Why, now, do you ask my name?" And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel because: "I have seen angels from before the Lord face to face and my life has been spared."³⁴

Scholars have previously noted that "in the circles represented by the *Similitudes of Enoch*, Qumran and Neofiti variety of the Palestinian Targum, the angelic adversary of Jacob was recognized as one of the four celestial princes and called alternatively Sariel or Phanuel."³⁵ The *Ladder of Jacob* belongs in the same circles. In *Targ. Neof.* and *Frag. Targ.*³⁶ to Gen 32:27, Sariel is defined as "the chief of those who give praise" (ריש למשבחיה) (ריש למשבחיה). The *Ladder* alludes to this title by describing Sariel as "stareishino uslazhdaemych,"³⁷ a Slavonic expression which translates as "the chief of those who give joy."³⁸ Enochic influences undergird the angelology in the Jacobite accounts. This is especially evident in the *Ladder of Jacob* where Sariel/Uriel assumes the traditional "Enochic" functions of an *angelus interpres*.³⁹

The angel of the divine Face or Presence also plays an important role in the story of another biblical and pseudepigraphical exemplar – Moses. In the *Book of Jubilees* the angel of the Face, who does not have a specific name there, is depicted as a special agent of God who dictates the contents of the heavenly tablets to Moses.⁴⁰

The activities of the *sar hannanim* are an important part of the apocalyptic epistemological system. In this system, these angelic servants are responsible for guarding and revealing the divine knowledge to human initiates. Enoch's initiation into the office of the angelic servant of the Face reveals that in his role as the mediator of the divine knowledge, he is the "guardian of the divine secrets," and the "sign of knowledge for all generations."⁴¹ Nevertheless, the divine knowledge which Enoch transmits in his role as the mediator of the divine Face includes not only scribal or sapiential knowledge but also theophanic mysteries. An important feature in this respect is the parallelism between God's

Face and Enoch's face. This is often reiterated in *2 Enoch* and the parallelism in this context, like in the Mosaic traditions, might depict Enoch as the mirror of the divine theophany. In *2 Enoch* Enoch's face acquires the same qualities of luminosity as God's Face. In *2 Enoch* 37 the deity calls one of his angels to chill the face of Enoch before his return to earth. The angel, who "appeared frigid," then chilled Enoch's face with his icy hands. Immediately after this procedure, the deity informs Enoch that if his face had not been chilled in such a way, no human being would be able to look at his face.⁴² This chilling procedure indicates that Enoch's metamorphosis into the *Sar ha-Panim* involves the transformation of the visionary's face into the fiery, perilous entity which now resembles the divine Face itself.⁴³

Enoch-Metatron as God's Face

In later Jewish lore, Enoch-Metatron's office as the mediator of God's Face continues to play a significant role.⁴⁴ Similar to early Enochic writings, in Hekhalot literature, Metatron assumes the usual functions for a mediator of the divine presence, but he also takes on a much higher role as the embodiment of the divine Face.⁴⁵ *3 Enoch* and some other Hekhalot materials depict Metatron as a special attendant of the divine Countenance who mediates God's presence to the rest of the angelic community. Moreover, in this role, Metatron is often directly named "Face of God." In *Synopse* §13, God introduces Metatron as his secretary, saying, "any angel and any prince who has anything to say in my [God's] presence should go before him [Metatron] and speak to him. Whatever he says to you in my name you must observe and do."⁴⁶

Metatron's office as the servant of the divine Face/Presence is one of his most important roles in *Sefer Hekhalot*, since in that account the appellation, "Prince of the Divine Presence," repeatedly follows the name Metatron. The recurring designation of Metatron as the Prince of the Divine Presence sometimes puzzles scholars because this title does not belong exclusively to this angel. The Hekhalot tradition follows the pseudepigrapha here, which attests to a whole class of the highest angels/princes who are allowed to see and serve the divine Face.⁴⁷ Although this designation is not restricted to Metatron, in *3 Enoch* it becomes an essential part of the common introductory formula, "The angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence," through which R. Ishmael relates the revelations received from his heavenly patron. It also becomes a dividing grid of the microforms that partition the narrative of *Sefer Hekhalot*.

The prominent office of the *sar happanim* represents a transitional stage in the process of Metatron's identification as the divine Face. Yet, this crucial shift may have already been developed inside this office. Some scholars suggest that the title *sar happanim* is better understood as the "prince *who is the face* [of God]."⁴⁸ Nathaniel Deutsch states that

some sources understood Metatron to be the hypostatic embodiment of a particular part of the divine form, most notably the face of God. . . . It is

likely that this tradition underlies the title *sar happanim*, which is associated with Metatron. Rather than “prince of the face [of God],” this title is better understood as “prince who is the face [of God].”⁴⁹

Synopse §73, which speaks about Metatron’s glorious face in connection with his heavenly form, represents a key step in understanding him as the hypostatic divine Visage:

I increased his stature by seventy thousand parasangs, above every height, among those who are tall of stature. I magnified his throne from the majesty of my throne. I increased his honor from the glory of my honor. I turned his flesh to fiery torches and all the bones of his body to coals of light. I made the appearance of his eyes like the appearance of lightning, and the light of his eyes like “light unfailing.” I caused his face to shine like the brilliant light of the sun.⁵⁰

Furthermore, some Hekhalot passages explicitly identify Metatron as the hypostatic Face of God. For example, *Synopse* §§396–397 discloses the following tradition:

Moses said to the Lord of all the worlds: “If your face does not go with us, do not bring me up from here” (Exod 33:15). The Lord of all the worlds warned Moses that he should beware of that face of his. So it is written, “Beware of his face” (Exod 23:21). This is he who is written with the one letter by which heaven and earth were created, and was sealed with the seal of “I am that I am” (Exod 3:14). This is the prince who is written with six and with seven and with twenty two. This is the prince who is called Yofiel Yah-dariel. In the holy camps of angels he is called Metatron.⁵¹

In this excerpt, Metatron is envisioned as the divine Face – the nexus of the visionary’s aspirations, appearing as a personified deposit of the utmost divine mysteries. This personified divine Face becomes the teleological objective for the adept’s ascension, since, “everything God wishes to transmit to the *yored merkavah* . . . is concentrated in God’s countenance.”⁵²

Jacob as the divine Face

In the first chapter of the book, we learned that unlike the majority of rabbinic testimonies which speak about Jacob’s *imago Dei* on the heavenly throne, the *Ladder of Jacob* does not mention his image. Instead, it portrays his heavenly identity as a celestial face that is “carved out of fire” with its shoulders and arms. Nevertheless, while the majority of the rabbinic texts speak about Jacob’s image, some of them, like the *Ladder of Jacob*, convey knowledge about his

heavenly identity as the upper Face. This tradition, for example, occurs in *Hekhalot Rabbati* (*Synopse* §164), where the portrayal of Jacob's face on the throne is overlaid with explicit erotic symbolism:

And testify to them. What testimony? You see Me – what I do to the visage of the face of Jacob your father which is engraved for Me upon the throne of My glory. For in the hour that you say before Men “Holy,” I kneel on it and embrace it and kiss it and hug it and My hands are on its arms three times, corresponding to the three times that you say before Me, “Holy,” according to the word that is said, Holy, holy, holy (Isa 6:3).⁵³

In this passage the deity embraces and kisses Jacob's heavenly identity engraved on God's throne. Although, here the striking difference to other rabbinic passages is that now Jacob's face, or more precisely a cast (*qlaster*)⁵⁴ of his face, is engraved on the throne. This conceptual turn is not merely a slip of a Hekhalot writer's pen but a deliberate shift, since it appears in other Jewish accounts.⁵⁵ For example, in some *piyyutim*, Jacob's heavenly identity is also understood as the “face” on the throne. In a liturgical poem of R. Yannai one can find the following depiction:

Your trust is in Jacob and the proof is Israel. One who sees the image of Jacob will sanctify the holy one of Israel. And those who make mention of the name Jacob will venerate you God of Israel. You are called the God of Jacob and also the God of Israel. And the exemplar of the camps of your angels, this one will call out the name Jacob. And this one will call out the name Israel. This one will say he is holy and this one will say he is blessed. And they will call out to one another. . . . And they will encircle the chariot, and rub with their wings. . . . And they will prostrate their entire length to it. And they will cover the face of the throne. And a sound will emerge from its wheels. . . . Their singing is to Jacob. They sanctify you, Holy One of Jacob. And they will respond and say: “Holy, holy, holy. The Lord of hosts fills the entire earth with his glory.” From his place he [God] descended and brought down his hosts to see the image of Jacob. In his place he [Jacob] was asleep; behold I [God] am with you because your image is with me. In his place he slept; while you sleep your guardian will not sleep.⁵⁶

One of the curious expressions here is the phrase “the face of the throne.” Rachel Neis notices that “this expression invokes Job 26:9, ‘He covers the face of his throne,’ but in this setting must also work with the references to Jacob's image and facial features.”⁵⁷

Another late Jewish testimony, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* 35, also replaces the *selem* imagery with the symbolism of Jacob's *panim* by arguing that when the

angels went to see the patriarch's face, his heavenly countenance was similar to a visage of one of the Living Creatures of the divine throne⁵⁸:

Rabbi Levi said: In that night the Holy One, blessed be He, showed him all the signs. He showed him a ladder standing from the earth to the heaven, as it is said, "And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven" (Gen 28:12). And the ministering angels were ascending and descending thereon, and they beheld the face of Jacob, and they said: This is the face – like the face of the *Chayyah*, which is on the throne of Glory. Such (angels) who were (on earth) below were ascending to see the face of Jacob among the faces of the *Chayyah*, (for it was) like the face of the *Chayyah*, which is on the throne of Glory.⁵⁹

Rachel Neis mentions that "it is conceivable that the 'face of Jacob' is used in a more generic sense for Jacob's image or likeness."⁶⁰ The distinct terminological exchanges between *tselem* and *panim* evoke the memory of Enochic accounts where the symbolism of the seer's *imago Dei* is connected to *panim* imagery.

Moses as the divine Face

We already witness in our study that the motif of Moses' shining face played a formative role in many pseudepigraphical accounts devoted to the personifications of God's theophanic knowledge. Indeed, Jewish religious traditions describe Moses' glorious visage as an embodied theophany, in which the biblical exemplar brings iconic knowledge about God's epiphany not only in his writings and oral instructions but also through the medium of his glorified body. The divine radiance that is emitted by Moses' face serves as a conduit through which theophanic knowledge reaches the human adepts' spiritual and physical senses. Although in modern epistemological frameworks it is difficult, if not impossible, to conceptualise the divine radiance as knowledge, whereas in ancient systems, divine luminosity encompassed several semantic facets, conveying knowledge about status, majesty, holiness, and power of God.⁶¹ Elliot Wolfson remarks that:

the realm of the chariot – including the glory, the throne, different groups of angels, and the mystic himself who participates in this realm – is essentially made of light that can be symbolized (within the human imagination) by images from the corporeal world.⁶²

The heavenly light becomes an essential part of the adept's otherworldly ontology which communicates the visible and invisible aspects of God's theophany. In this respect, it is important that the biblical materials portray Moses' glorious *panim* as similar to God's Form and surround it with peculiar theophanic characteristics. Exod 34:29 indicates the divine provenance of Moses' facial luminosity: "Moses did not know that the skin of his face shone because he had been talking with God." In Exod 34:35 human adepts view the divine

light through the exemplar's face: "the Israelites would see the face of Moses, that the skin of his face was shining." The construction of Moses' profile as the embodiment of the divine presence is juxtaposed in Exodus with a manifestation of another prominent cultic image – the Golden Calf. Stephen Herring argues that "the depiction of the calf's creation, consecration, and destruction all point to the interpretation of the calf as a cultic image, believed to substitute, extend, or 'make present' the represented deity in ancient Near Eastern thought."⁶³ Herring suggests that

in the creation, worship, and destruction of the calf, the tension exists as to whether the calf was considered as being genuinely divine. As we have seen, the actions of the people, Aaron, and even Moses demonstrate that the calf is considered a divine image.⁶⁴

Herring further argues for a parallelism of Moses and the Golden Calf – two cultic images that function in Exodus as embodiments of the divine presence. He claims that Moses' "absence, or more specifically, the absence of his protection and leadership described in formulas reserved for YHWH (or his various manifestations), brings about a situation to which the answer is found in the making of a divine image."⁶⁵ According to Herring,

in the vacuum left by Moses' absence the people gather against Aaron and demand "a god who will go before us." This description emphasizes divine power and protection and is a prominent characteristic of YHWH in Exodus, accomplished by means of divine representation. In the immediate context of Exodus 32, however, this description is clearly meant as a substitute for Moses.⁶⁶ [This connection] between the calf image and Moses is further underscored by the formula, "to bring up from Egypt." This formula, which is applied to the calf image in verses 4 and 8, is also applied to Moses in verses 1 and 7.⁶⁷

Herring concludes by suggesting that

the calf was made to replace Moses and, given its treatment as divine image, to manifest deity. The final descent scene confirms Moses' role as the "container" of divine presence. Moses, not the calf, is the visible extension of YHWH among his people.⁶⁸ [In Exodus,] Moses functions for the people as a cultic image, i.e. as the extension and manifestation of the divine presence.⁶⁹

An additional feature that pertains to Moses' role as the mediator of the divine presence is the danger associated with the prophet's face. This theme also appears in other biblical and extra-biblical descriptions of God's apparitions. Exod 34:30 describes the Israelites' fear upon encountering Moses' face: "When Aaron and all the Israelites saw Moses, the skin of his face was shining,

and they were afraid to come near him.” This danger motif is reaffirmed in verses 33⁷⁰ and 35⁷¹ of the same chapter in reference to Moses’ protective veil.

Further illustrations of Moses’ face as a mirror of the divine theophany can be found in the Greek and Aramaic renderings of the Exodus account. The Septuagint connects Moses’ shining face with glory language by narrating the prophet’s visage as “charged with glory” (δεδόξασται). The LXX version of Exod 34:29–35 reads:

And as Moyses was descending from the mountain, the two tablets also were in Moyses’ hands. Now as he was descending from the mountain, Moyses did not know that the appearance of the skin of his face was charged with glory (δεδόξασται) while he was speaking to him. And Aaron and all the elders of Israel saw Moyses, and the appearance of the skin of his face was charged with glory, and they were afraid to come near to him. And Moyses called them, and Aaron and all the rulers of the congregation turned to him, and Moyses spoke to them. And after these things all the sons of Israel drew near to him, and he commanded them all the things that the Lord said to him on the mountain, Sina. And when he stopped speaking to them, he placed a covering over his face. But whenever Moyses would enter in before the Lord to speak with him, he would remove the covering until coming out. And when he came out, he would tell all the sons of Israel what the Lord commanded him. And the sons of Israel saw the face of Moyses that it was charged with glory, and Moyses put a covering over his face until he went in to converse with him.⁷²

In targumic accounts, the link between Moses’ face and God’s Glory is even more accentuated. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on Exod 34:29 explicitly connects Moses’ shining face with the splendor of the Glory of the Shekinah:

At the time that Moses came down from Mount Sinai, with the two tables of the testimony in Moses’ hand as he came down from the mountain, Moses did not know that the splendor of the *iqonin* of his face shone because of the splendor of the Glory of the Shekinah of the Lord at the time that he spoke with him.⁷³

Linda Belleville notes that here “a source for the splendor is specified as the glory of the Shekinah of Yahweh himself.”⁷⁴

Furthermore, some targums speak about the possible transfer of Moses’ splendor to another subject, namely, Joshua. This is hinted at already in Num 27:20: “You shall give him some of your radiance (מהוירך)⁷⁵, so that all the congregation of the Israelites may obey.” *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on Num 27:20 makes an even clearer reference to the transference of God’s Glory: “And you shall put upon him [Joshua] some of the *splendor of your Glory* (מזוי יקרך) in order that the entire congregation of the Israelites will listen to him.”⁷⁶ Belleville comments that “the Targumim interpret the command given to Moses to place

his ('authority') on Joshua as a transfer of the splendor of Moses' face."⁷⁷ This tradition also occurs in *b. Baba Bathra* 75a:

And thou shalt put of thy honour upon him, but not all thy honour. The elders of that generation said: The countenance of Moses was like that of the sun; the countenance of Joshua was like that of the moon.⁷⁸

This development demonstrates that like scribal or sapiential knowledge, the theophanic iconic knowledge can be transmitted from the exemplar to other adepts.

Within the targumic Mosaic traditions a key feature is the permanence of the luminosity emanating from the prophet's face. Belleville states that "Moses' splendor was thought never to have weakened right to the end of his life" which is "indicated by the targumic interpretations of Moses' death and burial in Deut 34:7."⁷⁹ Both Palestinian⁸⁰ and Babylonian⁸¹ targums support this assertion.

Over the last several decades, the biblical motif of Moses' luminous face has received an enormous amount of scholarly attention. However, these discussions have not taken into account the epistemological dimension of this tradition. Yet, already in the Hebrew Bible, the prophet's radiant face serves as a deposit for the iconic theophanic knowledge that Moses brings with him from the great mountain, along with the tablets of the Law. Some extra-biblical accounts connect the splendor of Moses' face with his acquisition of the divine knowledge. This link appears, for example, in Chapter 19 of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, where Moses receives divine revelations immediately before his death. At the end of God's instructions Moses' face becomes luminous and *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* ties his luminosity with the knowledge that he receives from God. From *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 19:16 we learn the following:

When Moses heard this, he was filled with understanding and his appearance was changed to a state of glory; and he died in glory in accord with the word of the Lord, and he buried him as he had promised him.⁸²

A second epistemological facet found in *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* is the link between the glory of Moses' face, the tablets of the Law and "Moses' office of covenant mediator."⁸³ These ties between the prophet's facial luminosity and the Torah also occur in rabbinic materials. For example, *Exod. Rab.* 33:1 unveils the following motif: "Similarly with the Torah, one cannot know its value save from the reward received by Moses, for it says, That Moses knew not that the skin of his face sent forth beams while he talked with Him."⁸⁴ This passage suggests that the prophet's visage becomes radiant when he receives the Torah from the deity's mouth. A similar connection appears in *Exod. Rab.* 47:6:

Moses knew not that the skin of his face sent forth beams. Whence did Moses derive these beams of glory? The Sages said: From the cleft of the rock, as it says, And it shall come to pass, while My glory passeth by, that

I will put thee in a cleft of the rock, and I will cover thee with My hand until I have passed by. R. Berekiah, the priest, said in the name of R. Samuel: The tables were six handbreadths in length and six in breadth; Moses grasped two handbreadths and the Shekinah another two, two handbreadths being left in the centre, and it was from them that Moses derived those beams of splendour. R. Judah b. Nahman said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish: A little ink was left on the pen with which Moses wrote [the Decalogue] and when he passed this pen through the hair of his head the beams of splendour appeared; hence does it say: Moses knew not that the skin of his face sent forth beams.⁸⁵

Deut. Rab. 3:12 also reiterates the connection between Moses' reception of the Torah and his facial radiance:

And who wrote this document? Moses. Whence do we know this? For it is said, And Moses wrote this law. And what reward did God give him? A lustrous countenance, as it is written, That Moses knew not that the skin of his face sent forth beams.

These traditions showcase that the cause of the adept's radiance is the deposit of the divine knowledge imbued in Torah.

Furthermore, it is likely that Exodus imagines Moses' shining face as a personified mirror of the divine *Kavod*. If so, through Moses, God's theophany became paradoxically transferred in the midst of an earthly community. According to Thomas Dozeman, the shining face of Moses serves as

a metaphor of divine presence, for it represents a point of identification between himself and the fiery presence of God on Mountain Sinai. . . . [Moses] not only mirrors the movement of God, he even carries the fire of Yahweh's *Kabod* in his face.⁸⁶

Nevada Levi DeLapp also argues that Moses' radiant face is "a permanent sign of God's presence with Israel. Like Jacob who wrestled with God 'face-to-face' and came away with a limp, Moses has spoken with God 'face-to-face' (or perhaps 'face to back') and come away with a blazing face."⁸⁷ These scholarly reflections affirm the possibility that biblical and pseudepigraphical exemplars are embodiments of divine theophanic knowledge.

Divine Face and acquisition of the theophanic knowledge

Disclosures of divine knowledge in Jewish apocalyptic and mystical accounts are often surrounded with explicit and implicit warnings about the imminent threat which these revelations might pose to an adept who is not ready to receive them. Safeguarding the divine knowledge therefore becomes the major task of the various classes of angelic servants, including the angelic guardians

of the heavenly books. Jewish apocalyptic and mystical accounts also contain attempts to hierarchise the divine knowledge's acquisition by portraying some creatures as having access to divine mysteries while others cannot. In *2 Enoch*, for example, God places Enoch closer to himself than the archangel Gabriel during the revelation of cosmological secrets.

Similar to oral and written revelations of the divine mysteries, visual disclosures of the theophanic presence and knowledge are also hierarchised. Here, the danger motif is employed to convey the highly guarded nature of the endeavor. Biblical Mosaic accounts demonstrate that the danger motif often occurs during theophanies of the divine Face. Widespread in many biblical and pseudepigraphical accounts, the danger motif comes to its symbolic apex in the *Hekhalot* materials, where both the eyes and ears of the celestial spectators and listeners must be guarded to protect them from the deadly impact of the divine Face's theophany.⁸⁸ *3 Enoch* 22b discloses the following tradition about the dangers of the divine Countenance:

What does YHWH, the God of Israel, the glorious King, do? The great God, mighty in power, covers his face. In *‘Arabot* there are 660 thousands of myriads of glorious angels, hewn out of flaming fire, standing opposite the throne of glory. The glorious King covers his face, otherwise the heaven of *‘Arabot* would burst open in the middle, because of the glorious brilliance, beautiful brightness, lovely splendor, and radiant praises of the appearance of the Holy One, blessed be he. How many ministers do his will? How many angels? How many princes in the *‘Arabot* of his delight, feared among the potentates of the Most High, favored and glorified in song and beloved, fleeing from the splendor of the Shekinah, with eyes grown dim from the light of the radiant beauty of their King, with faces black and strength grown feeble?⁸⁹

Here, the deity covers his Face so the angels will not be destroyed by its splendor. Other accounts show the revelation of the iconic knowledge as a hierarchised process, which some angelic servants tolerate better than others. In some cases, angelic servants are even able to protect other participants from the theophany's harmful effects. *Hekhalot* and *Shi'ur Qomah* traditions often portray Enoch–Metatron as a protector. *Sefer Hekhalot* describes Enoch–Metatron as the one who puts the “fire of deafness” into the ears of the *Hayyot* in order to safeguard them from the harmful sound of God's speech. *3 Enoch* 15B relates the following ordeal:

Metatron is the Prince over all princes, and stands before him who is exalted above all gods. He goes beneath the throne of Glory, where he has a great heavenly tabernacle of light, and brings out the deafening fire, and puts it in the ears of the holy creatures, so that they should not hear the sound of the utterance that issues from the mouth of the Almighty.⁹⁰

In this text, the danger motif receives its distinctive “aural” shape, since Metatron safeguards the angelic hosts against the audial manifestation of God so they will not be able to “hear the sound of the utterance that issues from the mouth of the Almighty.” Another Hekhalot passage (*Synopse* §390) portrays some similar routines performed by the great angel:

One *hayyah* rises above the seraphim and descends upon the tabernacle of the youth whose name is Metatron, and says in a great voice, a voice of sheer silence: “The throne of Glory is shining.” Suddenly the angels fall silent. The watchers and the holy ones become quiet. They are silent, and are pushed into the river of fire. The *hayyot* put their faces on the ground, and this youth whose name is Metatron brings the fire of deafness and puts it into their ears so that they could not hear the sound of God’s speech or the ineffable name. The youth whose name is Metatron then invokes, in seven voices, his living, pure, honored, awesome, holy, noble, strong, beloved, mighty, powerful name.⁹¹

The passages found in the *Shi’ur Qomah* texts attest to a similar tale in which Metatron guards other angelic servants. Thus, *Sefer Haqqomah* 155–164 reads:

And (the) angels who are with him come and encircle the throne of Glory. They are on one side and the (celestial) creatures are on the other side, and the Shekinah is on the throne of Glory in the center. And one creature goes up over the seraphim and descends on the tabernacle of the lad whose name is Metatron and says in a great voice, a thin voice of silence, “The throne of Glory is glistening!” Immediately, the angels fall silent and the *irin* and the *qadushin* are still. They hurry and hasten into the river of fire. And the celestial creatures turn their faces towards the earth, and this lad whose name is Metatron, brings the fire of deafness and puts (it) in the ears of the celestial creatures so that they do not hear the sound of the speech of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the explicit name that the lad, whose name is Metatron, utters at that time in seven voices, in seventy voices, in living, pure, honored, holy, awesome, worthy, brave, strong, and holy name.⁹²

Along with aural safeguarding, this passage also alludes to a visual component as it depicts the *Hayyot* turning their faces toward the earth. These passages perceive the divine theophany as a hierarchised and graded process in which different classes of beholders receive the iconic divine knowledge according to the level of their ontology. The exemplar of the story – Enoch–Metatron has the most intimate access to the divine Face and, in some traditions, he even personifies the Face.

The Enochic version of the danger motif is heavily indebted to the formative Mosaic template. In Exod 33:20 the deity warns Moses about the danger of seeing his Visage: “You cannot see my face, for no one may see me and

live.” The perilousness is further reinforced by the deity’s instructions in Exod 33:22 where he commands Moses to hide himself in a cleft in the rock and promises to protect the prophet with his hands. The danger of encountering the divine Face is reiterated later in the portrayals of Moses’ face which, in its role as a mirror of the divine Visage, poses imminent danger to its earthly beholders.⁹³ There is a curious resemblance between these two theophanies of the face; both are surrounded with similar markers of fear and danger. These early and late testimonies elucidate the role of God’s theophany as an epistemological blueprint that reoccurs in the exemplars’ own disclosures of such iconic knowledge.

An example of this parallelism appears in *2 Enoch* 39 where Enoch conveys to his earthly audience the iconic knowledge of the dangerous theophany by using his own transformed body.⁹⁴ In *2 Enoch* 39:3–6 the seventh patriarch returns from heaven and relates his heavenly encounter with the divine Face to his children. The priority of this disclosure, which precedes Enoch’s other instructions on ethical and cosmological subjects, demonstrates a degree of hierarchy regarding the divine knowledge. Here, the revelation of the iconic theophanic knowledge occupies the primary position. This is similar to later Hekhalot accounts where the revelation of the divine Countenance occupies a primary position. In the shorter recension of the Slavonic text, the following account can be found:

You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; I am one who has seen the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks. For you gaze into my eyes, a human being created just like yourselves; but I have gazed into the eyes of the Lord, like the rays of the shining sun and terrifying the eyes of a human being. You, my children, you see my right hand beckoning you, a human being created identical to yourselves; but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, beckoning me, who fills heaven. You see the extent of my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the extent of the Lord, without measure and without analogy, who has no end.⁹⁵

The authors of *2 Enoch* consider the vision of the divine Countenance to be the central event of the visionary’s experience which he must report upon his arrival from the celestial journey. How the exemplar decides to unveil this revelation, in comparison with other subjects, which he delivers in the form of instructions, deserves special attention. Instead of simply narrating this theophanic encounter, Enoch opts to use the medium of his body to convey his knowledge of God’s theophany. By doing so, he creates a special epistemological situation in which, like in biblical Mosaic traditions, the iconic knowledge about the deity’s Face is transmitted through the exemplar’s body. Despite the fact that Enoch’s celestial body was previously “chilled” in heaven by the “frozen angel,” in order to be bearable for humans, his adjusted physique still serves as the mirror of God’s theophany. It gives an additional insight to why Enoch’s

new celestial form was chilled before his missionary trip to the earth. It was chilled in order to better prepare his body to be a visual medium to communicate iconic theophanic knowledge. The “chilling” procedure in the Enochic story might serve here as a counterpart for Moses’ veil which was used for the same purpose: to make the adept’s radiant body less harmful for the earthly beholders.

As in the biblical Mosaic accounts where Moses’ luminous face teaches the Israelites about the divine Glory, here Enoch’s face and body fulfill the same epistemological function. This might offer an insight into why Enoch urges his children to look at his face and behold his form while transmitting knowledge to them about the divine Face. Despite Enoch’s assurance to his sons that “his body [is] created like yours” the readers of this account know that the patriarch already received a glorious form in the upper heaven, where he was anointed with the oil of resurrection and regained the prelapsarian Adam’s condition, to make him like “one of the glorious ones.” The mention of his changed ontology is repeated during his encounter with his children. In *2 Enoch* 56:2 during Enoch’s instructions, Methuselah asks his father for a blessing, so that he may prepare some food for him to eat. Yet, the patriarch suddenly rejects earthly provisions by uttering the following:

Listen, child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of his glory, food has not come into me, and earthly pleasure my soul does not remember; nor do I desire anything earthly (*2 Enoch* 56:2, the longer recension).

In the shorter recension of *2 Enoch*, the patriarch’s rejection of food is even more decisive: “Listen my child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with ointment of my glory, it has been horrible for me, and food is not agreeable to me, and I have no desire for earthly food.”⁹⁶ Through these affirmations it becomes clear that the patriarch’s nature is no longer the same as his children’s and the chilling procedure made his glorious body more bearable for earthly beholders. Using his transformed body as an icon for communicating God’s theophany, therefore, makes perfect sense. This personification is an effective epistemological device through which Enoch is able to convey to the people of the earth the fullness of the divine Face’s mystery.

What is also important is that the mediation of the direct vision of the divine Countenance involves an angelic servant of the divine Face, who might be envisioned here as its surrogate. As we recall, Enoch’s permanent installation in the office as the celestial servant of the divine Face is found in Chapter 36. There the deity assures Enoch, before his short visit to the earth, that a place has been prepared for him and that he will be in the front of God’s face “from now and forever.”⁹⁷ This insinuates that the seer’s installation into the office of the angel (or the prince) of the Presence (*sar happanim*) is irreversible and permanent.

Furthermore, in *2 Enoch* 39 the exemplar mediates to his children both the theophanic wisdom about the deity’s Face and the iconic knowledge about

God's limbs, saying that he had "seen the right hand of the Lord, beckoning me, who fills heaven." Scholars have previously suggested that these formulations are reminiscent of later Jewish *Shi'ur Qomah* traditions. Indeed, an important epistemological facet of Enoch's revelations about the divine Form suddenly emerges when 2 *Enoch* 39 is contextualised within the *Shi'ur Qomah* lore. These materials depict visionaries Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Akiba receiving revelations of the "measurement of the body" (in Hebrew, *Shi'ur Qomah*), an anthropomorphic description of the deity together with the mystical names of his gigantic limbs.⁹⁸ 2 *Enoch's* portrayal of the divine Face is often seen by scholars as an example of *Shi'ur Qomah* speculation. Although the majority of evidence from the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition survived in late Jewish writings, Gershom Scholem proposed⁹⁹ that the beginning of *Shi'ur Qomah* speculations can be dated no later than the second century CE. He appeals to 2 *Enoch* 39, where the patriarch Enoch conveys to his children the divine Face's theophany by using this expression: "You see the extent of my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the extent of the Lord, without measure and without analogy, who has no end."¹⁰⁰ Scholem notes that Abraham Kahana, in his Hebrew translation of 2 *Enoch*,¹⁰¹ rendered the expression "the extent of my body" as *shi'ur qomati*.¹⁰² Scholem further suggests that despite the late date of the known rabbinic *Shi'ur Qomah* materials, the *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology might already be evident in the account drawn from 2 *Enoch* 39 which contains the descriptions of God's gigantic limbs.¹⁰³

In the *Shi'ur Qomah* speculations, the descriptions of God's anthropomorphic body and his limbs are viewed as the ultimate knowledge that holds a profound salvific value. Nathaniel Deutsch argues that "affirmations that the knowledge of God's measurements is a form of gnosis in Merkabah mysticism emphasize the salvific or redemptive quality of such knowledge."¹⁰⁴ In *Merkavah Shelemah*, R. Ishmael expresses this belief, uttering: "whoever knows the measurements of our Creator and the glory of the Holy One, blessed be He, may he be assured of a place in the world to come." Reflecting on R. Ishmael's dictum, Gilles Quispel reasons that "the knowledge of this enormous body is a saving Gnosis."¹⁰⁵ Moshe Idel reiterates this position, suggesting that "the knowledge and repetition of whose [the *Shi'ur Qomah's*] precise dimensions constitute a salvific gnosis."¹⁰⁶

The *Shi'ur Qomah* speculations contain many parallels with previously explored pseudepigraphical accounts where the adept's transformed body serves as an epistemological "measure" of God's theophany. Deutsch observes that "by knowing the dimensions of the Creator, the Merkabah mystic becomes acutely aware of His anthropomorphic image and, therefore, of the identity between the divine form and the human form."¹⁰⁷ Deutsch further admits that

in this regard, it is not insignificant that knowledge of God's beautiful form or *qomah*, physically transforms the *qomah* of the Merkabah mystic as the *Siddur Rabbah* states: "*panav mazivot ve-qomato na' eh*" ["he shall have a glowing face and an attractive body"].¹⁰⁸

Like in early pseudepigraphical texts, the *Shī'ur Qomah* accounts also hold some tension between the various ways theophanic knowledge is communicated and acquired, such as through the adept's transformed body as opposed to the conventional epistemological means. The *Shī'ur Qomah* materials also repeatedly stress that grasping and transmitting theophanic knowledge through normal epistemological avenues is impossible. Scholars have previously noticed these epistemological tensions. In his analysis of the *Shī'ur Qomah* descriptions of the divine body and limbs, Joseph Dan raises an important set of questions:

what is to be gained from the imparting of such detailed knowledge about the dimensions of the divine being as described here, since the figures are so far beyond the capacity of the human mind to comprehend? What difference does it make whether the exact measurement is the one stated, and not a few parsecs more or less? What is the disciple to gain from the knowledge of such meaningless figures regarding the various members and parts of the divine "body"?¹⁰⁹

Dan then attempts to answer his own queries by pointing out that

it would seem that we are not dealing here with "knowledge" in the usual sense. The text has no intention whatsoever of imparting facts. Rather, the purpose is to prove that the divine "body" is beyond all knowledge, transcending comprehension, its understanding pertaining to the realm of mystical knowledge and not that of mathematical science.¹¹⁰

Dan further adds that

it is not intended that the disciple, after having studied the text, should "know"; the intention is that he should appreciate that the matter is a secret that he can never "know," even though some hint of the order of magnitude involved, and of the relative magnitude of the divine members, is given. In other words, the disciple is given a veiled hint about the structure and outline of mystical truth that words and figures cannot convey.¹¹¹

Although the limitations of apprehending and transmitting knowledge about the divine Body through conventional means have been noticed by scholars, these studies often ignore other avenues acquiring theophanic mysteries: the adept's transformed body. Despite scholars' previous suggestions that the *Shī'ur Qomah* doctrine refers to a God who is "at once visible and yet . . . incapable of being really visualized,"¹¹² earlier and later Jewish accounts offer plenty of evidence that "visualization" of the deity can be paradoxically executed through theophanies of his "embodied icons," including Enoch-Metatron. The roots of this type of transmission in the Enoch-Metatron tradition can be found in *2 Enoch* 39, where God's body appears as an enormous extent "without measure and without analogy." While the text unambiguously states that the deity's

extent transcends any analogy, the account of Enoch's vision of God's Form represents a set of analogies in which the descriptions of the patriarch's face and body parts are compared with elements of the divine Face. Several details in this narrative are important for establishing a connection between 2 *Enoch's* account and the later Jewish "embodied theophanies" where Enoch-Metatron conveys the divine theophanic knowledge through his otherworldly body.

Through the analogical descriptions introduced in 2 *Enoch* 39, a significant bond was established between the immense body of the deity and Enoch's body; this bond will later play a prominent role in the Hekhalot and *Shi'ur Qomah* mysticism. In 2 *Enoch*, the proximity between the two bodies is reinforced by additional metaphors. These metaphors demonstrate the closeness between the corporeality of the deity and Enoch-Metatron's corporeality.¹¹³ One pivotal link is the familiar imagery of God's hand, which according to later Hekhalot accounts "rests on the head of the youth, named Metatron."¹¹⁴ In 2 *Enoch* 39:5, a similar metaphor is deployed when Enoch tells his children that he has seen the right hand of the deity helping him.¹¹⁵

In the *Shi'ur Qomah* traditions, divine corporeality is labeled as the Measure of the Body¹¹⁶ (שיעור קומה). The same terminology is often applied to Enoch-Metatron's body. According to one of the Hekhalot texts, "the stature (קומתו) of this youth fills the world."¹¹⁷ The link between the body of the patriarch and the divine body in 2 *Enoch* is emphasised by the identical terminology. In 2 *Enoch* the *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology is applied not only to the body of the Lord (the stature¹¹⁸ of the Lord) but also to the body of the patriarch (the stature of my [Enoch's] body).

In 2 *Enoch* 39, Enoch's body serves as the measure and the analogy through which the patriarch conveys to his children the immeasurability of the Lord's stature. In 2 *Enoch* 39:6, the term *without measure*¹¹⁹ (Slav. безмѣрно) occurs immediately after the expression "the stature¹²⁰ of the Lord."¹²¹ The conflation of "stature" and "measure" further strengthens Scholem's hypothesis that 2 *Enoch* 39 attests to *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology, since the term שיעור can be translated as a measure.¹²²

The message about the impossibility of measuring¹²³ God's body comes from the mouth of Enoch who is depicted in 2 *Enoch* as the measurer responsible for quantifying earthly and celestial phenomena.¹²⁴ This demonstrates a remarkable parallel to the later role of Metatron as one who conveys the measure of the Body to visionaries. The *Shi'ur Qomah* passage of the *Merkavah Rabbah* states: "I said to him, to the Prince of Torah,¹²⁵ teach me the measure of our Creator, and he said to me the measure of our Creator, and he said to me the measure of the body" (*Synopse* §688).¹²⁶ In later Jewish mysticism, Enoch-Metatron himself is described as the measure¹²⁷ of the divine body.

The transmission of the theophany through the exemplar's transformed body became even more important in some rabbinic and Hekhalot accounts where the deity is depicted only in an invisible, audial mode, often as the divine voice. In these accounts, the expression and transmission of divine theophanic knowledge is the duty of the translated humans, including the heavenly personas of

Jacob, Moses, and Enoch–Metatron. Enoch–Metatron’s elevation into the rank of God’s visible “icon” in *Sefer Hekhalot* represents the epitome of this development. Joseph Dan suggests that Metatron becomes “almost a miniature version of God Himself.”¹²⁸

Notes

- 1 C. L. Seow, “Face,” in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, eds. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst (Leiden: Brill, 1995) 322.
- 2 P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Albany: SUNY, 1992) 18. This motif recalls 2 *Enoch*, in which the description of the Face and the statement about the impossibility of enduring its vision likewise are combined.
- 3 This theme looms large in the Hekhalot tradition where one can often find the “danger motif” applied to the Face imagery. On this see Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 17; *Synopse* §§102, 159, 183, 189, 356.
- 4 Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 18.
- 5 Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 18.
- 6 Neis, “Embracing Icons,” 42.
- 7 On this motif see I. Chernus, *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism: Studies in the History of Midrash* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982) 74–76.
- 8 Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud, Berachot*, 17a. According to some traditions Adam receives similar “nourishment” before his fall. See 2 *Enoch* 31:2 (longer recension): “And I created for him an open heaven, so that he might look upon the angels, singing the triumphal song. And the light which is never darkened was perpetually in paradise.” Andersen, “2 *Enoch*,” 1.152–154; 3 *Enoch* 5:3: “The first man and his generation dwelt at the gate of the garden of Eden so that they might gaze at the bright image of the Shekinah, or the brilliance of the Shekinah radiated from one end of the world to the other.” Alexander, “3 *Enoch*,” 1.259.
- 9 Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud, Baba Batra*, 10a.
- 10 The Georgian version of the *Primary Adam Books* 13:2 reads: “The very day when you were created, on that day I fell from before the face of God, because when God breathed a spirit onto your face, you had the image and likeness of divinity.” Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 16E.
- 11 The LXX version of Gen 2:7 reads: “And God formed man, dust from the earth, and breathed into his face (εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ) a breath of life, and the man became a living being.”
- 12 Anderson and Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 16–16E.
- 13 Steenburg, “The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God.” 96. In Steenburg’s opinion, “‘face’ relates more specifically to physical, visual appearance, just as the angelic worship of Adam in *Vit. Ad.* is peculiar to Adam alone. . . . To be adequate to the text in its irregular usage of ‘face,’ however, we are probably meant to understand that Adam is not just a representative by virtue of his patriarchy, but that he is also the best representative and that his superiority in this regard pertains to his physical or visible likeness to God.” Steenburg, “The Worship of Adam and Christ,” 97.
- 14 Fletcher-Louis, *Jesus Monotheism*, 270. Van Kooten writes that “if indeed ‘the image is actually the physical representation of God,’ then this view is similar to other physical interpretations of the ‘image of God.’ . . . At the same time, the explicit statement that this likeness between God and man concerns the face is remarkably similar to a particular view on the divine and human face in 2 *Enoch*.” Van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology*, 30.
- 15 Andersen, “2 *Enoch*,” 1.171; N. Deutsch, *The Gnostic Imagination: Gnosticism, Mandaeism, and Merkabah Mysticism*, BSJS, 13 (Leiden: Brill, 1995) 102.
- 16 Andersen, “2 *Enoch*,” 1.170.

- 17 According to Nathaniel Deutsch, “the key to understanding this passage has been provided by F. I. Andersen, who notes in his edition of *2 Enoch*, that its form imitates that of Gen 1:27, which states that ‘God created man in His image, in the image of God he created him, male and female he created them.’ Instead of the ‘image’ of God, in *2 Enoch* we find God’s ‘face,’ and in place of ‘male and female He created them,’ we read ‘small and great the Lord created.’ In light of the Jewish, Gnostic, and Mandaean traditions which treated the image of God in Gen 1:27 hypostatically, often identifying it with the Cosmic Adam, the substitution of the divine image in Gen 1:27 with the divine face is early evidence that God’s face was perceived hypostatically, as well.” Deutsch, *Gnostic Imagination*, 102.
- 18 Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.171, note b. As previously indicated, in other Jewish materials the concept of the divine image is often rendered through the symbolism of the divine Face. See M. Idel, “The Changing Faces of God and Human Dignity in Judaism,” in *Moshe Idel: Representing God*, eds. H. Tirosh-Samuelson and A. W. Hughes; LCJP, 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2014) 103–122.
- 19 But even before Odeberg, another scholar, Louis Ginzberg observed that the words “God set him before His face” in *2 Enoch* 67:2 might be related to “the usual designation found in Geonic mysticism of Metatron-Enoch as the ‘prince of the face.’” L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 7 vols. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1998) 5.161.
- 20 M. D. Fowler, “The Meaning of *lipnê YHWH* in the Old Testament,” *ZAW* 99 (1987) 384–390.
- 21 H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973) 55.
- 22 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 158, n. 17.
- 23 *2 Enoch* 21:3: “And the Lord sent one of his glorious ones, the archangel Gabriel. And he said to me, ‘Be brave, Enoch! Don’t be frightened! Stand up, and come with me and stand in front of the face of the Lord forever.’” *2 Enoch* 22:6: “And the Lord said to his servants, sounding them out, ‘Let Enoch join in and stand in front of my face forever!’” *2 Enoch* 36:3: “Because a place has been prepared for you, and you will be in front of my face from now and forever.” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.136, 1.138, 1.161.
- 24 G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1954) 67.
- 25 Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 67.
- 26 Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.194.
- 27 On later Christian development of this motif, see B. G. Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses*, SVC, 95 (Leiden: Brill, 2009) 36–51.
- 28 The beginning of this tradition can be found in the *Book of Heavenly Luminaries* (*1 Enoch* 74:2), where Enoch writes Uriel’s instructions regarding the secrets of heavenly bodies and their movements. See Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.173.
- 29 Vermes observes that at Qumran, “Sariel becomes one of the four chief angels, replacing Uriel, the traditional fourth archangel in the Greek *Enoch* and midrashic literature . . . He also appears in an Aramaic fragment of 4Q *Enoch* 9.1.” G. Vermes, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies,” *JJS* 26 (1975) 1–14 at 13.
- 30 *Hekhalot Rabbati* (*Synopsis* §108) refers to the angel Suria/Suriel as the Prince of the Face. Cf. Schäfer et al., *Synopsis*, 52. On the identification of Sariel with the Prince of the Presence, see Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 99–100; Smith, “Prayer of Joseph,” 709.
- 31 The connection between God’s Face (פניאל) and the Place (המקום) in Gen 32:31 is important. In later theophanic contexts the term המקום is closely associated with *Kavod* imagery. This tradition can be found, for example, in *3 Enoch* 45:1; 47:1; 48D:8. *3 Enoch* also uses an expression “the Curtain (*pargod*) of the Place” in reference to the celestial veil, which shields the angelic hosts from the harmful luminescence of the *Kavod*.
- 32 Geza Vermes suggests that the angelic name Phanuel “is depended on the Peniel/Penuel of Genesis 32.” Vermes, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies,” 13. Smith supports Vermes’ position. In his opinion, “it is most likely that the name Phanuel is to be derived from the place name Peniel/Penuel (the face of God) in Gen 32:30, and therefore may be related to the title ‘a man seeing God.’” Smith, “Prayer of Joseph,” 709.

See also Saul Olyan, who argues that “the angel Penuel was either derived from texts such Exod 13:14–15 and Deut 4:37, where the divine presence is given figurative treatment, or it emerged from the exegesis of Gen 32:25–33.” Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 108–109.

33 Smith, “Prayer of Joseph,” 713.

34 McNamara, *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis*, 158; A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1, Targum Palestinense Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana*, Textos y Estudios, 7, 6 vols. (Madrid and Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968) 1.217–219.

35 Vermes, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies,” 13; Smith, “Prayer of Joseph,” 709.

36 Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch*, 1.59 and 2.22.

37 MSS S, R, F. Cf. P. Novickij, *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda. Vosproizvedenie Sinodal’noj Rukopisi No 210* (St. Petersburg: Tipografia Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk, 1892) 101b; A. Pypin, *Lozhnye i otrechennye knigi russkoj stariny. Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj literatury, izdavaemye Grafom Grigoriem Kushelevym-Bezborodko*, 3 vyp. (St. Petersburg: Kulish, 1862) 3.28; I. Franko, *Apokrifi i legendi z ukrains’kih rukopisiv. Monumenta Linguae Necon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum (Ruthenicarum)*, 5 vols. (L’vov: Shevchenka, 1896–1910) 1.110.

38 Slavonic *uslzhdaemych* can be literally translated as “sweetened.” See R. M. Cejtin, *Staroslovjanskij slovar’ po rukopisjam X-XI vekov* (Moscow: Russkij jazyk, 1994) 477; I. I. Sresnevskij, *Slovar’ drevnerusskogo jazyka*, 3 vols. (Moscow: Kniga, 1989) 3.1266.

39 On Uriel as an *angelus interpres*, see Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 60.

40 On this angelological tradition, see K. Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, JSHRZ, 2.3 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus Gerd Nohn, 1981) 322–324; R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis* (London: Black, 1902) lvi–lviii; D. Dimant, “The Sons of Heaven: The Theory of the Angels in the Book of Jubilees in Light of the Writings of the Qumran Community,” in *A Tribute to Sarah: Studies in Jewish Philosophy and Cabala Presented to Professor Sara A. Heller-Wilensky*, eds. M. Idel, D. Dimant, and S. Rosenberg (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994) 97–118 [Hebrew]; H. Najman, “Angels at Sinai: Exegesis, Theology and Interpretive Authority,” *DSD* 7 (2000) 313–333; A. A. Orlov, “Moses; Heavenly Counterpart in the Book of Jubilees and the Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, eds. G. Boccaccini and J. Ibba (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009) 131–144; M. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses du livre des Jubilés* (Geneva: Droz, 1960) 75–92; J. C. VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees,” *DSD* 7 (2000) 378–393.

41 Sir 44:16 [Hebrew].

42 This motif demonstrates similarities with the concept of *melammu* – celestial radiance in the Mesopotamian traditions which can be removed from a person. The connection with the concept of *melammu* may be already present in the biblical story of Moses’ face that constitutes the background of this Enochic episode. Menahem Haran suggested that

the closest ancient Near Eastern anthropological parallel to the shining of Moses’ face is the Mesopotamian concept of *melammu*. This substantive basically indicates the brilliant light that radiates from the gods and seems to be taken as mostly surrounding their heads.

M. Haran, “The Shining of Moses’ Face: A Case Study in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography,” in *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlstrom*, JSOTSS, 31 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984) 167

43 We can find an afterlife of this motif in another “Enochic” text, *Sefer Hekhalot*, which describes the transformation of Enoch-Metatron, the Prince of the Divine Presence, into the fiery creature. *3 Enoch* 15:1 reads:

R. Ishmael said: The angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, the glory of highest heaven, said to me: When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the

throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all needs of the Shekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire.

Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.267

- 44 On Metatron as the hypostatic Face of God, see A. DeConick, "Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First-Century Christology in the Second Century," in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*, eds. C. C. Newman, J. R. Davila, and G. S. Lewis; JSJSS, 63 (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 308–341; Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 424–425.

- 45 3 Enoch 8:2:

Then the Holy One, blessed be he, bestowed upon me wisdom heaped upon wisdom, understanding upon understanding, prudence upon prudence, knowledge upon knowledge, mercy upon mercy, Torah upon Torah, love upon love, grace upon grace, beauty upon beauty, humility upon humility, might upon might, strength upon strength, power upon power, splendor upon splendor, loveliness upon loveliness, comeliness upon comeliness; and I was honored and adorned with all these excellent, praiseworthy qualities more than all the denizens of the heights.

Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.263

Curiously, in this passage bestowal of divine knowledge is understood as bestowal of a theophanic attribute.

- 46 3 Enoch 10. Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.264. Schäfer et al., *Synopse*, 8–9.
 47 Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God," 105.
 48 On this, see N. Deutsch, *Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity*, BSJS, 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 43; R. S. Boustán, *From Martyr to Mystic. Rabbinic Martyrology and the Making of Merkavah Mysticism*, TSAJ, 112 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 118–121; Neis, "Embracing Icons," 42.
 49 Deutsch, *Guardians of the Gate*, 43.
 50 Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.312; Schäfer et al., *Synopse*, 36–37.
 51 Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 425; Schäfer et al., *Synopse*, 167–168.
 52 Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 18.
 53 Davila, *Hekhalot Literature in Translation*, 86; Schäfer et al., *Synopse*, 72.
 54 Rachel Neis observes that

the word *qlaster* in rabbinic texts describes the identity facial features (e.g. Isaac's and Abraham's). Jastrow views the expression *qlaster panim* as analogous to the term *יְיָ אֱקָרְנֵי* [radiance of icon], which is used to mean "features of face," in cases of verisimilitude.

Neis, "Embracing Icons," 42

- 55 Louis Ginzberg also suggests that "the legend about the man in the moon, who is identified with Jacob, is perhaps connected with the old legend concerning Jacob's countenance in the divine throne." Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 5.291. On these traditions, see also E. R. Wolfson, "The Face of Jacob in the Moon: Mystical Transformations of an Aggadic Myth," in *The Seductiveness of Jewish Myth*, ed. S. D. Breslaur (Albany: SUNY, 1997) 235–270.
 56 Neis, "Embracing Icons," 46.
 57 Neis, "Embracing Icons," 46.
 58 In the Hekhalot literature one of the Living Creatures of the throne bears the name Israel. On this tradition, see *Synopse* §406; Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 62; Wolfson, "The Image of Jacob Engraved upon the Throne," 7.
 59 *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, ed. G. Friedlander, 2nd ed. (New York: Hermon Press, 1965) 265.
 60 Neis, "Jacob's Face on the Throne," 42.

- 61 Oppenheim, "Akkadian *pul(u)h(t)u* and *melammu*," 31–34.
 62 Wolfson, *Through a Speculum*, 86.
 63 Herring, "Moses as Divine Substitute in Exodus," 55.
 64 Herring, "Moses as Divine Substitute in Exodus," 61.
 65 Herring, "Moses as Divine Substitute in Exodus," 62.
 66 Herring, "Moses as Divine Substitute in Exodus," 62.
 67 Herring, "Moses as Divine Substitute in Exodus," 62.
 68 Herring, "Moses as Divine Substitute in Exodus," 66–67.
 69 Herring, "Moses as Divine Substitute in Exodus," 53.
 70 Exod 34:33: "he put a veil on his face."
 71 Exod 34:35: "the Israelites would see the face of Moses, that the skin of his face was shining; and Moses would put the veil on his face again, until he went in to speak with him."
 72 *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, trans. A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) 76.
 73 McNamara et al., *Targum Neofiti 1 and Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*, 260.
 74 Belleville, *Reflections of Glory*, 29.
 75 Haran notes that

in its primary meaning the concept *hōd* apparently signifies the light radiating from the figure. An indication of this meaning is the depiction of God as one who is "clothed" with *hōd* (Ps 104:1; this psalmodic wording reverberating in Job 40:10), after which the text goes on to say that God is "wrapped in light as a garment". . . . The basic meaning of *hōd* is, as has been said, the halo of light surrounding and radiating from a figure. Yahweh's *kabod*, as against this, in its concrete and tangible meaning, which is particularly characteristic of the language of P and Ezekiel, signifies the extraordinary, "thick" covering that envelopes the divine image, concealing it from the outside.

Haran, "The Shining of Moses' Face," 166–167

- 76 McNamara and Clarke, *Targum Neofiti 1 and Pseudo-Jonathan: Numbers*, 270. See also Zohar I.21b: "Joshua derived prophetic inspiration from the majesty of Moses, as it is written, 'thou shalt confer of thy majesty upon him' (Num 27:20)." Sperling and Simon, *The Zohar*, 1.90.
 77 Belleville, *Reflections of Glory*, 29.
 78 Belleville remarks that "the implication being that the light of the moon is much inferior to that of the sun, and hence much deterioration had occurred in the transfer from Moses to Joshua." Belleville, *Reflections of Glory*, 67.
 79 Belleville, *Reflections of Glory*, 30.
 80 *Targum Neofiti* on Deut 34:7: "His eyes had not grown dim and the splendor of his face had not changed." M. McNamara, *Targum Neofiti 1: Deuteronomy*, ArBib, 5A (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997) 175.
 81 *Targum Onqelos* on Deut 34:7: "Now Moses was a hundred and twenty years old when he died; his eye was undimmed and the radiance of the glory of his face remained unchanged." B. Grossfeld, *The Targum Onqelos to Deuteronomy*, ArBib, 9 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988) 114.
 82 H. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*, AGAJU, 31, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 123.
 83 Belleville, *Reflections of Glory*, 42.
 84 Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 3.414.
 85 Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 3.541–542.
 86 Dozeman, *God on the Mountain*, 140–141.
 87 N. L. DeLapp, *Theophanic "Type-Scenes" in the Pentateuch*, LHBOTS, 660 (London: Bloomsbury, 2018) 73–74.
 88 On the motif of dangerous encounters with the divine in the Hekhalot literature, see J. R. Davila, *Descenders to the Chariot: The People behind the Hekhalot Literature*, JSJSS, 70 (Leiden: Brill, 2001) 136–139.

- 89 Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.305.
 90 Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.303.
 91 Schäfer et al., *Synopse*, 164.
 92 M. S. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*, TSAJ, 9 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985) 162–164. *Sefer Raziel*, 274–285 recounts a similar tradition:

... glorious throne. They are on one side and the (celestial) creatures are on the other side, and the Shekinah is on the throne of Glory in the center of them all. And one creature goes up over the seraphim and descends on the tabernacle of the lad and says in a great voice, a still, small voice, "The throne of Glory is glistening." Immediately, the wheelcreatures fall silent and the angels are still. Battalions of *irin* and *qadishin* hurry and hasten into the river of fire. And the (celestial) creatures fall on their faces on the earth and this lad, whose name is Metatron, brings the fire of silence and puts (it) in the ears of the creatures so that they do not hear the sound of the speech of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the explicit name that the lad utters at that time.

Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah*, 106–107

- 93 Exod 34:30: "When Aaron and all the Israelites saw Moses, the skin of his face was shining, and they were afraid to come near him."
 94 2 *Enoch* 39:8:

Frightening and dangerous it is to stand before the face of an earthly king, terrifying and very dangerous it is, because the will of the king is death and the will of the king is life. How much more terrifying [and dangerous] it is to stand before the face of the King of earthly kings and of the heavenly armies, [the regulator of the living and of the dead]. Who can endure that endless misery?

Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.164

- 95 Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.163.
 96 Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.182, 1.183.
 97 2 *Enoch* 36:3. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.161.
 98 G. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990) 20.
 99 Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 20.
 100 Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.163.
 101 A. Kahana, *Ha-Sefarim ha-Hitsonim* (Tel Aviv: Masada, 1936–1937) 102–141.
 102 G. Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in Kabbalah* (New York: Schocken, 1991) 29.
 103 According to Scholem, another early evidence to the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition is found in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* I.14.3:

I wish to show thee Aletheia (Truth) herself; for I have brought her down from the dwellings above, that thou mayest see her without a veil, and understand her beauty – that thou mayest also hear her speaking, and admire her wisdom. Behold, then, her head on high, *Alpha* and *Omega*; her neck, *Beta* and *Psi*; her shoulders with her hands, *Gamma* and *Chi*; her breast, *Delta* and *Phi*; her diaphragm, *Epsilon* and *Upsilon*; her back, *Zeta* and *Tau*; her belly, *Eta* and *Sigma*; her thighs, *Theta* and *Rho*; her knees, *Iota* and *Pi*; her legs, *Kappa* and *Omicron*; her ankles, *Lambda* and *Xi*; her feet, *Mu* and *Nu*. Such is the body of Truth, according to this magician, such the figure of the element, such the character of the letter. And he calls this element *Anthropos* (Man), and says that is the fountain of all speech, and the beginning of all sound, and the expression of all that is unspeakable, and the mouth of the silent Sige. This indeed is the body of Truth.

Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, eds. A. Roberts, J. Donaldson, and A. C. Coxe (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885) 1.337

- 104 Deutsch, *Gnostic Imagination*, 147.

110 *Divine Face as the hypostasis of knowledge*

105 Quispel, "Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis," 3.

106 M. Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1988) 158.

107 Deutsch, *Gnostic Imagination*, 149.

108 Deutsch, *Gnostic Imagination*, 149.

109 J. Dan, "Concept of Knowledge in the *Shī'ur Komah*," in *Jewish Mysticism: Late Antiquity*, ed. J. Dan (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1998) 205–215 at 207–208.

110 Dan, "Concept of Knowledge in the *Shī'ur Komah*," 208.

111 Dan, "Concept of Knowledge in the *Shī'ur Komah*," 207–208. Dan notes that "the astronomical numbers of the *Shī'ur Komah* do not intend to convey knowledge, but to point to the existence of a mystical truth that transcends both mathematical expressions of magnitude and human speech itself." Dan, "Concept of Knowledge in the *Shī'ur Komah*," 207–208.

112 Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 65.

113 Ithamar Gruenwald observes that "it is hard to say whether any method lies behind these measures, but we assume that originally the measures aimed at conveying the notion of ideal proportions. These proportions were shared by God and man alike." I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, AGAJU, 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1980) 214.

114 Schäfer et al., *Synopse* §384.

115 Cf. also *2 Enoch* 24:2 (the shorter recension): "And the Lord called me; and he placed me to the left of himself closer than Gabriel." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.143.

116 Scholem remarks that the term *qomah* was often translated as "height" ("measurement of the height"), used in the biblical sense. He stresses that this translation does not apply to the Merkavah materials where *qomah*, like in the Aramaic incantation texts, signifies "body." Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 364.

117 Schäfer et al., *Synopse* §162.

118 Slav. обЪЯТИЕ. G. Macaskill, *The Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*, SJS, 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2013) 147.

119 Some *Shī'ur Qomah* descriptions also stress the idea of the immeasurability of the divine Face:

The image of His face and the image of His cheeks is as the dimensions of the spirit and as the creation of the soul, such that no one can recognize it, as it is stated (in Scripture): "His body is *tarshish*." His splendor is luminous and glows from within the darkness, and (from within) the cloud and fog that surround Him and although they surround Him, all the princes of the Presence (supplicate) before Him as (obediently as water flows when it is poured from) a water-pitcher, because of the vision of His comeliness and beauty. There is no measurement in our hands; the names (alone) are revealed.

Cohen, *The Shī'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*, 47

120 Slav. обЪЯТИЕ literally can be translated as "embrace." This noun is related to the Slavonic verb – to embrace somebody, to fold somebody in one's hands. Francis Andersen translates the term as "scope" (the longer recension) and "extent" (the shorter recension).

121 *2 Enoch* 39:6: "I have seen the stature of the Lord, without measure and without analogy."

122 Markus Jastrow translates the term as "proportion," "standard," "definite quantity," "size," or "limit." M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, 2 vols. (New York: Shalom, 1967) 2.1565.

123 The stress on the immeasurability of God in *2 Enoch* does not contradict the theology of the *Shī'ur Qomah* tradition. Peter Schäfer observes that

the *Shī'ur Qomah* tradition does not intend to state that God can be "calculated," that he is, so to speak, a superman of enormous yet exactly measurable and conceivable dimensions . . . the completely absurd calculations is to demonstrate that God cannot be conceived of in human categories: he, "as it were," is like a human being and yet hidden.

Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 149–150

124 See, for example, *2 Enoch* 40:2–12:

I know everything, and everything I have written down in books, the heavens and their boundaries and their contents. And all the armies and their movements I have measured. And I have recorded the stars and the multitude of multitudes innumerable. . . . The solar circle I have measured, and its rays I have measured. . . . The lunar circle I have measured, and its movements. . . . I measured all the earth, and its mountains and hills and fields and woods and stones and rivers, and everything that exists.

Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.164–166

125 = Metatron.

126 Schäfer et al., *Synopse*, 252.

127 G. G. Stroumsa, “Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ,” *HTR* 76 (1983) 269–288.

128 J. Dan, *The Ancient Jewish Mysticism* (Tel-Aviv: MOD Books, 1993) 117.

3 The divine Name as the hypostasis of divine knowledge

Divine Name and divine knowledge

The complex nature of the pseudepigraphical exemplars' mediation of divine theophanic knowledge brings us to another early Jewish tradition of the divine presence, this time connected with the divine Name (*Shem*). In contrast to the visual theophanic trend epitomised in the *Kavod* symbolism, *Shem's* approach traditionally emphasised the audial dimension of the deity's presence usually symbolised by the divine Voice.¹ Although the *Shem* tradition receives its overwhelming expression in later rabbinic and Hekhalot materials, the origin of this theophanic trend appears in some biblical materials associated with the so-called Deuteronomistic School, in which the divine Name² is imagined as the ultimate deposit³ of knowledge about God.⁴ McDonough suggests that "the Name' could stand for any or all of the activities and attributes of the God of Israel."⁵

One of the most important aspects of the divine Name tradition is the Name's role as the conduit of the divine presence. Trygve Mettinger states that

at the oldest stage of the tradition, it is likely that one heard in the "He Is" of the divine Name an assurance of God's active and aiding presence . . . Thus the theological content of the divine Name comes surprisingly close to the divine promise that is so frequently uttered in the patriarchal narratives: "I shall be with you."⁶

The divine Name acts as a cypher for the divine presence⁷ which is predestined to reveal the very essence of the deity to human beings.⁸ Regarding the difference between visual and aural apprehensions, Jarl Fossum notes that

whereas the image is the material representation of the spirit or essence of a human or a god, the name is the immaterial image. The name expresses the living essence, the vital energy, the power of the human person or the deity.⁹

Because the Name reveals the most esoteric aspects of the deity, in Judaism even writing or uttering the divine Name necessitated an elaborate set of prohibitions and taboos.¹⁰ Furthermore, in many early Jewish accounts, the Name was

closely associated with the deity's power and demiurgic activity. In the aural *Shem* tradition, the divine Name fulfills the same function as the divine image in the visual *Kavod* paradigm. Like the *imago Dei*, it eventually became hypostasised and represented by the same mediatorial figures who personify the divine image, including Enoch, Jacob, and Moses.

Despite the difference between the aural and visual modality of the divine presence, the realities of both trends became curiously intertwined and mirrored in each other. The ancient Near Eastern aesthetics of visual and aural perception might have influenced this tendency. Regarding this, Bahrani notes that "signification for the Babylonians and Assyrians was not so clearly divided into visual and verbal as two separate realms but was one greater interdependent symbolic system."¹¹ She further suggests that

in Babylon and Assyria the relationship of the signified to the signifier is characterized by a constant shifting between the two realms – realms that are integral to the real. If this shifting between the two realms was made possible, at least in part, by the visual shape of things in the case of words (although iconic signifiers were not privileged), then the realm of visual signification must also take into account encountering things in various ways. Therefore, image and name, and the organic body of a person were all ways of encountering that person.¹²

In the Hebrew Bible the angelic personification of the divine Name, the Angel of the Lord, conveyed knowledge about God to mortals through verbal communication and visual appearance.¹³

Despite the fact that biblical and extrabiblical ideologies of the divine Name postulated God's aural invisible existence symbolised by the divine Voice, they did not extend the aesthetic of invisibility to the Name, which eventually became hypostasised in otherworldly figures. These mediators became the Name's visible manifestations endowed with the divine attributes and features, often borrowed from the rival visual paradigm of the divine presence.¹⁴

Regarding this process of onomatological hypostatisation, Benjamin Sommer concludes that:

Shem or Name can also refer to a hypostasis, a quality or attribute of a particular being that becomes distinct from that being but never entirely independent of it. In many texts, God's *Shem* embodies but does not exhaust God's self, and it also maintains some degree of separate identity. . . . Thus the notion of *Shem* reflects the possibility of a fragmented divine self and its physical manifestation in multiple bodies.¹⁵

Similar to the *Kavod* tradition, in the *Shem* tradition, the divine presence and iconic divine knowledge are transmitted through living embodiments of such knowledge taking the form of angelic and translated figures, including familiar

pseudepigraphical exemplars. As a result, *Shem* and *Kavod* traditions accommodated mediators from the opposite trend for their own purposes. In light of these proclivities our current study of the mediators of the divine Name can provide additional insights regarding the transmission and acquisition of theophanic knowledge in early Jewish milieus.

Indeed, the *Shem* paradigm bears familiar epistemological traits, including the previously explored ties between embodied knowledge and the Torah, where the hypostasised divine Name is eventually equated with this comprehensive compendium.¹⁶ A close examination of these traditions helps us better understand the connection between the Name and the divine knowledge. Barbara Holdrege notes that later Jewish mysticism “expressly assumes the identity of the Torah and the Name of God, declaring that the Torah is the one supernal Name of the Holy One.”¹⁷ Holdrege also concedes that “according to the most abstract level of interpretation, then, the Torah as the Name of God means that the Torah participates in the essence and power of God and that ultimately the Torah and God are one.”¹⁸ According to this understanding, the Torah represents “a living texture of names that is woven from the one true Name of God, the Tetragrammaton YHWH,” and “all of the names in the Torah are contained in the Tetragrammaton, and the Tetragrammaton is itself woven both directly and in a secret, hidden way throughout the fabric of the Torah.”¹⁹ Michael Miller notes that in this onomatological vision, the traditions of the Torah “have often been emptied into the Name tradition, by identifying the generative word spoken as God’s own Name, or claiming the Torah is a concealed list of divine names.”²⁰

One feature of the connection between the Torah and the Name is that they both manifest the deity’s power. For example, Gershom Scholem notes that “the Torah is interpreted as a mystical unity, whose primary purpose is not to convey a specific meaning, but rather to express the immensity of God’s power, which is concentrated in His Name.”²¹ Scholem further suggests that

to say that the Torah is a name does not mean that it is a name which might be pronounced as such, nor has it anything to do with any rational conception of the social function of a name. The meaning is, rather, that in the Torah God has expressed His transcendent Being, or at least that part or aspect of His Being which can be revealed to Creation and through Creation. . . . the Torah is the concentrated power of God Himself, as expressed in His Name.²²

The connection between the divine Name and the Torah occurs in the Hekhalot materials. In *Sefer Hekhalot* (*Synopse* §80) and some other Hekhalot materials (*Synopse* §397 and *Synopse* §734), Metatron transmits the Torah to Moses using seventy names, which represent the fullness of the divine Name. It is also possible that the revelation of the Torah-Name comes to the son of Amram in a personified form, since some Hekhalot passages portray Enoch-Metatron as

the hypostasis of the divine Name – the lesser YHWH. Accordingly, Moshe Idel notices that, in Jewish mystical lore,

the Torah is conceived of as a name of God (or a series of divine names), and the Torah is conceived of as an organism . . . in this conception, the Torah at its esoteric level, like God, has the form of a human being.²³

The conglomeration of the divine Name and the Torah coming to a seer in a personified form may not be a late rabbinic invention. In the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the main angelic protagonist, Yahoel, who is understood in the text as the hypostasis of the divine Name, is also imagined as a personification of the Torah.²⁴ His apprentice, Abraham, receives the Torah while he is “nourished” on this angelic embodiment of the divine Name in the form of Yahoel. Epistemological and anthropological dimensions are intertwined in this apocalyptic story when, through his feeding on the hypostasised Name, the adept receives the famous compendium of the divine knowledge. This recalls Moses’ nourishment on the Shekinah during his own reception of the Torah.

These illustrations demonstrate that the personifications of the Torah and the Name are interrelated from an early time. Some experts suggest that already in the early Israelite traditions, the Torah became envisioned as an embodied entity – an icon of the deity, reminiscent of a Near Eastern cultic statue.²⁵ Karel van der Toorn argues that “being the embodiment of God’s Word, the Torah is the object of a devotion that has its closest parallel in the cult of the divine image” and “the veneration of the Torah as a divine symbol has given rise to a mythology that strongly resembles the Mesopotamian mythology of the cult statues.”²⁶ He notices that a link between the Torah and the deity’s cultic image is apparent in the Deuteronomi(sti)c reinterpretation of the ark. Van der Toorn mentions that

whereas the Philistines carried their “idols” when they marched out to the battlefield (2 Sam 5:21), the Israelites carried the ark (1 Sam 4:1–11). Having been captured, the ark was placed in the temple of Ashdod next to the image of Dagon (1 Sam 5:2–4). . . . Like the divine image in other Near Eastern civilizations, the ark served as the focal point of the divine presence.²⁷

In addition to holding divine power, the Torah and the Name also serve as conduits of the divine presence, often in its personified form. Similar to the hypostasised Name, the Torah is also a heavenly organism. Moshe Idel argues that “the conception of Torah as an organism grows out of earlier conceptions which emphasise that the Torah has the form or shape of a human being.”²⁸ Idel further suggests that, “in all likelihood, what stands behind the teachings of these kabbalists is a notion drawn from the *Shi’ur Qomah* literature, that the Torah – on its esoteric level – is the full height of God’s body.”²⁹

This understanding most likely served as the conceptual basis for Yahoel's role as a revealer of the Torah in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and also for later Sar Torah traditions in the Hekhalot and *Shi'ur Qomah* lore. Idel advances that "symbolism of this sort facilitated a move from the earthly practice of studying Torah (on its overt level) to a practice through which the mystic formed contact with heavenly forms of the Torah (on its esoteric level)."³⁰

Like traditions of the divine image where the *imago Dei* is permanently etched into the exemplar's ontology, the divine Name also acts as a mediatorial instrument that reshapes the exemplar's anthropology. The Name is not only written externally on the hero's accoutrement or crown but also literally placed "in him." The paradigm shift from an aural to a visual plane creates an opportunity not merely to "hear" the Name but also to "see" it in its celestial form. Charles Gieschen illustrates that in some biblical accounts "the Divine Name was the possession of YHWY's visible image, such as the divine hypostasis who is identified as the Angel of YHWH or the Name of YHWH in the Pentateuch."³¹

The divine Name is also attached to creation, in such a way that the Name serves as the blueprint for creation and the power that actualises God's hidden plan into its visible counterpart manifested in the created order. A similar connection exists in Philo's Logos traditions, which some scholars consider to be the bedrock of Christian onomatological developments.

Many pseudepigraphical exemplars, in their capacity as the eschatological *imago Dei*, are initiated in the mysteries of creation as a part of their duty as embodiments of divine knowledge. Similar developments occur in the *Shem* trend, where the Name and its hypostatic manifestations are joined to the works of creation. Gieschen reminds us that already in *Jub.* 36:7 there are references to the divine Name's demiurgic power.³² In this early Jewish text, the patriarch Isaac tells his sons to swear by the "great oath" responsible for all creation.³³ The association between the Tetragrammaton and creation is alluded in the *Prayer of Manasseh*, where the divine Name is defined as an entity which seals the abyss.³⁴ Miller notes that "this text, interestingly, manages to combine the verbal commandment of creation with the sealing by the Name."³⁵ The demiurgic functions of the Name appears also to be attested to in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 60:2: "Darkness and silence were before the world was made, and silence spoke and the darkness came into sight. Then your name was pronounced in the drawing together of what had been spread out."³⁶

Additionally, the *Book of the Similitudes* intimates knowledge about the demiurgic powers of the Name when it describes the mysterious oath through which the whole universe came into existence. *1 Enoch* 69:13–15 relates the following tradition:

And this is the task of Kesbeel, the chief of the oath, who showed (the oath) to the holy ones when he dwelt on high in glory, and its name (is) Beqa. And this one told the holy Michael that he should show him the secret name, that they might mention it in the oath, so that those who

showed the sons of men everything which is secret trembled before that name and oath. And this (is) the power of this oath, for it is powerful and strong; and he placed this oath Akae in the charge of the holy Michael.³⁷

Jarl Fossum observes that, here, “the angel Michael is said to have been entrusted with the oath containing the ‘Hidden Name,’ through which the whole universe is created and sustained.”³⁸ The association of the Name with otherworldly figures (Kesbeel and Michael) reveals tendencies of its personification. Darrell Hannah suggests that “Michael was viewed by the author of the *Similitudes* as the angel of the Name, for into the ‘hand of Michael’ the secret of the oath, that is the divine Name, had been entrusted.”³⁹

Although *1 Enoch* 69:13–15 does not directly designate the mysterious oath as the Tetragrammaton, the verses that follow affirm the connection between the oath and the divine Name. *1 Enoch* 69:16–20 describes the powers of the oath:

And these are the secrets of this oath and they are strong through his oath, and heaven was suspended before the world was created and forever. And through it the earth was founded upon the water, and from the hidden (recesses) of the mountains come beautiful waters from the creation of the world and forever. And through that oath the sea was created, and as its foundation, for the time of anger, he placed for it the sand, and it does not go beyond (it) from the creation of the world and forever. And through that oath the deeps were made firm, and they stand and do not move from their place from (the creation of) the world and forever. And through that oath the sun and the moon complete their course and do not transgress their command from (the creation of) the world and forever.⁴⁰

Here, the enigmatic oath is a tool of creation with which the deity fashions heaven and earth.⁴¹ It is noteworthy that, other parts of the *Book of the Similitudes*, particularly, *1 Enoch* 41, use the demiurgic oath⁴² and the divine Name interchangeably.⁴³ Later rabbinic accounts also deliberate extensively on the demiurgic functions of the Tetragrammaton⁴⁴ and its letters,⁴⁵ often interpreting them as the instruments through which the world comes into existence.⁴⁶ Frequently, these traditions construe God’s command םה at the creation of the world as an abbreviation of the divine Name.⁴⁷

In *1 Enoch* 69:14–15, the divine Name or Oath is connected with the symbolism of “power.”⁴⁸ In the *Book of the Similitudes*, “power” seems to pertain to the demiurgic functions of the Name. A reference to the “power” of the Name also appears in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, where Yahoel is able to control creation and even “unlock Hades” in his role as the “power inside the Ineffable Name.” These examples show the process of the hypostatisation of the divine Name and its demiurgic powers when angelic and translated figures personify the Name. We must now proceed to analyse two pivotal personifications in early Jewish biblical and pseudepigraphical materials – the Angel of the Lord and Yahoel.

Early mediators of the divine Name: the Angel of the Lord and Yahoel

The first chapter of the book articulated the importance of a biblical *Kavod* ideology that shaped an iconic epistemology, in which the image of God was able both to embody and to grasp the most recondite theophanic knowledge of God. While containing formative anthropomorphic ideologies, the Hebrew Bible also bears witness to other narratives that contest corporeal depictions of the deity and provide a strikingly different conception of the divine presence. Scholars have long discerned a sharp opposition in the Book of Deuteronomy and the so-called Deuteronomistic School to early anthropomorphic tendencies. Fighting ancient anthropomorphism, the book of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School promulgated the ideology⁴⁹ of the divine Name⁵⁰ with its idea of an earthly sanctuary⁵¹ as the exclusive abode of God's Name.⁵² Similar to the *Kavod* paradigm, the *Shem* tradition also becomes deeply rooted in cultic realities. Although the anti-anthropomorphic proclivities of the Deuteronomistic authors have often been underlined in previous studies, some scholars argue that "they were no less anthropomorphic than other biblical thinkers"⁵³ and instead, "these authors develop what might be called a practical or perceptual limit to anthropomorphism: God's body is always located outside this world and is never seen, even from behind a cloud, by any human."⁵⁴ These anthropomorphic tendencies appear in biblical and pseudepigraphical materials that depict the mediators of the Name.

The divine Name's constant and almost material presence in an earthly sanctuary, which, in some scholars' opinion, "verges closely upon a hypostasis,"⁵⁵ became "an important foreshadowing of the later idea of preexistent hypostases."⁵⁶

Michael Miller argues that

Deuteronomy presents a picture of a God who is actually distinguished from his Name, which appears to be a hypostatic element present on earth, localized in the Temple.⁵⁷ God is in heaven (4:36, 26:36), but the Name is in the temple (12:5, 11; 14:23; 16:11, etc.).⁵⁸

The Name, thus, "functions . . . both as a synonym for God and as a hypostasis or emanation of God."⁵⁹ A more "material" reformulation of the divine presence generated a need for the mediators who were predestined to personify the divine Name. In this respect, it is not surprising that one of the most prominent mediators of the divine presence in the Hebrew Bible – the Angel of the Lord – is closely associated with *Shem* ideology. Jarl Fossum suggests that the Angel of the Lord acts as "an extension of YHWH's personality, because the proper Name of God signifies the divine nature."⁶⁰ Thus, the Angel of the Lord has full divine authority by virtue of possessing God's Name.⁶¹ This angelic figure provides the foundational design for nearly all future Jewish

and Christian mediators of the divine Name.⁶² One early testimony about the Angel's roles in mediating⁶³ the divine Name is Exod 23:20–22:

I am going to send an angel in front of you, to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place that I have prepared. Be attentive to him and listen to his voice; do not rebel against him, for he will not pardon your transgression; for my name is in him. But if you listen attentively to his voice and do all that I say, then I will be an enemy to your enemies and a foe to your foes.

Jarl Fossum points out that this text “shows the individualization and personification of the Name of God in the figure of the Angel of the Lord.”⁶⁴ Fossum further argues that melding the divine Name with the otherworldly agent indicates that “the hypostasis formation cannot conceive the abstract concepts without a concrete basis or carrier and thus not without individualization and personification.”⁶⁵ Charles Gieschen affirms Fossum's insights, advocating that “Exod 23:21 supports the deduction that this important aspect of God – the divine Name – could be hypostatized as an angel.”⁶⁶

Several other interpreters also embrace the idea that the Angel of the Lord is a “hypostasis” of the Name. Ruth Tuschling, for example, suggests that “the concept of a hypostasis cannot be cleanly separated from angelic ideas. The expression ‘the Angel of the Lord’ is best understood as a hypostasis in some contexts, e.g., Exod 23:20–21.”⁶⁷ Scholarly hypotheses about the Angel of the Lord as a personification of the Name, in the light of the Name's association with divine knowledge, are important for our study because this hypostasis of divine knowledge is a crucial archetype for the exalted profiles of pseudepigraphical exemplars as mediators of divine knowledge. Gieschen acknowledges the impact of Exod 23 on extra-biblical Jewish onomatologies, remarking that “this union of Name and Angel caused later exegetes to read one tradition in light of the other.”⁶⁸ Thus, the biblical phrase, “for my name is in him,” in Exod 23 will be invoked in later stories of many onomatological mediators, including Yahoel⁶⁹ and Metatron.⁷⁰

Fossum remarks that, although Exodus depicts the Angel of the Lord as a temporary manifestation of God, subsequent Jewish lore will develop the notion of the permanent existence of the personification of the divine Name. From this perspective, the Name will receive not only a temporary existence, but will also become a lasting cosmological force.⁷¹

Already in the Hebrew Bible the Angel of the Lord diverges into many parallel conceptual streams, which variously represent the deity's presence in the form of the personified divine Name.⁷² Previous studies have typically underlined the importance of the Angel of the Lord traditions, including those found in Exod 23:20–22,⁷³ for the Deuteronom(ist)ic *Shem* ideologies.⁷⁴ According to one proposal, the figure of the Angel of the Lord from the Book of Exodus represented a root of *Shem* theology. Thus, Tryggve Mettinger argues that:

when the Deuteronomistic theologians choose *shem*, they seized on a term which was already connected with the idea of God's presence. Exod 23:21

tells us how God warned Israel during her wanderings in the desert to respect his angel and obey his voice, “for my name is in him.”⁷⁵

Aspects of the aural *Shem* ideology were already present in Exod 23 through repeated references to the “voice” of the angelic mediator. In Exod 23:21–22 Moses is advised to listen to the Angel of the Name’s “voice.” There, it is possible that this celestial messenger mediates not only the divine Name but also the deity’s Voice. Some interpreters entertain this as a possibility. Regarding the voice in Exod 23, Moshe Idel points out that

this angel is not just a visual yet silent apparition, a sort of pillar that guides the tribes day and night; rather it has a voice that is its own, though at the same time it is God who is speaking. The ambiguity here is quintessential: though God is the speaker, it is the angel’s voice that is heard. Thus it seems the angel serves as a form of loud speaker for the divine act of speech.⁷⁶

Exod 23:21 contains a statement that the Angel of the Lord will not forgive Israel’s trespasses, a phrase which is often interpreted⁷⁷ as the Angel’s power to remove sins.⁷⁸ This is reminiscent of *imago Dei* traditions, where mediators of the theophanic knowledge, including Enoch, were able to reverse Adam’s sin.

Angel of the Lord traditions served as a base for Yahoel’s profile as the mediator of the divine Name in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.⁷⁹ Since Yahoel represents the most complex case of the divine Name’s hypostatisation within early Jewish lore, we must now look more deeply into the story of this enigmatic mediator.

Similar to the Angel of the Lord, Yahoel’s role as the divine Name’s mediator is introduced by the deity himself. In *Apoc. Ab.* 10:3, while appointing Yahoel to be Abraham’s guide, God utters the following command: “Go, Yahoel, the namesake of the *mediation* (посредѣствѣ) of my ineffable name, sanctify this man and strengthen him from his trembling!”⁸⁰ This divine utterance reveals the angel’s function as a *mediator* of the Name through the usage of the Slavonic term “посредѣствѣ” – “mediation.”⁸¹ The hero of the story, Abraham, thus learns about Yahoel’s onomatological role directly from God’s lips. A few verses later, in *Apoc. Ab.* 10:8, Yahoel reiterates this role by uttering: “I am Yahoel named by him who shakes those which are with me on the seventh vault, on the firmament. I am a *power* (сила) in the midst of the Ineffable who put together his names in me.”⁸² That Yahoel mentions that the deity “named” him is important for our understanding of Enoch’s role as a mediator of the Name. Yahoel’s naming is reminiscent of some developments in Enoch–Metatron lore, where the deity also “names” Enoch–Metatron as the Lesser YHWH. In *3 Enoch* 12, for example, we learn about Enoch–Metatron’s endowment with his prominent title, “Lesser YHWH,” the deity’s “naming” him is likewise specifically mentioned: “and he named me, the lesser YHWH in the presence of his whole household in the height, as it is written, ‘My name is in him.’”⁸³ Interestingly, in both narratives the naming coincides with a reference to the indwelling of the Name/Names in the mediatorial figure.

Both texts also allude to the indwelling of the Tetragrammaton in the Angel of the Lord in Exod 23. Another significant phrase in *Apoc. Ab.* 10:8 is Yahoel's announcement that the deity is "putting together *names* in him." Here, once more, we might have an anticipation of Enoch-Metatron developments, where the divine Name is a combination of seventy names.⁸⁴ For example, in *3 Enoch* 48D:1, where Enoch-Metatron's name, "Lesser YHWH," is mentioned, again with allusion to Exod 23:21, "Lesser YHWH" is located among the seventy names of Metatron.⁸⁵ Jarl Fossum indicates that the references to the seventy names of Metatron may indirectly allude to the function of the exalted angel as the bearer of the "ultimate" Name of God, since these seventy names might represent various aspects of God's primary Name. Fossum points to *3 Enoch* 3:2, where Metatron tells R. Ishmael that his seventy names "are based on the name of the King of kings of kings," and to *3 Enoch* 48D:5, which supplies that "these seventy names are a reflection of the Explicit Name upon the *Merkavah* which is engraved upon the throne of Glory."⁸⁶ Fossum asserts that these seventy names originally belonged to God himself and only later were transferred to Metatron.⁸⁷

Many interpreters have previously noted links between Yahoel and the Angel of the Lord. In his analysis of *Apoc. Ab.* 10:9, in which Yahoel tells Abraham that the power of the Ineffable Name is dwelling in him, Fossum argues that, "obviously, this is a reference to the figure of the Angel of the Lord⁸⁸ in Exod 23, where God says that he has put his Name into (or, unto) his special angel."⁸⁹

Larry Hurtado proposes that the reference to Yahoel being indwelt by God's "name" is derived from Exod 23:20–21,⁹⁰ where God promises to send an angel to lead Israel to the place prepared for them and warns them not to rebel against this angel, "for my name is in him."⁹¹ Hurtado further asserts that,

given the enormous significance of the name of God in ancient Jewish tradition, the description of this Yahoel as indwelt by God's name suggests that this figure has been given exceptional status in God's hierarchy, perhaps superior to all but God himself.⁹²

Likewise, Sean McDonough points out that Yahoel

is a sophisticated interpretation (perhaps "illustration" is a better word) of Exod 23:21. The Iael name is the same as God's – Iao and El are two divine names with widespread attestation, and one could also view them in combination as a short-hand version of the OT designation YHWH Elohim. This preserves the sense of the Exodus passage: it is the name of God which is in the angel. At the same time, Iael sounds like the name of an angel. It makes the identification of God and the angel more obvious than in the case of Michael in The Testament of Abraham, without threatening to deify the angel as might happen with the designation of Metatron as the "lesser YHWH."⁹³

A recent study by Daniel Harlow also affirms these scholarly insights. He postulates that:

Yahoel bears the names of YHWH God in a combination of the two theophoric elements *yah-* and *-el*.⁹⁴ This makes him the midrashic embodiment of what God promised the people of Israel at Mt. Sinai: “I am going to send an angel in front of you, to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place that I have prepared. Be attentive to him and listen to his voice . . . for my name is in him” (Exod 23:20–21).⁹⁵

The *Apocalypse of Abraham* also contains a motif about Yahoel’s unique relationship to the seer’s nourishment. *Apoc. Ab.* 11:1–2 relates the following tradition:

And we went, the two of us alone together, forty days and nights. And I ate no bread and drank no water, because [my] food was to see the angel who was with me, and his speech with me was my drink.⁹⁶

This passage, which recounts the patriarch’s initiatory fast, is preceded by the deity’s order for the seer to abstain from food and drink for forty days and nights.⁹⁷ During this exercise of self-denial, the hero of the faith learns how to be sustained in a new celestial way, now no longer through food and drink, but through his contemplation of the great angel and his words.

It has been proposed that the background of Abraham’s forty-day fast and supernatural nourishment, like Moses’ ordeal, is possibly rooted in the biblical manna motif. Moses’ forty-day test in which he is sustained by the food of the angels has often been set in parallel by early Jewish interpreters to the Israelites’ wandering for forty years in the Egyptian desert, when the people of God were nourished on the food of angels – the manna.⁹⁸ The Septuagint version of Psalm 77(78):25 makes this connection explicit by identifying the manna of the wilderness as the bread of angels.⁹⁹ Wisdom of Solomon 16:20 attests to a similar tradition and in Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities*, Moses himself tells the Israelites that they have eaten the bread of angels for forty years.¹⁰⁰ Later rabbinic sources also understand the manna as an angelic provision.¹⁰¹ The peculiar interaction between Yahoel and Abraham is enveloped in the panoply of motifs drawn from Exodus and Deuteronomy.¹⁰² Considering these references it is possible that Abraham’s wanderings under Yahoel’s guidance,¹⁰³ his fasting for forty days, and his nourishment on otherworldly provisions are comparable to the forty-year ordeal of the Israelites, who under the guidance of the Angel of the Lord were nourished by manna in the wilderness. It is also possible that the *Apocalypse of Abraham* patterns Yahoel’s relationships with Abraham after the Angel of the Lord’s interactions with the Israelites in the wilderness. Another tie between the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and the biblical Angel of the Lord traditions is the imagery of the “voice,” which is found both in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and in Exodus. In Exod 23 God promises to send His angel and commands Israel to obey his voice. The voice also plays a very special role in the *Shem* ideology of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, where

it becomes a crucial apparition of the deity. This is similar to the role that the divine Form, *Kavod*, plays in the visual apocalyptic trend.

Yahoel is a multifaceted mediator of the Name, whose mediation encompasses several onomatological modes. One mode is the investiture of the Name. Interpreters have often neglected this aspect of Yahoel's profile. However, this facet is elucidated through some Hekhalot materials where there is an intriguing portrayal of the enigmatic letters written on Metatron's headgear. In 3 *Enoch* 16 God writes on Metatron's crown "the letters by which heaven and earth were created." Scholars interpret this as God decorating the great angel's crown with the Tetragrammaton. Additionally, in *Sefer Raziel*, "Metatron is 'inscribed' with the letter with which were created heaven and earth."¹⁰⁴

In light of these traditions, Yahoel may not only "personify" the divine Name, but, similarly to Metatron, become "clothed" with the Tetragrammaton. This "clothing with the Name" is intimated through the portrayal of the angel's turban, which is portrayed in our text as reminiscent of a rainbow in the clouds. Gieschen notes that "one part of that physical description indicates that he also bears the divine name outwardly."¹⁰⁵ In a cultic context, the rainbow-like appearance of the priestly headgear has been often interpreted as his decoration with the divine Name.¹⁰⁶ This is because the high priest's golden plate with the Tetragrammaton, which this sacerdotal servant wore on his turban, shone like a rainbow. Jewish and Christian accounts, therefore, often portray divine and angelic priestly figures with the imagery of a rainbow. As one remembers, such symbolism is applied to Yahoel in *Apoc. Ab.* 11:2–3. Considering the high priestly credentials of Yahoel, it is possible that the turban of the great angel, like the high priest's headgear, was also decorated with the divine Name.¹⁰⁷

Interestingly, the rainbow-like appearance of the mediator also occurs in the Metatron tradition. Michael Miller notes that

a *Shi'ur Qomah* passage repeated in *Siddur Rabbah*, *Sefer Raziel* and *Shi'ur Qomah* contains a section which describes the Youth in exactly the same terms that Metatron described God – including his crown bearing the name of Israel, his horns, and his fiery, rainbow-like appearance.¹⁰⁸

Yahoel's influence on later Enoch–Metatron lore also includes his possible role as an angelic or even divine personification of the Name. This is similar to Metatron's office as the "Lesser YHWH."¹⁰⁹ Jean Daniélou lists the *Apocalypse of Abraham* among a very few writings in which "the Name assumes the character of a true hypostasis."¹¹⁰ Several interpreters, including Jarl Fossum, endorsed this theory of Yahoel's hypostatic nature. Fossum argues that

it is quite possible that Yahoel even is regarded as a personification of the divine Name, since his name, יהו אל, is the name of God himself . . . such name as Yahoel seems to have been the original one in the traditions about the angel who is said to be the "Little YHWH"¹¹¹ and to have a name "similar to that of his Master."¹¹²

However, some scholars disagree with Fossum's conclusions. Larry Hurtado has offered a nuanced criticism¹¹³ of Fossum's understanding of Yahoel as a hypostasis of the divine Name, concluding that his hypothesis "appears to exceed the warrants of the text."¹¹⁴ Hurtado argues that, in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*,

Yahoel is not said to be the divine Name but is indwelt by it, which is intended merely to explain the medium of his special power and authority in the heavenly hierarchy. The writer is not speculating about evolution in the deity; he is only explaining the basis for Yahoel's special privileges and capabilities.¹¹⁵

The debate regarding Yahoel's role as the personification of the divine Name and its connection with later Enoch-Metatron developments is important for our study. Thus, it is prudent to draw our attention to several additional features in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, which might point both to Yahoel's unique role as the personification of the divine Name and his possible connection with future onomatological offices of Enoch-Metatron.

The first feature of Yahoel's depiction as the mediator of the Name, which has not received proper scholarly attention, is his designation as "power." In his very first words to the patriarch, the great angel defines himself as a "power" (Slav. *сила*), uttering: "I am a *power* (*сила*) in the midst of the Ineffable who put together his names in me."¹¹⁶ It is significant that the word "power" coincides with the angel's role as the mediator of the Name. But what does Yahoel's designation as a "power" really mean?

One option is that "power" indicates that the divine Name itself is endowed with power.¹¹⁷ Ephraim Urbach notes that, in the ancient world, "the Name was endowed with power. The Name and the Power were synonyms."¹¹⁸ The power of the Name is amply demonstrated by its unique role in the deity's mighty deeds of fashioning and sustaining the entire creation. Power also points to a unique epistemological/ontological conglomerate in which an adept, through his knowledge of the Name, is able to transform reality. With the help of the Tetragrammaton, human and angelic heroes and villains are able to control creation by parting seas or procreating a new race of Giants. In his comments on the potencies of the Tetragrammaton, Charles Gieschen asserts that

a significant aspect of the understanding of the divine Name . . . is an emphasis on its power. This name is not another word among the myriad of words in the human language, but is the most powerful word of the world, even the very word that God spoke to bring the world into existence (Ps 124:8).¹¹⁹

Gieschen further argues that, for example, *Jub.* 36:70 "testifies to the cosmogonic power ascribed to the divine Name as it describes Isaac calling his sons to swear an oath by the name that is responsible for all creation."¹²⁰

Christian exegetes have further perpetuated this understanding of power as well. Daniélou, for example, points out that the conception of the Name as the personal power of God which sustains creation appears in the *Shepherd of Hermas* and other early Christian accounts.¹²¹

Another option is that “power,” in Yahoel’s statement, serves as a definition of the mediatorial agent as an embodiment of the divine presence. Gieschen indicates that, in some Hellenistic materials, “power” is another designation for a heavenly being, including principal angels.¹²² He further notes that early Jewish accounts offer some examples of principal angels being identified as a Power (or “the Power”). Moreover, some of these texts depict angelic “powers” as being endowed with the same functions as the mediators of the divine Name. Gieschen refers to one instance in the *Prayer of Joseph*, where Jacob is described as “a power” and a mediator of the divine Name.¹²³ In the *Prayer of Joseph*, the patriarch is defined as “the archangel of the power of the Lord (ἀρχάγγελος δυνάμεως κυρίου).”¹²⁴ Gieschen argues that the designation, “the archangel of the power of the Lord,” is another way of designating the mediator as “the Power of the Lord.”¹²⁵ It is interesting that in the *Prayer* the terms “archangel” and “power” coincide, alluding to the idea that power is connected to the status of the mediator in the celestial hierarchy. Ithamar Gruenwald suggests that this designation of the angel as a “power” might also indicate his authority. He notices that the reference to Yahoel’s possessing “power,” in virtue of the Ineffable Name dwelling in him,

may be the earliest occurrence of the idea found also in several midrashic sayings that “a tablet with the Name of the Holy One, blessed be He, is engraved on the heart of each angel, and on it the name of the Holy One, blessed be He.” In all likelihood, the idea behind this midrashic saying is that the suffix “el” at the end of the names of many angels indicates not only their divine origin, but also the divine power or authority (*exousia*) which they possess.¹²⁶

The question, however, remains: does Yahoel’s designation as a “power” somehow indicate that Yahoel is understood in our text as the personification of the divine presence? In this respect, it is intriguing that “power” was also used in certain early Jewish and Christian texts to describe divine agents. Gieschen points to Mark 14:62, where Jesus utters: “you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power (τῆς δυνάμεως), and coming with the clouds of heaven.” Here, Gieschen argues that “these words are meant to call to mind the enthronement scene of Dan 7:13–14. Hence, the Power is used here as an alternate designation for the Ancient of Days.”¹²⁷

Yahoel’s designation as a “power” might also elucidate later Metatron developments, wherein the chief angelic protagonist is associated with the same concept. Michael Miller notices that “the *Visions of Ezekiel* 2 lists several names for a mysterious ‘Heavenly Prince,’ giving his fifth name as ‘Metatron,’ like the name of the Power.”¹²⁸ This designation, which conflates “Power” and “Name,”

is interesting, since it might bear the influence of onomatological developments similar to those found in *Apoc. Ab.* 10.

Equipped with the knowledge about two formative mediators of the divine Name in early Jewish lore: the Angel of the Lord and Yahoel, we should now proceed to a close analysis of the onomatological developments found in Enochic, Jacobite, and Mosaic lore.

Enoch as the mediator of the divine Name

From a later Jewish text, *Sefer Noah*, one learns about Enoch's acquisition of the divine Name:

After four generations there arose Enoch b. Yared, and he paid heed to the fear of God. He conducted himself in purity: he would bathe and consecrate himself in running water, and he would plead in supplication before the Creator of all. There was revealed to him in a dream the place within which there was hidden a book, the way how he should apply it, what its use was, and its pure sanctity. He arose early and went to the cave and waited until noon. Due to the intensity of the sun, he brought himself within so that the people of the place did not observe him. He beseeched the Blessed Deity and ascended (to heaven) in purity. He acquired possession of the Pure Name, and at the moment that he understood it, his eyes illuminated all his paths.¹²⁹

Yet, Enoch's association with the divine Name has been attested already in early Enochic booklets. These early testimonies serve as the background for traditions found in later Hekhalot lore where Enoch's heavenly alter ego, Metatron, appears as the Lesser YHWH – the hypostasis of the Tetragrammaton. Often, Enoch's role as the mediator of the divine Name is unfolded through speculations about his heavenly identity. This occurs, for example, in the *Book of the Similitudes*.

Enoch as the Son of Man and his mediation of the divine Name

One of the earliest reflections about Enoch's mediation of the divine Name is in the *Book of the Similitudes*, where his heavenly persona, the Son of Man, is an embodiment of the divine Name. Although this Enochic text is not found among the Qumran fragments of the Enochic writings, the current scholarly consensus is that the book was likely composed before the second century CE.¹³⁰

In *1 Enoch* 48 the Son of Man, who later in the text is identified as Enoch, is portrayed as a preexistent being who received a special "name" by the Lord of Spirits in the primal "hour" before the beginning of creation. *1 Enoch* 48:2–3 reads:

And at that hour that Son of Man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name (was named) before the Head of Days. Even before

the sun and the constellations were created, before the stars of heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits.¹³¹

In relation to this passage, Charles Gieschen proposes that “the name” by which the Son of Man “was named” is the divine Name of the Lord of Spirits, since there are many references to “the name of the Lord of the Spirits” throughout the *Book of the Similitudes*.¹³² Gieschen also draws attention to the verses that follow: “All those who dwell upon the dry ground will fall down and worship before him [the Son of Man], and they will bless, and praise, and celebrate with psalms the Name of the Lord of Spirits” (*1 Enoch* 48:5).¹³³ Scrutinising this obscure language of worship, Gieschen suggests that the crowds “will use the name of the Lord of Spirits in worshiping the Son of Man because both possess the same divine Name.”¹³⁴

The authors of the *Similitudes* develop the Son of Man’s mediatorial profile by relying heavily on the imagery in Dan 7, where the Ancient of Days appears alongside the Son of Man. Scholars have noticed that the association between these two figures receives new significance in the onomatological framework of the *Book of the Similitudes*, solidifying the Son of Man’s ownership of the divine Name.¹³⁵ In light of these developments, Gieschen proposes that references to the “name” of the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 37–71 indicate that he shares the divine Name of the Ancient of Days, the Tetragrammaton.¹³⁶

Another important motif is the connection between the Son of Man’s name and the mysterious demiurgic oath that initiates and sustains creation. Some paradigmatic personifications of the divine Name, including Yahoel, are depicted as sustainers of God’s creation, a feature which illustrates their mediation of the divine knowledge. The Son of Man in the *Similitudes* performs a similar function.

In *1 Enoch* 48:3 the following statement occurs: “Even before the sun and the constellations were created, before the stars of heaven were made, his [the Son of Man’s] name was named before the Lord of Spirits.” It appears that the preexistent “Name” of the Son of Man is endowed with demiurgic functions, because it is closely connected with the demiurgic oath which plays a prominent role in the *Book of the Similitudes*. This connection becomes more transparent in *1 Enoch* 69, which speaks at length about the great oath/name that fashions and sustains creation. *1 Enoch* 69:18–25 relates the following function of the oath/name:

And through that oath the sea was created, and as its foundation, for the time of anger, he placed for it the sand, and it does not go beyond (it) from the creation of the world and forever. . . . And through that oath the sun and the moon complete their course and do not transgress their command from (the creation of) the world and forever. And through that oath the stars complete their course. . . . And this oath is strong over them, and through it they are kept safe, and their paths are kept safe, and their courses are not disturbed.¹³⁷

It is noteworthy that later in the narration, in *1 Enoch* 69:26, the demiurgic “oath” is connected with the Son of Man’s name: “And they had great joy, and they blessed and praised and exalted because the name of that Son of Man had been revealed to them.”¹³⁸ This has led Gieschen to conclude that

the significance of the revealing of the name of the Son of Man becomes readily apparent when one sees the relationship between the divine Name, the oath used in creation, and the name of the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 69.¹³⁹

Enoch–Metatron as the mediator of the divine Name

The portrayal of the seventh antediluvian hero as a mediator and as a hypostasis of the divine Name reaches its conceptual apex in the Enoch–Metatron tradition. Although the critical bulk of the Enoch–Metatron lore is preserved in the Hekhalot composition, known to us as *Sefer Hekhalot* or *3 Enoch*, I previously argued for the conceptual roots of this development in earlier Enochic pseudepigraphical works.¹⁴⁰

Enoch–Metatron’s endowment with distinctive onomatological functions in the Hekhalot literature is not surprising, considering the role that the divine Name plays in the overall conceptual framework of this corpora. Scholars have previously noted that within the scope of Hekhalot texts, the Name is depicted not merely as a simple appellation or convention for the purpose of naming and recognising persons, but “a venerable bearer of power” and “a hypostasis of inherent power and function.”¹⁴¹ As a consequence, the onomatological, mediatorial office of the chief angelic protagonist also stands as the pivotal nexus of the story.

Commenting on Metatron’s association with the divine Name, Michael Miller rightly points out that the mediation of the divine Name is “an integral part of Metatron’s characterization and possibly even his defining feature.”¹⁴² Miller further argues that “in fact Metatron is more commonly referred to as the angel who shares in God’s Name than as the Prince of the Presence, or any other qualification.”¹⁴³ It is quite possible that Metatron exemplifies “rabbinic Judaism’s attempt to personify the divine Name [and] to articulate its presence in an angelic or hypostatic being.”¹⁴⁴

Before we proceed to an in-depth investigation of Enoch–Metatron’s onomatological functions, we should note that his mediation of the Tetragrammaton faithfully follows the conceptual steps that have already been explored in its prototypes – the Angel of the Lord and Yahoel traditions. First, the very name “Metatron,” according to some hypotheses, represents the Tetragrammaton. Second, Metatron appears as the hypostasis of the Name, which his peculiar designation as the Lesser YHWH reflects. He also “internalizes” the Name, similar to figure of the Angel of the Lord. Finally, the Name appears externally on Metatron as he fashions the Tetragrammaton on his heavenly attire and crown. We should now explore these mediatorial dimensions more closely.

Metatron's name as the Tetragrammaton

Despite constant efforts of ancient and modern interpreters to uncover the exact etymology of the name “Metatron,” there is no scholarly consensus regarding the precise meaning of this enigmatic designation. According to some hypotheses, Metatron's name represents the Tetragrammaton. Proponents of this rely on a tradition found in *b. Sanh.* 38b, where Metatron is compared with the Angel of the Lord, concerning whom Exod 23:21 states: “God's name is in him.” Joseph Dan suggests that the name “Metatron” may be connected with the angel's function as the bearer of God's Name. Dan understands “him” in the Exodus passage as a reference to Metatron, suggesting that “he has within himself God's ineffable Name, which gives him his power.”¹⁴⁵ Dan further entertains the possibility that, in view of the phrase “my name is within him,” the name Metatron might be related to the four letters of the divine Name.¹⁴⁶ He observes: “it appears that the reference here is to *tetra*, i.e., the number four in Greek, a four letter word in the middle of the name *Metatron*.”¹⁴⁷

Michael Miller has recently reexamined this etymology thoroughly and concludes that “it would be logical to interpret the name [‘Metatron’] as consisting of the central element *TTR*, plus a prefix and a suffix.”¹⁴⁸ Miller further asserts that

there are two possibilities for the prefix. The prefix *Mi* – may be a concatenation of *min*, meaning “from”; or it may be the word *mi*, meaning “who,” as in the name Michael. The ending *-on* is often found in angels in the Hekhalot literature, e.g., Adiriron, Sandalfon, etc., and it may have diminutive connotations – either way, its use as a suffix is well established.¹⁴⁹

In light of this, Miller concludes that the name “Metatron” “could mean either ‘from Tetragrammaton’ or ‘(the one) who is lesser Tetragrammaton.’”¹⁵⁰ As in the case of Yahoel, whose name includes the Tetragrammaton, Metatron also fashions the divine Name in his own sobriquet.

Metatron and the Angel of the Lord traditions

The Angel of the Lord tradition serves as a formative predecessor for the construction of Enoch–Metatron's onomatological profile. Some interpreters have argued that “the most important element or complex of elements which gave life and endurance to the conception [of Metatron] was the notion of the Angel of YHWH, who bears the divine Name.”¹⁵¹

Indeed, both rabbinic and Hekhalot materials, which narrate Metatron's story, include references to the figure of the Angel of the Lord. This association is an important conceptual device in *b. Sanh.* 38b, where Metatron's name is defined as “similar to his Master, for it is written: For My name is in him.”¹⁵²

Likewise, in *Sefer Hekhalot*, Metatron's endowment with the office of the Lesser YHWH coincides with a reference to the Angel of the Lord tradition from Exodus. Thus, in *3 Enoch* 12:5, the deity called the great angel “the lesser YHWH

in the presence of his whole household in the height as it is written, ‘My name is in him.’”¹⁵³ A similar allusion appears also in *Sefer Zerubbabel*: “Michael, who is (also) Metatron, answered me saying: ‘I am the angel who guided Abraham throughout all the land of Canaan. . . . He placed His name within me.’”¹⁵⁴

The connection of Metatron with the Angel of the Lord remains in later mystical lore. Michael Miller proposes that “Eleazar of Worms must have known these [traditions] for his interpretation the dictum: ‘My Name is in him’ of Metatron, to mean that ‘the great name is inscribed on his heart’ (MS Paris-BN 850, fol. 83b).”¹⁵⁵

Metatron’s investiture with the Name

The external adornment with the divine Name occurs in portrayals of heavenly and earthly mediators of the Tetragrammaton. Frequently, such onomatological embellishments effect the headgear of these figures, such as the turban of the heavenly priest Yahoel or the tiara of the high priest of the Jerusalem Temple. Metatron’s crown is also adorned with the letters of the Tetragrammaton. This endowment holds an initiatory significance, since in *3 Enoch* 12:4–5, the placing of the headdress on Metatron coincides with his designation as the personification of the divine Name.¹⁵⁶

3 Enoch 13 provides a detailed description of Metatron’s crown, which like Yahoel’s headgear, is embellished with the letters of the Tetragrammaton,¹⁵⁷

the letters by which heaven and earth were created; the letters by which seas and rivers were created; the letters by which mountains and hills were created; the letters by which stars and constellations, lightning and wind, thunder and thunderclaps, snow and hail, hurricane and tempest were created; the letters by which all the necessities of the world and all the orders of creation were created.¹⁵⁸

Sefer Hekhalot describes the functions of the Tetragrammaton’s letters in sustaining God’s creation.¹⁵⁹ The demiurgic powers of the letters on Metatron’s crown therefore are reminiscent of the distinguished abilities of Yahoel in relation to the works of creation.

Moreover, as in Yahoel’s story where the angel’s headgear has a distinctive sacerdotal significance, Metatron’s crown evokes memories of the high priestly *ziz*. Like the chief sacerdotal servant’s golden plate, which according to some early Jewish sources shined like stars, moon and sun,¹⁶⁰ each letter on Metatron’s crown “flashed time after time like lightnings, time after time like torches, time after time like flames, time after time like the rising of the sun, moon, and stars.”¹⁶¹

Metatron’s association with the demiurgic letters placed on his forehead remains in later Jewish mystical testimonies. Martin Cohen recalls that in *Sefer Raziel* 260–261 “Metatron is inscribed with the letter (‘ot) with which were created heaven and earth.”¹⁶²

We have already noted that the Tetragrammaton's placement on the foreheads of Yahoel and the high priest was often accompanied by the symbolism of the rainbow. This imagery is also present in the descriptions of Metatron. Nathaniel Deutsch draws attention to the rainbow-like body of Metatron in *Synopse* §398:

When he [the “prince” called Metatron] enters, the great, mighty, and terrible God is praised three times each day. He gives some of his glory to the princes of the Gentiles; the crown on his head is named “Israel.” His body resembles the rainbow, and the rainbow resembles “the appearance of fire all around it” (Ezek 1:27).¹⁶³

Michael Miller also notices that *Siddur Rabbah* and *Sefer Raziel* describe the Youth-Metatron with rainbow-like appearance.¹⁶⁴

Importantly, in these texts not only the forehead but the whole body of the mediator resembles the rainbow, illustrating that, not only his crown, but his entire extent now fashions the divine Name.

Metatron as the lesser YHWH

The most fascinating and unique dimension of Enoch-Metatron's onomastological profile is, of course, his endowment with the office of the Lesser YHWH, יהוה הקטן.¹⁶⁵ This designation occurs with abbreviations several times in *Sefer Hekhalot*, including passages found in *Synopse* §15,¹⁶⁶ §73,¹⁶⁷ and §76.¹⁶⁸ In *Synopse* §15, Enoch-Metatron conveys to R. Ishmael that the deity declared him to be the junior manifestation of his Name in front of all angelic hosts:

the Holy One, blessed be he, fashioned for me a majestic robe . . . and he called me, “The Lesser YHWH” (יְיִ הַקָּטָן) in the presence of his whole household in the height, as it is written, “My name is in him.”¹⁶⁹

As with Enoch-Metatron's other offices, this role is closely connected with the angel's duties in the immediate presence of the deity and as the pivotal conduit of the divine presence. Scholars have previously observed that the name attested in *3 Enoch*, “Lesser YHWH,” is used “as indicative of Metatron's character of representative, *vicarius*, of the Godhead; it expresses a sublimation of his vice-regency¹⁷⁰ into a second manifestation¹⁷¹ of the deity in the name¹⁷² YHWH.”¹⁷³

In his remarks concerning Metatron's activities as God's vice-regent, Christopher Morray-Jones refers to the composite nature of this office, noticing its similarities to the Angel of the Lord tradition. He argues that

as the Angel of the Lord, Metatron functions as the celestial vice-regent who ministers before the throne, supervises the celestial liturgy and officiates over the heavenly hosts. He sits on the throne which is a replica of the throne of Glory and wears a glorious robe like that of God. He functions as the agent of God in the creation, acts as intermediary between heavenly

and lower worlds, is the guide of the ascending visionary, and reveals the celestial secrets to mankind. He is, by delegating divine authority, the ruler and the judge of the world. He is thus a *Logos* figure and an embodiment of the divine Glory. In his *sh'ur qomah*, we are told that Metatron's body, like the *Kabod*, fills the entire world, though the writer is careful to maintain a distinction between Metatron and the Glory of God Himself.¹⁷⁴

Metatron's elevation into a lesser manifestation of the divine Name is accompanied by a panoply of familiar theophanic attributes. Among them are, as Hugo Odeberg lists, the enthronement of Metatron, the conferment upon him of (a part of) the divine Glory, "honor, majesty and splendor," represented by "a garment of glory, robe of honor," and especially "a crown of kingship on which the mystical letters, representing cosmic and celestial agencies are engraved."¹⁷⁵ The sharing of the attributes with the Godhead is significant since, here, like in Yahoel lore, the vice-regent receives the most exalted theophanic attributes of the deity. Peter Schäfer observes that in *Sefer Hekhalot*, Enoch-Metatron stands at the head of all the angels as "lesser YHWH," and is the representation of God. Endowed with the same attributes as God, Metatron, just like the deity, is omniscient.¹⁷⁶

An additional feature that the "Lesser YHWH" shares with the deity is the attribute of the celestial seat, an important symbol of authority. The Aramaic incantation bowl labels Metatron as the Great Prince of God's throne.¹⁷⁷ He is the one who is allowed to sit in heaven, a privilege denied to angels. In the Aher story, this attribute signals Metatron's "divine" status.

Enoch-Metatron's endowment with the familiar theophanic attributes of the deity alludes to his role as the embodiment of the divine presence and theophanic knowledge, which is very similar to the *imago Dei* traditions. Some passages that speak about the angel's role as the lesser YHWH also evoke his role as the mediator of the divine presence and divine knowledge. A conceptual constellation, which includes Enoch-Metatron's titles "the lesser YHWH," "the Prince of the Divine Presence," and "the knower of secrets" is repeated in many texts. The conglomeration of Enoch-Metatron's titles occurs, for example, in *3 Enoch* 48C:7:

I made honor, majesty, and glory his garment; beauty, pride, and strength, his outer robe, and a kingly crown, 500 times 500 parasangs, his diadem. I bestowed on him some of my majesty, some of my magnificence, some of the splendor of my glory, which is on the throne of glory, and I called him by my name, "The lesser YHWH, Prince of the Divine Presence, knower of secrets." Every secret I have revealed to him in love, every mystery I have made known to him in uprightness.¹⁷⁸

Here, the lesser YHWH's endowment with the attributes of the divine Glory coincides with his mediation of the divine presence and his proficiency in "every secret." *3 Enoch* 48C:7 curiously links these functions in the three titles of Enoch-Metatron: "The lesser YHWH, Prince of the Divine Presence, knower of secrets."

A similar collection of the three titles is found in the *Alphabet of the Rabbi Akiva*: “I addressed him with My name, the ‘lesser YHWH,’ Prince of the Presence and Knower of Mysteries. I revealed to him every mystery in love, and each and every esoteric secret I communicated to him.”¹⁷⁹ Metatron’s roles as the “Prince of the Presence” and the Knower of Mysteries are associated with his role as the lesser Tetragrammaton also in *Bereshit Rabbati* (ed. Albeck):

He took Enoch b. Yared . . . He gave him some of His majesty and some of the splendor of His glory associated with the throne of Glory and called his name “the lesser YHWH,” Prince of the Presence and Knower of Mysteries.¹⁸⁰

The clusters of Metatron’s titles, which include “name,” “presence,” and “knowledge” illustrate the epistemological dimension of the divine Name’s mediation, in which the hypostatic Name becomes a conduit of the theophanic knowledge. Appearances of the divine Name’s hypostases, similar to their *imago Dei* counterparts, are often presented as theophanies. We witness this in all accounts of onomatological mediators, including the stories of the Angel of the Lord, Yahoel, and Enoch-Metatron.

Returning to the Lesser YHWH tradition, we must note that some interpreters postulate that the title is rooted in the Yahoel figure. For example, Scholem claims that

Jewish speculation about Metatron as the highest angel who bears, in a way, the name of God, and who is called . . . the Lesser Tetragrammaton, was preceded by an earlier stage in which this Angel on High was not called Metatron, but Yahoel; a fact which explains the talmudic references to Metatron much more convincingly than any of the older attempts.¹⁸¹

He further argues that the statement found in *b. Sanh.* 38b, according to which Metatron has a name “like the name of his Master” is incomprehensible unless it is understood as a reference to the name Yahoel.¹⁸²

The Name and power

In the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, Yahoel’s presentation as the mediator of the divine Name occurs alongside his designation as a “power.” In his first words to the patriarch, the great angel describes himself as a “power” (Slav. *сила*), uttering the following enigmatic statement: “I am a *power* (*сила*) in the midst of the Ineffable who put together his names in me.”¹⁸³

It is significant that the word “power” is juxtaposed with the mediator’s onomatological definition. A similar juxtaposition occurs in Metatron lore. In the *Visions of Ezekiel*, Metatron is defined both as the Name and the Power: “Eleazar of Nadwad says: Metatron, like the name of the Power.”¹⁸⁴ Here, Metatron’s name represents the Tetragrammaton and therefore demonstrates the ultimate power. According to Karl Grözinger, in Hekhalot literature “the

name is nothing else but a functional concentration of power.”¹⁸⁵ Grözinger further proposes that the angelic figure “is nothing else than the function expressed in its name, a hypostasis of this function.”¹⁸⁶ In this light, Metatron, by virtue of his possession of the seventy names that signify the fullness of his mediation of the Name, has fullness of power. Grözinger reflects that

the fragments and splinters of tradition of the Hekhalot literature tell about celestial powers whose authority falls only a little behind the authority of the supreme Godhead, and who are even ascribed a share in the work of creation. . . . Primary among them is Enoch–Metatron who, according to several texts, has been endowed with extraordinary fullness of power. The depicted onomatological theology could evidently express this fullness of power adequately only by stating that the highest deity gives some of its own names away because the participation God’s Name is participation in God’s power, and thus in the deity itself. Therefore the fullness of power of Metatron expresses itself above all the fact that he obtains seventy names from the seventy names of God, or – in a somewhat different diction – that the Name of God is dormant in him, or that his name is like the Name of his Lord. It should not then surprise us that this finds its most concrete and logical expression in the name *Adonay Ha-Qatan*.¹⁸⁷

Metatron’s onomatological profile accommodates almost all the elements previously encountered in our investigation of Yahoel. Similar to Yahoel, Metatron’s unique name represents the Tetragrammaton. In addition, like in Yahoel lore, Metatron’s presentation in various materials includes allusions and direct references to the Angel of the Lord traditions. Metatron’s accoutrement, similar to Yahoel’s attire, is decorated with the divine Name and he is an embodiment of the Tetragrammaton, designated as the lesser YHWH.

Metatron as the revealer of the Name

One of the most important aspects of Enoch–Metatron’s mediation of the divine Name connects to his revelation of the Tetragrammaton. In the view of the Name’s association with the divine knowledge and especially with the Torah, these disclosures are conceptual counterparts to the apodictic revelation of divine mysteries in stories about the eschatological *imago Dei*. In these onomatological currents, the divine Name, embodied in a translated or other-worldly figure, often came to be understood as an epistemological organism or a “statue” of knowledge, similar to the personified image of God.

In Hekhalot and *Shi’ur Qomah* sources, Enoch’s heavenly alter ego, the supreme angel Metatron, reveals the divine Name in several ways. One such disclosure appears in a passage from *Synopse* §390:

One *hayyah* rises above the seraphim and descends upon the tabernacle of the youth whose name is Metatron, and speaks with a loud voice. A voice of sheer silence. . . . Suddenly the angels fall silent. The watchers and holy

ones become quiet. They are silent, and are pushed into the river of fire. The *hayyot* put their faces on the ground, and this youth whose name is Metatron brings the fire of deafness and puts it into their ears so that they could not hear the sound of God's speech or the ineffable name. The youth whose name is Metatron then invokes, in seven voices his living, pure, honored, awesome . . . name.¹⁸⁸

This passage illustrates how the divine knowledge through the Ineffable Name is revealed to creation. The transmission of this ultimate knowledge is paradoxical because it renders the disclosure as both a revelation and a concealment. Before the uttering of the Name, Metatron performs the mysterious ritual by putting the fire of deafness into the ears of the *Hayyot*.¹⁸⁹ This passage also indicates that Metatron not only protects and prepares the heavenly hosts for praising the deity,¹⁹⁰ but he himself conducts the liturgical ceremony by invoking the divine Name. Putting the deafening fire in the ears of the angels is similar to the visual danger motif, already mentioned in our analysis of the Mosaic and Enochic stories about the divine Face. Metatron not only mitigates the audial presence of the deity, he also expresses it by uttering the divine Name. In this revelatory framework, the Tetragrammaton, which is embodied visually in Metatron and expressed by him audibly, corresponds to the visual and aural "icons" of the divine presence. This passage underlines the extraordinary scope of Metatron's abilities to express the aural presence of God which allows him to invoke the deity's Name in seven voices. Because of his office as the mediator and even embodiment of the Tetragrammaton, it is not surprising that it is Metatron who invokes the divine Name during the celestial liturgy. The liturgical setting serves as the theophanic nexus in which Metatron's external and internal potentials in the divine Name's mediation reach their threshold.

Another aspect of Metatron's mediation of the divine Name involves understanding the Tetragrammaton as the Torah. Thus, in several Hekhalot passages Metatron transmits the Name (or a combination of the seventy names that constitute the divine Name) to the generation of future sages in a fashion reminiscent of *Pirke Avot* and *Avot de-Rabbi Nathan*, which describe the transmission of the Torah. In *Synopse* §80 (3 *Enoch* 48D:10), the Torah is the combination of divine names passed through a familiar mishnaic chain of the Torah's transmission. Similar testimonies occur in *Synopse* §397 and *Synopse* §734.¹⁹¹ In these passages, Metatron transmits the Torah to Moses in the form of seventy names that represent the fullness of the divine Name. Moshe Idel notes that, in Jewish mystical tradition, the Torah is sometimes understood as an anthropomorphic organism representing a name of God (or a series of divine names).¹⁹²

In his comment on *Synopse* §397, Peter Schäfer notices the paradoxical exchange of the Torah for the divine Name. He observes that here we have "a new version of *m. Avot* 1:1," but

instead of the Torah that Moses received on Mount Sinai, he now receives the "great name" and transmits it to Joshua, the elders, the prophets, the

members of the great assembly, and finally to Ezra and to Hillel, after which the Name was concealed.¹⁹³

Schäfer remarks that

this is not only an odd retelling of the famous chain of transmission in *Pirkei Avot*, with the “name” substituting the Torah; what is most remarkable is the fact that the scribes of our manuscripts do not agree on whose name is meant: God’s or Metatron’s.¹⁹⁴

Yet, in light of the aforementioned mediatorial offices of Enoch–Metatron, such a reinterpretation is appropriate, since it fits nicely in the onomatological profile of this distinguished mediator of the Name who himself becomes the “embodiment” of the Torah. *Sefer Hekhalot* 48D appears to support this idea that the “seventy names,” representing the Torah revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai, are fashioned in Metatron.¹⁹⁵

Jacob as the mediator of the divine Name

The biblical traditions about the Angel of the Lord have exercised a lasting influence on subsequent onomatological currents. Some traditions concerning the patriarch Jacob bear signs of having been influenced by this formative blueprint. The impact of this trend might be implicitly present in the *Prayer of Joseph*. The text portrays Jacob’s heavenly identity as a high-ranking angelic servant. Explaining his superiority to other angelic beings, the patriarch utters the following cryptic statement:

I told him his name and what rank he held among the sons of God. “Are you not Uriel, the eighth after me? And I, Israel, the archangel of the power of the Lord and the chief captain among the sons of God? Am I not Israel, the first minister before the face of God? *And I called upon my God by the inextinguishable name* (καὶ ἐπεκαλεσάμην ἐν ὀνόματι ἀσβέστω τὸν θεὸν μου).”¹⁹⁶

Richard Hayward suggests that in this passage Jacob serves as the high priest, a special sacerdotal servant who mediates the divine Name. He notes that

the *Prayer* describes Israel as first λειτουργός before God, who invokes the Divine Name. This very probably has high priestly connotations. Philo in *De Som.* II. 231 speaks of the high priest as representative of Israel ministering in the Temple Service on Yom Kippur (when, famously, the Divine Name was shouted aloud) as a λειτουργός who is neither man nor God, but occupying an intermediate rank.¹⁹⁷

Jacob–Israel stands as the first minister before the deity’s face who calls upon God using his inextinguishable Name. This recalls Metatron’s duties, which

include invoking the Tetragrammaton in some Hekhalot and *Shi'ur Qomah* accounts.¹⁹⁸ In fact, scholars have argued that in the *Prayer of Joseph*, Jacob-Israel might possess the divine Name and personify it in the form of the Angel of YHWH. Fossum, for example, proposes that in the *Prayer of Joseph*

we find a pre-existent angel called “Jacob” and “Israel,” who claims superiority over the angel Uriel on the basis of his victory in personal combat where he availed himself of the divine Name. The angelic name “Israel,” explained as אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, is among the names of the many-named intermediaries in Philo’s works,¹⁹⁹ and, in one of the passages where Philo presents this name as one of the designations of the intermediary, he also says that the “Name of God” is among the appellations of this being.²⁰⁰

Fossum further suggests that in some Jewish and Christian circles, “Israel” apparently was one of the names of the Angel of the Lord. He refers to Justin Martyr’s testimony where the name “Israel” is one of the names of the Son that appeared under the old dispensation.²⁰¹ Fossum brings into the discussion another passage in Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho* 75:2,²⁰² which identifies the Angel of the Lord in Exod 23:20 as Jesus, stating that he was also called “Israel,” since he bestowed this very name upon Jacob.²⁰³

Likewise, Alan Segal argues that the text presents

an archangel of the power of the people of God who is called Israel and is also identified with the patriarch Jacob. He was created before all the works of creation and claims ascendancy over Uriel on the basis of his victory in personal combat by which he ostensibly possesses the divine name.²⁰⁴

Charles Gieschen also determines that the evidence found in the *Prayer* leads to the conclusion that this angel, who represents the heavenly identity of Jacob, “was understood to be the Angel of the Lord and more specifically the divine Name Angel of Exod 23:20.”²⁰⁵

Moses as the mediator of the divine Name

Later rabbinic accounts frequently depict Moses as a distinguished operator of the divine Name, who is able to part the Red Sea or destroy Israel’s enemies with the help of the Tetragrammaton. It is possible that these testimonies represent not merely later rabbinic fantasies but instead have their early conceptual roots in certain Second Temple Jewish materials. Already in the Hebrew Bible Moses receives the revelation of the divine Name. Although in this disclosure from the burning bush found in Exod 3, the deity reveals himself as *Ehyeh Asher Ehyeh*, an expression usually translated as either “I will be what I will be,” or “I am who I am,” experts believe that this designation is connected with the Tetragrammaton.²⁰⁶ In Exod 33 another important onomatological reference can be found, when in response to Moses’ plea to God to show him His Glory, the deity promises instead to proclaim his Name before the prophet.²⁰⁷ Here,

there is a subtle tension between the two paradigms of the divine presence, visual and aural, with their corresponding symbols, manifested through the divine Glory and the divine Name.

Moses' association with the divine Name is also elaborated in early Jewish extra-biblical accounts. Gedaliahu Stroumsa references a fragment of Artapanus' Greek romance devoted to biblical figures, which was probably written in the late third or early second century BCE. Fragment 3, preserved in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*, relates the following encounter between Moses and the Pharaoh:

Startled at what happened, the king ordered Moses to declare the name of the god who had sent him. He did this scoffingly. Moses bent over and spoke into the king's ear, but when the king heard it, he fell over speechless. But Moses picked him up and he came back to life again.²⁰⁸

Regarding the sudden fainting of the Egyptian monarch, Stroumsa suggests that "this passage reflects the magical power of the divine Name, and of he who utters it. Moses . . . is such a powerful magician because he knows the Name."²⁰⁹ Interpreters also argue that Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 2.275–276 might attest to a similar tradition concerning the magical power of the divine Name.²¹⁰ There, one finds the following deliberation:

Moses, unable to doubt the promises of the deity, after having seen and heard such confirmation of them, prayed and entreated that he might be vouchsafed this power in Egypt; he also besought Him not to deny him the knowledge of His name, but, since he had been granted speech with Him and vision of Him, further to tell him how He should be addressed, so that, when sacrificing, he might invoke Him by name to be present at the sacred rites. Then God revealed to him His name, which ere then had not come to men's ears, and of which I am forbidden to speak. Moreover, Moses found those miracles at his service not on that occasion only but at all times whensoever there was need of them; from all which tokens he came to trust more firmly in the oracle from the fire, to believe that God would be his gracious protector, and to hope to be able to deliver his people and to bring disaster upon the Egyptians.²¹¹

John Gager highlights that, in this passage, "the relationship between the revelation of the divine Name and the performance of miracles . . . is patently clear."²¹²

The tradition of Moses' use of the divine Name for magical purposes has a long afterlife in later Jewish lore and often appears in several midrashic compositions.²¹³ Some rabbinic sources postulate that the son of Amram was able to kill an Egyptian by uttering the Tetragrammaton.²¹⁴ *Avot de-Rabbi Nathan A:20* recounts the following tradition:

Another interpretation of the statement, my mother's sons were angry against me: this refers to Moses, who killed the Egyptian. For it is said.

And it came to pass in those days, when Moses had grown up, that he went out to his brethren and looked on their burdens. And he looked this way and that, and when he saw that there was no man, he killed the Egyptian and hid him in the sand (Exod 2:11). Why does Scripture say, there was no man? It teaches that Moses called into session sanhedrin-courts made up of ministering angels, and he said to them, "Shall I kill this man?" They said to him, "Kill him." Did he kill him with a sword? Was it not merely by a spoken word that he killed him? For it is said. Do you speak to kill me, as you killed the Egyptian (Exod 2:14). This teaches that he killed him by invoking the divine name.²¹⁵

Here, the life of a human being is taken by the invocation of the divine Name. A similar legend is attested in *Lev. Rab.* 32:4:

When he saw that there was no man, he smote the Egyptian. R. Judah, R. Nehemiah, and our Rabbis differ on the interpretation of this. R. Judah says: He saw that there was none to stand up and display zeal in the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, so he slew him himself. R. Nehemiah says: He saw that there was none to stand up and utter the Ineffable Name against him, so he slew him.²¹⁶

In rabbinic lore, Moses also performs several miracles with his staff engraved with the divine Name.²¹⁷ A prominent instance is parting the Red Sea in Exod 14. Although Exod 14:21 states that Moses merely stretched out his hand over the sea,²¹⁸ later rabbinic rewritings enhance the story by postulating that it was his rod engraved with the divine Name that caused the sea to be driven back. For instance, in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on Exod 14:21, the following tradition is found:

And Moses inclined his hand over the sea, holding the great and glorious rod that had been created in the beginning, and on which the great and glorious Name was clearly inscribed, as well as the ten signs with which he had smitten the Egyptians, the three fathers of the world, the six matriarchs, and the twelve tribes of Jacob. And immediately the Lord drove back the sea with a strong east wind all the night, and he turned the sea into dry land. And the waters were split into twelve divisions, corresponding to the twelve tribes of Jacob.²¹⁹

Another example of Moses' use of the power of the divine Name is found in *Deuteronomy Rabbah*, where the prophet fights an antagonistic spiritual power with his rod decorated with the Tetragrammaton,²²⁰ causing Sammael to flee. *Deut. Rab.* 11:10 reads:

God commanded Sammael, "Go, and bring Moses' soul." Straightway he drew his sword from the sheath and placed himself at the side of Moses. Immediately Moses became wroth, and taking hold of the staff on which

was engraved the Ineffable Name he fell upon Sammael with all his strength until he fled from before him, and he pursued him with the Ineffable Name and removed the beam of glory [halo] from between his eyes and blinded him. Thus much did Moses achieve.²²¹

In *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on Exod 15:23–25 Moses sweetens the water of Marah with the divine Name:

They came to Marah, but they could not drink the water of Marah, because it was bitter. That is why it was named Marah. And the people murmured against Moses, saying, “What shall we drink?” So he prayed before the Lord, and the Lord showed him a bitter oleander tree. He wrote the great and glorious Name on it and threw (it) into the water, and the water became sweet.²²²

Additionally, in *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*, Moses recovers Joseph’s coffin with the help of the divine Name. *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*, Beshalah 1 on Exod 13:18 reads:

But how did Moses know where Joseph was buried? It is told that Serah, the daughter of Asher, survived from that generation and she showed Moses the grave of Joseph. She said to him: The Egyptians put him into a metal coffin which they sunk in the Nile. So Moses went and stood by the Nile. He took a table of gold on which he engraved the Tetragrammaton, and throwing it into the Nile, he cried out and said: “Joseph son of Jacob! The oath to redeem his children, which God swore to our father Abraham, has reached its fulfillment. If you come up, well and good. But if not, we shall be guiltless of your oath.” Immediately Joseph’s coffin came to the surface, and Moses took it.²²³

In all of these instances, mighty acts are performed through the power of the divine Name and they demonstrate the Name’s repeated ability to “unlock” the works of creation and interfere with the established processes in the created order.

Although the story of Moses’ reception of the divine Name was already attested in the biblical accounts, later Jewish and Samaritan traditions attempt to embellish this significant event by rendering it, not merely as his reception of or operation with the Tetragrammaton but as an investiture with the Name.²²⁴ In these traditions, Moses becomes not merely an onomatological operator, but likely, similar to Enoch and Jacob, an embodiment of the divine Name. The possibility of Moses’ endowment with this role receives additional support from Enoch–Metatron’s and Yahoel’s portrayals where the mediators of the Name fashion onomatological regalia on their headdresses and accoutrements. The motif of Moses’ clothing being decorated with the divine Name is most extensively elaborated on in Samaritan materials, including the compilation *Memar Marqah*.²²⁵ From the very first chapter of this document, one learns that

the deity himself announced to the great prophet that he will be “vested” with the divine Name.²²⁶ Several other passages of *Memar Marqah* affirm this striking clothing endeavor.²²⁷

The investiture of the Tetragrammaton in the Samaritan materials, similar to Yahoel’s and Metatron’s stories, entails a coronation ritual using the divine Name.²²⁸ Thus, *Memar Marqah* 1:9 recounts the following actions of the deity:

On the first day I created heaven and earth; on the second day I spread out the firmament on high; on the third day I prepared a dish and gathered into it all kinds of good things; on the fourth day I established signs, fixing times, completing my greatness; on the fifth day I revealed many marvels from the waters; on the sixth day I caused to come up out of the ground various living creatures; on the seventh day I perfected holiness. I rested in it in my own glory. I made it my special portion. I was glorious in it. I established your name then also – my name and yours therein as one, for I established it and you are crowned with it.²²⁹

Here, Moses’ coronation, like Metatron’s, is surrounded with peculiar creational imagery, where the letters on both headdresses are demiurgic tools that make heaven and earth. In *3 Enoch* 13 the deity will write with his finger, “as with a pen of flame,” upon Metatron’s crown, “the letters by which heaven and earth were created.” This crowning with demiurgic instruments, represented by the letters of the divine Name, offers the recipient the ability to understand the highest mysteries of creation and the power to control the entire creation.²³⁰

It is possible that the investiture with the divine Name occurs in another Mosaic account – the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian. There, Moses acquires the mysterious crown. Immediately after its reception, he is suddenly able to comprehend the secrets of creation and to control the created order. *Exagoge* 75–80 relates the following:

Then he gave me a royal crown and got up from the throne. I beheld the whole earth all around and saw beneath the earth and above the heavens. A multitude of stars fell before my knees and I counted them all.²³¹

Here, crowned, Moses has immediate access to all the created realms, “beneath the earth and above the heaven,” and the stars now kneel before a newly initiated demiurgic agent. Although the divine Name is not mentioned in this Mosaic narrative, it is possible that, because of these peculiar features, the seer’s transformation coincides with his endowment with the divine Name.

Transformations of the adepts

In our investigation of the *imago Dei* traditions, we witnessed how the eschatological embodiments of the divine image in the biblical patriarchs and prophets transformed human adepts by preparing their ontology to acquire theophanic

knowledge. Similar routines occur in other apocalyptic accounts affected by the *Shem* paradigm, where the human adepts are “nourished” on the embodied divine presence through the Name’s hypostases. We must now look more closely at two important specimens of this acquisition of the divine knowledge in the *Shem* paradigm in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and *Joseph and Aseneth*.

Our previous analysis demonstrated that spiritual nourishment with God’s Glory played a significant role in the Mosaic traditions. By feeding on the Shekinah’s luster, Moses and his companions proleptically foreshadow the eschatological condition of humankind, in which earthly creatures, like the angels, will be again sustained by the divine presence. This motif receives a prominent after-life not only in the visual *Kavod* tradition but also in the aural *Shem* paradigm where the embodiments of the divine Name often provide heavenly sustenance for their human adepts. One of the specimens of such supernatural feeding appears in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, where the hypostasis of the divine Name in the form of Yahoel delivers heavenly sustenance for Abraham. Like in the paradigmatic Moses’ story, in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the celestial nourishment occurs during the seer’s ascetic practice of his forty-day fast. *Apoc. Ab.* 9:7 provides details of this fasting ordeal when God commands Abraham that he must “for forty days abstain from every food which issues from fire, and from the drinking of wine, and from anointing [yourself] with oil.”²³² The patriarch’s abstinence from human food mimics here the biblical fast of the son of Amram. Yet, unlike in the Mosaic tradition where the seer is sustained through the luminous presence of God’s Glory, here the adept is fed on the angelic hypostasis of the divine Name.

A similar event, in which celestial nourishment unfolds in the midst of a protagonist’s ascetic practices, occurs in *Joseph and Aseneth*. Like Moses and Abraham, the hero of the story, Aseneth, fasts and then receives nourishment through the angelic personification of the divine Name.²³³

The celestial initiations of Abraham and Aseneth are strikingly similar. Like in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, in *Joseph and Aseneth*, the adept’s nourishment comes from the hypostasis of the divine Name.²³⁴ This is evident from the depictions of the chief angelic protagonists of each account, the celestial agents responsible for initiating the respective seers. Yahoel’s credentials lie on the surface because the *Apocalypse of Abraham* defines him as the mediation of “my [God’s] ineffable name (неизрекомаго имени моего).”²³⁵ However, even apart from the explanation of the guide’s office, the peculiar designation “Yahoel” (Slav. Иаоиль), itself unequivocally denotes the angel as the embodiment of the divine Name. Abraham, therefore, is not merely sustained by the vision and the audition of the angelic being, but he is nourished by the personification of the divine Name.

Joseph and Aseneth also depicts the human seer as being fed by the Angel of the Name. Ross Kramer suggests that “the designation of the angelic double of Joseph . . . is probably closely associated, if not to be identified, with the Name-Bearing Angel.”²³⁶

The *Shem* features of the angels are further revealed in their particular operations. Thus, the audial *Shem* aspect of both angelic operators became

manifested in the fact that supernatural nourishment comes from their *mouths*. In the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the patriarch receives his unconventional provision from the mouth of Yahoel when the speech of the great angel serves as Abraham's drink. The aural aspect of nourishment is also present in *Joseph and Aseneth*, specifically, through Aseneth's repeated affirmations about the provenance of the honeycomb from the mouth of the celestial being.²³⁷ *Jos. Asen.* 16:8–10, for instance, reads:

And the comb was big and white as snow and full of honey. And that honey was like dew from heaven and its exhalation like breath of life. And Aseneth wondered and said in herself, Did then this comb come out of the man's mouth, because its exhalation is like the breath of this man's mouth?²³⁸

Also, *Jos. Asen.* 16:11 provides a similar affirmation of the aural source of the angelic food:

And Aseneth was afraid and said, "Lord, I did not have a honeycomb in my storeroom at any time, but you spoke and it came into being. Surely this came out of your mouth, because its exhalation is like breath of your mouth."²³⁹

Some interpreters suggest that the provenance of the angelic food in *Joseph and Aseneth*, which comes from the mouth of the celestial being, has roots in biblical manna traditions. According to Andrea Lieber,

The association of the honeycomb with manna is explicit: it was like dew from heaven, white like snow, containing the breath of life. Indeed the honeycomb, like manna, is identified with the "word" of the angel – the *anthropos* spoke and the comb came from his angelic mouth.²⁴⁰

In Deuteronomy, the manna tradition has been reinterpreted in the terms of the aural paradigm when the symbolism of heavenly nourishment was juxtaposed with the imagery of the word coming from the Deity's mouth. In Deut 8:3, we find the following tradition:

He humbled you by letting you hunger, then by feeding you with manna, with which neither you nor your ancestors were acquainted, in order to make you understand that one does not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of the Lord.²⁴¹

Given that the Book of Deuteronomy served as the bedrock for the *Shem* paradigm, the fact that such a striking aural reformulation comes from this biblical text is not coincidental.²⁴² Indeed, it appears that the peculiar transformations of the Egyptian maiden and the Jewish patriarch found in *Joseph and Aseneth* and the *Apocalypse of Abraham* are profoundly affected by the divine Name ideology

as the natures of both visionaries are reconstituted because of nourishment that is associated with the Tetragrammaton. Moreover, the transformation is also executed aurally, that is to say, from the mouth of the angel of the Name to the mouth of an earthly creature. In the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the patriarch drinks the words coming from the mouth of Yahoel and is fed by the sight of the divine Name's hypostasis. In *Joseph and Aseneth*, similarly, the heavenly Man, who bears some characteristics of the Angel of the Name, puts the angelic food that originated from his mouth into the mouth of the female seer.

If, in these two pseudepigraphical stories, the human seers are indeed transformed through ingesting the divine Name, these initiatory practices, like in the accounts about the *imago Dei*, can be traced to ancient Near Eastern traditions of vivification of the cultic statues. Aseneth's partaking of the celestial food is reminiscent of certain Jewish practices, through which cultic images are given life by placing the divine Name in their mouths. These rituals are rooted in ancient Mesopotamian animation ceremonies of cultic statues known as the rites of the "washing of the mouth" (*mīs pī*) and the "opening of the mouth" (*pīt pī*).²⁴³ Some scholars argue that these trends exercised a formative influence on some later Hermetic²⁴⁴ traditions and Kabbalistic stories about the creation of the artificial humanoid.²⁴⁵ In these materials the Near Eastern and Egyptian rites of the cultic statues' vivification were projected into the protological biblical motifs including the story of Adam's creation.

In this respect, it appears to be not coincidental that Abraham's and Aseneth's metamorphoses, effected through the mouth of the celestial beings, are replete with familiar protological symbolism, reminiscent of the *imago Dei* traditions. These transformational accounts appear to replicate creation of humankind when the spirit of life was blown from the mouth of the deity into the mouth of the lifeless human body that was molded from the dust of the earth. Adam's vivification has often been linked to the rites of the "washing of the mouth" and the "opening of the mouth." Andreas Schüle points out that "looking at the process of the *mīs pī* ritual one might in fact be reminded of Gen 2."²⁴⁶ Similarly, Catherine Leigh Beckerleg suggests that

Gen 2:5–3:24 seems to describe the creation of the first man in terms reminiscent of the creation of a divine image in the *mīs pī* and *pīt pī* rituals. There are parallels among them in content, overall progression, and, to some extent, purpose, suggesting that, despite the absence of the terms *šelem* and *demut*, Gen 2:5–3:24 implicitly presents the idea that the first man was, on some level, an "image of God."²⁴⁷

Another scholar, Herbert Niehr, also thinks that "the ritual of vivifying the cult statue was transferred to man in Gen 2."²⁴⁸ Bringing Adam into existence with the "breath of life" in Gen 2:7 is especially important in this respect, because it is the pivotal event of the vivification ritual. Beckerleg, following H.-P. Müller's²⁴⁹ and A. Berlejung's²⁵⁰ insights, postulates that "Gen 2:7, where man is quickened by Yahweh's breath of life, reflects the Yahwist's familiarity with the

mouth-washing and/or mouth-opening ceremony, or at least with the idea that a divine image could be activated by manipulating its sensory organs.”²⁵¹

The Adamic connections are even more distinctive in *Joseph and Aseneth*, in which the angelic food, the honeycomb, is compared to the spirit of life. Through the ingestion of the divine Name, the protagonists of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and *Joseph and Aseneth* perform the *Shem* version of the initiation into the role of the eschatological image of God where the human adept will regain his or her prelapsarian condition.²⁵² In vivifications of the eschatological “statues” of Aseneth and Abraham there is a curious interplay of the divine image and the divine Name traditions, when the human adepts regain their prelapsarian state with the help of the hypostasised divine Name.

We encounter the *imago Dei*'s counterpart of these initiations in *2 Enoch* when the elders of the earth are glorified before the eschatological image in the form of the seventh antediluvian hero. Vivifications of Abraham and Aseneth also recall later Jewish Golem legends in which the lifeless body of the artificial humanoid is “vivified” when God’s Name is inserted into his mouth.²⁵³ It appears to be not coincidental that the theme of the vivification of human “idols” is juxtaposed in both pseudepigraphical accounts with the rejection of the idolatrous cultic images made not from human flesh and blood but from wood and stone. It is intriguing that in *Joseph and Aseneth* as well as in *Apocalypse of Abraham* the theme of celestial nourishment appears in the midst of the adepts’ fight with idolatry. Interestingly, both protagonists are initially portrayed as idolaters, which creates a meaningful cultic context. In the beginning of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, for instance, Abraham manufactures idols and participates in the idolatrous worship. Aseneth, too, is portrayed as an idol worshiper at the beginning of the narrative. *Jos. Asen.* 8 states that Aseneth’s lips were defiled because she “blesses with her mouth dead and dumb idols.”²⁵⁴ Later, however, she, like Abraham, destroys her idols.²⁵⁵ Through their destruction of the old divine images, both adepts release a symbolic space for new cultic “statues,” now in the form of the pseudepigraphical exemplars.

Concluding this chapter of our study we must state that our analysis of the *Shem* paradigm and its mediators revealed remarkable parallels to the *imago Dei* trend. Similar to the divine image traditions, the personification of the divine Name by the pseudepigraphical exemplars reflects a process of the mediation of God’s presence and divine theophanic knowledge. By embodying the divine Name, the pseudepigraphical exemplars in the form of Enoch, Jacob, and Moses fulfill an epistemological role. It is significant that the acquisition of this role unfolds in a distinctive cultic context which, like in the *imago Dei* traditions, is reminiscent of the Near Eastern traditions of the divine presence’s cultivation.

Notes

- 1 Benjamin Sommer points out that “where other biblical texts put God, Deuteronomy puts words that came from God.” Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 100.
- 2 Michael Miller notes that “the Name of God is the most holy aspect of existence, the single word which cannot be spoken and sometimes seems even to replace God as the

foundation of reality.” M. T. Miller, *The Name of God in Jewish Thought: A Philosophical Analysis of Mystical Traditions from Apocalyptic to Kabbalah* (New York: Routledge, 2015) 1.

- 3 In some Jewish traditions, God’s Name encapsulates the comprehensive knowledge about its owner’s ontology. Joseph Dan argues that “the holy name of God is not an expression of the divine: it is the essence of divinity itself. It is not revelation, it is the Revealer. It is not the instrument of creation, but the Creator.” J. Dan, “The Name of God, the Name of the Rose, and the Concept of Language in Jewish Mysticism,” *Medieval Encounters* 3 (1996) 228–248 at 229. Walther Eichrodt notes that

when it is believed that the nature of a thing is comprehended in its name, then on the one hand emphasis is laid on the idea that knowledge of the name mediates a direct relationship with the nature, and on the other the name is regarded as to such an extent an expression of the individual character of its owner that it can, in fact, stand for him, become a concept interchangeable with him.

W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2 vols., The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967) 2.40

- 4 In later Jewish traditions, the divine Name is envisioned not only as the ultimate divine knowledge, but as the initial source of all knowledge. Scholem observes that in these traditions the name of God is

the metaphysical origin of all language. . . . The language of God, which is crystallized in the name of God and, . . . in the one single name itself, which is its center, is the basis of all spoken language, in which it is reflected and symbolically manifest.

Scholem, “The Name of God and the Linguistic Theory of the Kabbalah,” 63

- 5 S. M. McDonough, *YHWH at Patmos: Rev. 1:4 in Its Hellenistic and Early Jewish Setting*, WUNT, 2.107 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999) 123.
- 6 T. N. Mettinger, *In Search of God: The Meaning and Message of the Everlasting Names* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) 42.
- 7 McDonough argues that “in both the OT and early Judaism, the name served as a way of emphasizing both God’s presence with his people and his transcendence of any particular place.” McDonough, *YHWH at Patmos*, 125.
- 8 Benjamin Sommer states that “the term ‘name’ in ancient Near Eastern cultures can refer to the essence of anything and hence can be a cipher for the thing itself.” Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 59.
- 9 Fossum, *The Name of God*, 84. Bahrani similarly argues that

the name was so consequential because Babylonian theological thought held the basic doctrine that the naming of a thing was tantamount to its existence and that a thing did not exist unless it was named. Thus, the opening lines of the Babylonian Epic of Creation describe a time before creation, when nothing had yet been named. This equation of the act of naming with creation made the power of naming indispensable in substitution and imitative magic. This association of the name with existence explains the standard curses concerned with the removal of the name. The contiguity of the signifier with the signified made the removal of the name a means of obliterating the identity of the named person. Similarly, the firm belief in substitution led to seeing the damage to a person’s image as a means of harming the person. The removal of the name from the image could also invalidate that image as an immortalization of the represented.

Bahrani, *The Graven Image*, 174

- 10 Stroumsa reminds us that

since the times of the Exile, the Jews sought to avoid pronouncing the name of their God, and developed a highly complex series of substitutes and circumlocutions, in Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic. . . . In the place of YHWH the titles *Elohim*, *Adonai*

(my Lord), or its Greek and Aramaic equivalents *Kyrios*, *Mari*, were used during the Second Commonwealth, together with other substitutes, such as *Ha-Shem* (the Name), *ha-Kadosh* (the Holy One), *Elohei ha-shammaim* (God of the heavens), *El Elyon*, or *Hypsistos*.

G. G. Stroumsa, *Hidden Wisdom: Esoteric Traditions and the Roots of Christian Mysticism*, SHR, 70 (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 185

On these traditions, see also N. Andrade, “The Jewish Tetragrammaton: Secrecy, Community, and Prestige among Greek-Writing Jews of the Early Roman Empire,” *JSJ* 46 (2015) 198–223; C. A. Gieschen, “The Divine Name as a Characteristic of Divine Identity in Second-Temple Judaism and Early Christianity,” in *Monotheism and Christology in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, ed. M. V. Novenson; NovTSup, 180 (Leiden: Brill, 2020) 61–84 at 63–64.

11 Bahrani, *The Graven Image*, 121.

12 Bahrani, *The Graven Image*, 128.

13 Miller argues that “the Name externalizes what was previously only within God” becoming “the crucial mediating factor between God and humanity.” Miller, *The Name of God*, 4.

14 On this see A. A. Orlov, *Yahoel and Metatron: Aural Apocalypticism and the Origins of Early Jewish Mysticism*, TSAJ, 169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

15 Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 59.

16 Although present already in early Jewish texts, this understanding is articulated clearly in later Jewish mysticism with their understanding of the Torah as part of the divine nature. Holdrege reminds us that

the authoritative status of the Torah as a limitlessly encompassing symbol is linked in certain rabbinic and kabbalistic traditions not only to its historical manifestation as a divinely revealed corpus of teachings, but also to its cosmological status as a supra-historical, primordial reality that has existed from “the beginning” as an aspect of God and the immediate source of creation. Among the various representations of the Torah in rabbinic and kabbalistic texts, four main complexes can be distinguished: (1) the Torah is identified with the Word (*dabar*) of God or Name (*em*) of God, which participates in the reality and essence of God himself; (2) the Torah is personified or hypostatized, in the case of kabbalistic texts as primordial wisdom, *Hokmah*, which serves as the architect of creation; (3) the Torah is depicted as the subtle plan or blueprint of creation, which contains the primordial elements of the divine language through which God brings forth the universe.

B. A. Holdrege, *Veda and Torah: Transcending the Textuality of Scripture* (Albany: SUNY, 2012) 131

17 Holdrege, *Veda and Torah*, 200. Scholem makes the observation that

one of the most important variants of this theory occurs in Joseph Gikatila, a leading Spanish Kabbalist who wrote at the end of the thirteenth century and was no doubt familiar with parts of the *Zohar*. In his view, the Torah is not itself the name of God but the explication of the Name of God. To him the Name meant exactly what it had meant for the Jewish tradition, namely the tetragrammaton, which is the one and only true name of God. He writes: Know that the entire Torah is, as it were, an explication of, and commentary on, the tetragrammaton YHWH. And this is the true meaning of the Biblical term “God’s Torah” [*torath YHWH*]. In other words, the phrase *torath YHWH* does not mean the Torah which God gave but the Torah which explains YHWH, the name of God.

G. Scholem, *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism* (New York: Schocken, 1965) 42

18 Holdrege, *Veda and Torah*, 201.

19 Holdrege, *Veda and Torah*, 201. On the identification of the Name of God with the Torah, see also G. Scholem, "The Name of God and the Linguistic Theory of the Kabbala," *Diogenes* 79 (Fall 1972) 59–80; *Diogenes* 80 (Winter 1972) 164–194; Idel, *Kabbalah*, 244–247.

20 Miller, *The Name of God*, 2.

21 Scholem, *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism*, 40.

22 Scholem, *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism*, 40.

23 Idel, "Concepts of Scripture in Jewish Mysticism," 159.

24 According to Idel, in this paradigm of thought, "the Torah as God's Name serves as an intermediary, allowing God to descend into the world. . . . Here the Torah serves as an intermediary between the creator and man." Idel, "Concepts of Scripture in Jewish Mysticism," 172–173.

25 In another part of his study van der Toorn argues that

the question is not, or not only, whether the Israelites worshipped images, but whether they had symbols which for all practical purposes served as divine images for them. This was the case, I submit, for the Torah. In the Book of Deuteronomy, there is a direct relation between the prohibition of images and the propagation of the written law. While other peoples carried carved seals and figurative decorations as amulets, the Israelites were instructed to carry portions of the Torah on their persons. Many a Babylonian house had a head of Huwawa or a Kusarikku figure to dissuade demons from entering, whereas the Israelite house had lines from Scripture on its doorposts; and instead of a shrine with an image of their God, the Israelite priests carried an ark containing a copy of the Book of the Law. These comparisons suggest a functional correspondence between the divine image among the surrounding nations and the Torah among the Israelites.

van der Toorn, "The Iconic Book," 229

26 van der Toorn, "The Iconic Book," 243–244.

27 van der Toorn, "The Iconic Book," 241–242.

28 Wolfson points out that

Torah was the incarnate form of divine presence, which, at the height of prophetic vision, assumes a human shape (*anthropos*) in the heart of the visionary. This is the hermeneutical foundation for the kabbalistic understanding of Scripture: the scroll, rendered hyperliterally, constitutes the scriptural body of the divine.

E. R. Wolfson, "The Glorious Name and the Incarnate Torah," in *The Jewish Study Bible*, eds. A. Berlin and M. Z. Brettler (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990) 1980

29 Idel, "Concepts of Scripture in Jewish Mysticism," 161.

30 Idel, "Concepts of Scripture in Jewish Mysticism," 162.

31 C. A. Gieschen, "The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, ed. G. Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 249.

32 Gieschen, "The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch," 244.

33 *Jub.* 36:7 reads:

Now I will make you swear with the great oath – because there is no oath which is greater than it, by the praiseworthy, illustrious, and great, splendid, marvelous, powerful, and great name which made the heavens and the earth and everything together – that you will continue to fear and worship him.

VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.238

34 *Prayer of Manasseh* 1–3 reads:

O Lord, God of our fathers, God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their righteous offspring; He who made the heaven and the earth with all their beauty; He who bound

the sea and established it by the command of his word, He who closed the bottomless pit and sealed it by his powerful and glorious name.

J. H. Charlesworth, "Prayer of Manasseh," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985) 2.625–637 at 2.634

- 35 Miller, *The Name of God*, 35.
 36 Miller, *The Name of God*, 35. On this tradition see M. Endo, *Creation and Christology: A Study on the Johannine Prologue in the Light of Early Jewish Creation Accounts*, WUNT, 2.149 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002) 139.
 37 Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.162–163.
 38 Fossum, *The Name of God*, 299. Jean Daniélou also argues that "certainly the Name and the Oath appear here as the instruments of God in creation." J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964) 148.
 39 D. D. Hannah, *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*, WUNT, 2.109 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999) 52.
 40 Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.163–164.
 41 C. Kaplan, "The Hidden Name," *JSOR* 13 (1929) 181–184. With respect to the oath imagery in *1 Enoch* 69, Daniel Olson asserts that

it is common place in mystical Judaism that the Name of God is the force which binds and orders all things in creation, and a word that binds is by definition an oath. The idea is certainly old enough to appear in the "Parables."

D. Olson, *Enoch. A New Translation: The Ethiopic Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch* (North Richland Hills: Bibal Press, 2004) 271

- 42 Regarding the association of the demiurgic name with the oath, see McDonough, *YHWH at Patmos*, 128–130; Fossum, *The Name of God*, 257ff.
 43 In this respect, it is intriguing that some rabbinic texts describe the process of cursing as involving the use of the divine Name. One such tradition, for example, can be found in *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*, which speaks about cursing using the Tetragrammaton: "Curse it means by using the divine name, so also when it says do not curse it means not to curse by using the divine name." *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael: A Critical Edition on the Basis of the Manuscripts and Early Editions with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes*, ed. J. Z. Lauterbach, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2004) 2.388. Jonathan Ben-Dov notices that "oaths and the great name as elements of creation appear again in later Jewish literature such as Hekhalot and late midrash." J. Ben-Dov, "Exegetical Notes on Cosmology in the Parables of Enoch," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, ed. G. Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 143–150 at 149.
 44 The demiurgic powers of the divine Name also appear in *3 Enoch* 12:1–2. The list in that passage is reminiscent of the list in *1 Enoch* 69.
 45 Cf. *Gen. Rab.* 12:10:

R. Berekiah said in the name of R. Judah b. R. Simeon: Not with labour or wearying toil did the Holy One, blessed be He, create the world, but: "By the Word of the Lord, and the heavens were already made." By means of *heh*, He created them.

Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 1.95

Gen. Rab. 12:10:

R. Abbahu said in R. Johanan's name: He created them with the letter *heh*. All letters demand an effort to pronounce them, whereas the *heh* demands no effort; similarly, not with labour or wearying toil did the Holy One, blessed be He, create His world.

Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 1.95

Gen. Rab. 12:10:

With a *heh* created He them, it follows that this world was created by means of a *heh*. Now the *heh* is closed on all sides and open underneath: that is an indication that all

the dead descend into *she'ol*; its upper hook is an indication that they are destined to ascend thence; the opening at the side is a hint to penitents. The next world was created with a *yod*: as the *yod* has a bent [curved] back, so are the wicked: their erectness shall be bent and their faces blackened [with shame] in the Messianic future, as it is written, And the loftiness of man shall be bowed down.

Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 1.95

b. *Men.* 29b:

it refers to the two worlds which the Holy One, blessed be He, created, one with the letter *he* and the other with the letter *yod*. Yet I do not know whether the future world was created with the *yod* and this world with the *he* or this world with the *yod* and the future world with the *he*; but since it is written, These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth when they were created.

Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud. Menahoth*, 29b

Cf. also 3 *Enoch* 15B:5 where Metatron reveals to Moses the letters of the divine Name which are understood there as an oath: "But Moses said to him, 'Not so! Lest I incur guilt.' Metatron said to him, 'Receive the letters of an oath which cannot be broken!'" Alexander, "3 *Enoch*," 1.304.

46 On these traditions, see Fossum, *The Name of God*, 253–256.

47 In the Palestinian targumic tradition (*Targ. Neof.*, *Frag. Targ.*), the divine command יהוה uttered by God during the creation of the world is identified with the Tetragrammaton. For a detailed discussion of this tradition, see Fossum, *The Name of God*, 80. Thus, *Targum Neofiti* reads: "He who spoke, and the world was there from the beginning, and is to say to it: יהוה and it will be there, He it is who has sent me to you." *Fragmentary Targum* attests to a similar tradition: "'He who said to the world from the beginning: יהוה and it was there, and is to say to it: יהוה and it will be there.' And He said: Thus you shall say to the Israelites: 'He has sent me to you.'" Regarding the same tradition, see also *Samaritan Liturgy* 445.2: "It was created by a word, [namely, by] יהוה and, in a flash, it was made new."

48 "And this (is) *the power of this oath*, for it is powerful and strong; and he placed this oath Akae in the charge of the holy Michael." Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.162–163.

49 Ian Wilson notices that scholars usually derive the Name theology

from two sets of texts, namely references to YHWH's Name dwelling, or being in some other sense present, at the sanctuary (e.g. in Deut 12–26 and throughout the Deuteronomistic History) and those to YHWH himself dwelling or being in heaven (e.g. Deut 4:36; 26:15 and 1 Kings 8, in Solomon's prayer of dedication of the temple).

I. Wilson, *Out of the Midst of the Fire: Divine Presence in Deuteronomy*, SBLDS, 151 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1995) 3

50 For modern reconstructions of the ideology of the divine Name in Deuteronomy and other biblical materials, see S. Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology: lesakken semo sam in the Bible and the Ancient Near East*, BZAW, 318 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002) 26–39.

51 Similar to the *Kavod* paradigm, the *Shem* ideology is also permeated by distinctive sacerdotal concerns that will maintain their powerful grip on the onomatological imagery long after the destruction of the Second Jerusalem temple. Wilson asserts that

despite the resulting Deuteronomistic emphasis on the transcendence of YHWH in the *Shem* ideology, the sanctuary retains its importance for the Israelite worshiper, since the presence there of the Name is seen as providing indirect access to that of the deity himself.

Wilson, *Out of the Midst of the Fire*, 7

52 Mettinger observes that in the *Shem* theology "God himself is no longer present in the Temple, but only in heaven. However, he is represented in the Temple by his Name."

T. N. D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, ConBOT, 18 (Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982) 124. See also M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972) 193. Wilson claims that

this distinction between YHWH and his Name is fundamental to Name Theology. In contrast to those traditions in which the Deity is represented as being localized on the earth, here it is his Name which is conceived as being thus present, in this case at the sanctuary. YHWH himself is in heaven.

Wilson, *Out of the Midst of the Fire*, 4

53 Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 99.

54 Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 99.

55 Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence*, 15–16.

56 Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence*, 15–16.

57 Richter notes that “Deuteronomy . . . replace[s] the older and more popular idea that God lives in the temple with the idea that he is actually only hypostatically present in the temple.” Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 8.

58 Miller, *The Name of God*, 13.

59 Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 59.

60 Wolfson notes that

the line separating the angel and God is substantially blurred, for by bearing the name, which signifies the power of the divine nature, the angel is the embodiment of God’s personality. To possess the name is not merely to be invested with divine authority; it means that ontologically the angel is the incarnational presence of the divine manifest in the providential care over Israel.

E. R. Wolfson, “Judaism and Incarnation: The Imaginal Body of God,” in *Christianity in Jewish Terms*, eds. T. Frymer-Kensky et al. (Boulder: Westview Press, 2000) 239–253 at 244

61 Fossum, *The Name of God*, 86.

62 Gilles Quispel notices this conceptual link between the Angel of the Lord, Yahoel, and Metatron, seeing them as “Jewish speculations about the Name, the ineffable Shem, and about the bearer of the Name, the Angel of the Lord, called Jael (later Metatron).” G. Quispel, “The Demiurge in the Apocryphon of John,” in *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica. Collected Essays of Gilles Quispel*, ed. J. van Oort; NHMS, 55 (Leiden: Brill, 2008) 43–76 at 67.

63 Scholars often view the mediation of the Name as the crucial source of the angel’s authority. On this, see Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 17.

64 Fossum, *The Name of God*, 86.

65 Fossum, *The Name of God*, 86. Fossum observes that

when God promises to send his angel carrying his own Name in order to guide Israel to the land he has appointed for them, this means that he has put his power into the angel and thus will be with his people through the agency of the angel. The Angel of the Lord is an extension of YHWH’s personality, because the proper Name of God signifies the divine nature. Thus, the Angel of the Lord has full divine authority by virtue of possessing God’s Name: he has the power to withhold the absolution of sins.

Fossum, *The Name of God*, 86

66 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 77. In a separate study, Gieschen suggests that the figure of the Angel of the Lord exhibits

a delicate distinction between YHWH and his visible form. . . . This text testifies that a figure that has some independence from YHWH can still share in his being through the possession of the divine Name (i.e., a divine hypostasis).

C. A. Gieschen, “The Divine Name in the Ante-Nicene Christology,” *VC* 57 (2003) 115–158 at 122–123

- 67 R. M. M. Tuschling, *Angels and Orthodoxy: A Study in Their Development in Syria and Palestine from the Qumran Texts to Ephrem the Syrian*, STAC, 40 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007) 99.
- 68 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 77.
- 69 Cf. *Apoc. Ab.* 10:8.
- 70 Cf. *b. Sanh.* 38b; *3 Enoch* 12.
- 71 Fossum, *The Name of God*, 86.
- 72 Camilla von Heijne, in her recent study, points out that

the relationship between God and this angel is far from clear and the identity of YHWH and His angel is merged in many texts, e.g., Gen 16:7–14; 21:17–20; 22:1–19; 31:10–13; 48:15–16; Exod 3:1–6; Josh 5:13–15; 6:2, and Judges chapters 6 and 13. In these pericopes, “the angel of YHWH” seems to be completely interchangeable with YHWH Himself. According to Exod 23:20–21, the angel possesses the name of God, it is “in him,” and it appears to be implied that this “divine name angel” has the power to forgive sins, an ability that elsewhere in the Bible is reserved for God. This angel is always anonymous and speaks with divine authority in the first person singular as if he is God Himself, thus there is no clear distinction between the sender and the messenger. Unlike other biblical angels, the “angel of the Lord” accepts being worshiped by men and seems to be acknowledged as divine; e.g., Gen 16:13; 48:15–16; Josh 5:13–15, and Judg 13:17–23.

von Heijne, *The Messenger of the Lord in Early Jewish Interpretations of Genesis*, 1

- 73 There are a variety of opinions about the possible conceptual roots of Exod 23:20–22. Some scholars suggest that it represents a Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction of Exodus. On this, see W. Johnstone, “Reactivating the Chronicles Analogy in Pentateuchal Studies, with Special Reference to the Sinai Pericope in Exodus,” *ZAW* 99 (1987) 16–37 at 26; L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22–23,33). Studien zu seiner Entstehung und Theologie*, BZAW, 188 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990) 406–414; J. Blenkinsopp, “Deuteronomistic Contribution to the Narrative in Genesis-Numbers: A Test-Case,” in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*, eds. L. S. Schearing and S. L. McKenzie; JSOTSS, 268 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999) 84–115 at 94–97.
- 74 von Heijne discerns that in Exod 23,

the angel is apparently distinct from God and yet not completely separate from Him. By possessing the divine name, he also shares the divine power and authority. Compare this to the Deuteronomistic theology, in which the concept of the name of God is used to describe the way in which YHWH is present in the Temple of Jerusalem.

von Heijne, *The Messenger of the Lord in Early Jewish Interpretations of Genesis*, 97–98

- 75 Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 124–125.
- 76 M. Idel, *Ben: Sonship and Jewish Mysticism* (London: Continuum, 2007) 17.
- 77 Cf. *Exod. Rab.* 32:4: “Do not say ‘Since he is our guardian angel, we will worship him and he will forgive our sins.’” Commenting on this rabbinic dictum, Matthias Hoffmann suggests that “in *Exodus Rabbah* 32:4 the angel apparently has the power of forgiving sins.” M. R. Hoffmann, *The Destroyer and the Lamb: The Relationship Between Angelomorphic and Lamb Christology in the Book of Revelation*, WUNT, 2.203 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 112.
- 78 Idel observes that “this redemptive role of the angel is quite reminiscent of the Exodus scenario.” Idel, *Ben*, 17.
- 79 Already, Box noted that “just as Metatron bears the Tetragrammaton (cf. Exod 23:21, ‘My Name is in him’), so Jaol here (chap. x.) is possessed of the power of the Ineffable Name.” G. H. Box and J. I. Landsman, *The Apocalypse of Abraham: Edited, with a*

Translation from the Slavonic Text and Notes, TED, 1.10 (London and New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918) xxv.

- 80 A. Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham*, TCS, 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2005) 17.
- 81 B. Philonenko-Sayar and M. Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham. Introduction, texte slave, traduction et notes*, Semitica, 31 (Paris: Librairie Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1981) 58.
- 82 Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 18; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham. Introduction, texte slave, traduction et notes*, 58.
- 83 Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.265.
- 84 On the names of Metatron, see J. Dan, "Seventy Names of Metatron," in *Jewish Mysticism. Late Antiquity*, ed. J. Dan (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1998) 229–234; Cohen, *The Shfur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism*, 128.
- 85 3 Enoch 48:1 reads: "Metatron has seventy names, and these are they . . . lesser YHWH, after the name of his Master, as it is written, 'My name is in him.'" Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.313–314.
- 86 Fossum, *The Name of God*, 298.
- 87 Fossum, *The Name of God*, 298.
- 88 Gilles Quispel also entertains this connection by arguing that Yahoel "is nothing but an angel, the most important angel, the one who is called the angel of the Lord in the Hebrew Bible." G. Quispel, "Gnosticism," in *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica. Collected Essays of Gilles Quispel*, ed. J. van Oort; NHMS, 55 (Leiden: Brill, 2008) 161.
- 89 Fossum, *The Name of God*, 318.
- 90 Hurtado argues that

this description of Yahoel as indwelt by the divine name is a powerful indication of the status of this angel, especially in comparison with the rest of the heavenly retinue, but the text shows no indication that the divine name "in" Yahoel conferred upon him divinity in the sense of entitling him to cultic devotion.

Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 84

- 91 Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 80.
- 92 Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 80.
- 93 McDonough, *YHWH at Patmos*, 125.
- 94 As observed by Hurtado, Yahoel's name "seems to be an allusion to, and a combination of, well-known Hebrew terms for God, Yahweh and El." Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 79.
- 95 D. C. Harlow, "Idolatry and Alterity: Israel and the Nations in the Apocalypse of Abraham," in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*, eds. D. C. Harlow, M. Goff, K. M. Hogan, and J. S. Kaminsky (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011) 302–330 at 313.
- 96 Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 19.
- 97 *Apoc. Ab.* 9:7: "But for forty days abstain from every food which issues from fire, and from the drinking of wine, and from anointing [yourself] with oil." Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 17.
- 98 Concerning the manna traditions, see R. Meyer, "Manna," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, 10 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76) 4.462–466; P. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*, NovTSup, 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1965); B. J. Malina, *The Palestinian Manna Tradition*, AGAJU, 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1968); P. Maiberger, *Das Manna: Eine literarische, etymologische und naturkundliche Untersuchung*, ÄAT, 6.1–2, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983); D. Merkur, *The Mystery of Manna: The Psychedelic Sacrament of the Bible* (Rochester: Park Street Press, 2000).
- 99 Cf. D. Goodman, "Do Angels Eat?" *JJS* 37.2 (1986) 160–175 at 161; H. J. Hodges, *Food as Synecdoche in John's Gospel and Gnostic Texts* (Ph.D. diss. University of California, Berkeley, 1995) 308–309.

100 Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 19:5 reads:

You know that you have eaten the bread of angels for forty years. And now behold I bless your tribes before my end comes. You know my toil that I have toiled for you from the time you went up from the land of Egypt.

Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*, 1.121

101 Thus, *b. Yoma* 75b reads: "Our Rabbis taught: Man did eat the bread of the mighty, i.e., bread which ministering angels eat. This was the interpretation of R. Akiba." Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud. Yoma*, 75b.

102 On these connections, see Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 110; M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 62; N. L. Calvert, *Abraham Traditions in Middle Jewish Literature: Implications for the Interpretation of Galatians and Romans* (Ph.D. diss. Sheffield University, Sheffield, 1993) 274; Box and Landsman, *Apocalypse of Abraham*, 50; C. Begg, "Rereading of the 'Animal Rite' of Genesis 15 in Early Jewish Narratives," *CBQ* 50 (1988) 36–46 at 44.

103 An allusion to this guiding function of Yahoel, similar to the Angel of the Lord role, appears in *Apoc. Ab.* 10:14, where Yahoel tells Abraham that "he [Yahoel] indicated the way of the land for his [Abraham's] sake." Rubinkiewicz connects this office of Yahoel with the role of the Angel of the Lord in Exod 23:20. On this, see R. Rubinkiewicz, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire*, ŻM, 129 (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1987) 133.

104 Cohen, *The Sh'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism*, 125. *Sefer Razi'el* 260–261 reads: "This is Metatron, Prince of the Presence, who is written in (the) one letter, with which were created heaven and earth." Cohen, *The Sh'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*, 105.

105 Gieschen, "The Divine Name as a Characteristic of Divine Identity," 70.

106 Gieschen notes that "Yahoel is understood in this document to be the archetype for the earthly high priest later commanded in Exodus." Gieschen, "The Divine Name as a Characteristic of Divine Identity," 70.

107 It is possible that the Tetragrammaton is also inscribed on Yahoel's staff, which some scholars associate with Aaron's staff. On this connection, see in the following. *Num. Rab.* 18:23 states that the Tetragrammaton was engraved on Aaron's staff:

He did it in order that they should not say that Aaron's rod was fresh and that this was the reason why it budded. The Holy One, blessed be He, decreed that on the staff should be found the Ineffable Name that was on the plate (*ziz*), as may be inferred from the text, And put forth buds, and bloomed blossoms – *ziz* (Num 17:23).

Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 6.744

108 Miller, *The Name of God*, 87.

109 Stroumsa points out that "there is no doubt that Yahoel-Metatron whose name is said to be identical to his Master's name, is conceived as God's archangelic hypostasis." Stroumsa, "Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ," 278.

110 Daniélou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 148.

111 Fossum suggests that "it is obvious that Yahoel is the prototype of Metatron, who is said to possess the Name of God and to have been enthroned in heaven." Fossum, *The Name of God*, 321.

112 Fossum, *The Name of God*, 318. Already, Box argued that "the name Ja'el itself is evidently a substitute for the Tetragrammaton, which was too sacred to be written out in full." Box and Landsman, *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, xxv.

113 Richard Bauckham later expressed a similar criticism. See R. Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Essays on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008) 227.

- 114 Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 88–89.
- 115 Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 88–89.
- 116 Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 18; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham. Introduction, texte slave, traduction et notes*, 58.
- 117 On this understanding of the “power” of the Name, see also McDonough, *YHWH at Patmos*, 128–131.
- 118 E. E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975) 1.124.
- 119 Gieschen, “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 244.
- 120 Gieschen, “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 244.
- 121 Daniélou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 151–152.
- 122 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 119. Gieschen illustrates that
- the popularity of using “Power” as a designation for either angel or God is vividly portrayed in Philo’s writings. For example, Philo identifies two of the three men that visited Abram (Gen 18) as *aggeloi* (*Abr.* 115) and later as *dunameis* (*Abr.* 143–145).
- Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 120
- 123 Gieschen also makes a reference to Yahoel’s passage in *Apoc. Ab.* 10:8, arguing that “it is the possession of the divine Name that is the basis for his exalted status as ‘a Power.’” Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 120.
- 124 Smith, “Prayer of Joseph,” 2.713; Denis, *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca*, 61.
- 125 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 120.
- 126 I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 2nd ed.; AGAJU, 90 (Leiden: Brill, 2014) 92.
- 127 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 121.
- 128 Miller, *The Name of God*, 67.
- 129 Reeves and Reed, *Enoch from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, 1.72. A. Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash: Sammlung kleiner Midraschim und vermischter Abhandlungen aus der ältern jüdischen Literatur*, 6 vols. (Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrmann, 1938) 3.157–158.
- 130 In his conclusion to the Enoch Seminar’s volume devoted to the *Book of the Similitudes* Paolo Sacchi writes:
- In sum, we may observe that those scholars who have directly addressed the problem of dating the Parables all agree on a date around the time of Herod. Other participants of the conference not addressing the problem directly nevertheless agree with this conclusion.
- P. Sacchi, “The 2005 Camaldoli Seminar on the Parables of Enoch: Summary and Prospects for Future Research,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting of the Book of Parables*, ed. G. Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 510
- See also D. Suter, “Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, ed. G. Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 415–443; G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch. Chapters 37–82*, Hermeneia (Mineapolis: Fortress, 2012) 58–63.
- 131 Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.133–134.
- 132 Gieschen, “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 240. See also S. R. Scott, “The Binitarian Nature of the Book of Similitudes,” *JSP* 18 (2008) 55–78; Gieschen, “The Divine Name as a Characteristic of Divine Identity,” 67.
- 133 Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.134.
- 134 Gieschen, “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 240.
- 135 Gieschen observes that
- similar to Daniel 7, the “Son of Man” in *1 Enoch* 37–71 is closely identified with “the Ancient of Days,” who is also known as “the Lord of the Spirits,” by sharing the

- divine throne (51:3; 69:29). Especially crucial for this discussion is the depiction of this Son of Man as a preexistent being (42:7; 62:7) who possessed the “hidden name” (69:14) before creation (48:2) There is no doubt that “the name” by which the Son of Man “was named” is the divine Name because there are numerous references to “the name of the Lord of the Spirits” throughout the *Similitudes*.
Gieschen, “The Divine Name in the Ante-Nicene Christology,” 124
- 136 Gieschen, “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 238.
137 Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.163–164.
138 Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.164.
139 Gieschen, “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 241.
140 Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*.
141 K. Grözinger, “The Names of God and the Celestial Powers: Their Function and Meaning in the Hekhalot Literature,” *JSJT* 6.1–6.2 (1987) 53–69 at 54.
142 Miller, *The Name of God*, 67.
143 Miller, *The Name of God*, 68.
144 Miller, *The Name of God*, 68.
145 Dan, *The Ancient Jewish Mysticism*, 109.
146 In respect to this etymology, it is noteworthy that one Aramaic incantation bowl identifies Metatron with God. Alexander observes that “the possibility should even be considered that Metatron is used on this bowl as a divine name.” P. S. Alexander, “The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch,” *JJS* 28 (1977) 159–180 at 167. For detailed discussion of this inscription, see Cohen, *The Shi’ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism*, 159; R. M. Lesses, *Ritual Practices to Gain Power: Angels, Incantations, and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism*, HTS, 44 (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 1998) 358–359.
147 Dan, *The Ancient Jewish Mysticism*, 109–110. See also C. Rohrbacher-Sticker, “Die Namen Gottes und die Namen Metatrons: Zwei Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur,” *FJB* 19 (1991–1992) 95–168.
148 M. Miller, “Folk-Etymology, and its Influence on Metatron Traditions,” *JSJ* 44 (2013) 339–355 at 345.
149 Miller, “Folk-Etymology,” 345.
150 Miller, “Folk-Etymology,” 345.
151 Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 144.
152 On this see Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 68.
153 Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.265.
154 J. C. Reeves, *Trajectories in Near Eastern Apocalyptic: A Postrabbinic Jewish Apocalypse Reader*, RBS, 45 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006) 55.
155 Miller, *The Name of God*, 64.
156 *3 Enoch* 12:4–5 reads:

He fashioned for me a kingly crown in which refulgent stones were placed, each like the sun’s orb, and its brilliance shone into the four quarters of the heaven of ‘Arabot, into the seven heavens, and into the four quarters of the world. He set it upon my head and he called me, the Lesser YHWH in the presence of his whole household in the height as it is written, “My name is in him.”

Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.265

- 157 In relation to these onomatological traditions, Michael Miller asserts that

in *3 Enoch* God writes on Metatron’s crown: The letters by which heaven and earth were created . . . seas and rivers were created . . . mountains and hills were created . . . stars and constellations, lightning and wind, thunder and thunderclaps, snow and hail, hurricane and tempest were created; the letters by which all the necessities of the world and all the orders of creation were created. (13:1). Later, a near identical passage has these letters “engraved with a pen of flame upon the throne of glory”

- (41:1–3). That these creative letters would be those of the Name is confirmed when “all the sacred names engraved with a pen of flame on the throne of glory fly off like eagles.” . . . At other points Metatron is said to be written with the letter (singular) by which heaven and earth were created (e.g. §389 in manuscripts N8128 and M40)—a letter we may presume to be *heh*, in light of the early traditions discussed above.
 Miller, *The Name of God*, 46–47
- 158 Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.266.
- 159 In some Hekhalot passages, Metatron’s names appear on the crown of God. In view of this Schäfer suggests that “God’s and Metatron’s names become almost interchangeable, to such an extent that it is not always clear who is being addressed. Paragraph 397 begins with names of Metatron, inscribed on God’s crown.” P. Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009) 297.
- 160 See *Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira* 50:7: “like a star of light from among clouds, and like the full moon in the days of festival; and like the sun shining resplendently on the king’s Temple, and like the rainbow which appears in the cloud.” C. N. R. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1996) 41–42.
- 161 Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.266.
- 162 Cohen, *The Shūr Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism*, 125.
- 163 Deutsch, *Gnostic Imagination*, 115.
- 164 Miller, *The Name of God*, 87.
- 165 For a collection of passages related to Metatron’s title “Lesser YHWH,” see Reeves and Reed, *Enoch from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, 1.265–270.
- 166 *3 Enoch* 12:5.
- 167 *3 Enoch* 48C:7.
- 168 *3 Enoch* 48D:1[90].
- 169 Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.265.
- 170 Alan Segal remarks that “in the Hebrew Book of Enoch, Metatron is set on a throne alongside God and appointed above angels and powers to function as God’s vizir and plenipotentiary.” Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 63. In a similar vein, Philip Alexander observes that “the Merkabah texts represent God and his angels under the image of an emperor and his court. God has his heavenly palace, his throne, and, in Metatron, his grand vizier.” Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.241.
- 171 Nathaniel Deutsch has noted that “along with his roles as heavenly high priest and angelified human being, Metatron was sometimes portrayed as a kind of second – albeit junior – deity.” Deutsch, *Guardians of the Gate*, 35.
- 172 Jarl Fossum suggests that the references to the seventy names of Metatron might indirectly point to this exalted angel as the bearer of the ultimate Name of God, since these seventy names might just reflect God’s main Name. Fossum points to *Synopse* §4 (*3 Enoch* 3:2), where Metatron tells R. Ishmael that his seventy names “are based on the name of the King of kings of kings,” and to *Synopse* §78 (*3 Enoch* 48D:5), which informs us that “these seventy names are a reflection of the Explicit Name upon the Merkabah which is engraved upon the throne of Glory.” Fossum asserts that these seventy names originally belonged to God himself and only later were transferred to Metatron. Fossum, *The Name of God*, 298.
- 173 Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 82.
- 174 C. Morray-Jones, “Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition,” *JJS* 43 (1992) 1–31 at 8.
- 175 Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 82.
- 176 Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 141.
- 177 C. Gordon, “Aramaic Magical Bowls in the Istanbul and Baghdad Museums,” *Archiv Orientalni* 6 (1934) 319–334 at 328.
- 178 Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.312.
- 179 Reeves and Reed, *Enoch from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, 1.267; Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash*, 2.114–115.

- 180 Reeves and Reed, *Enoch from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, 1.270; H. Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbati* (Jerusalem: Mekitze Nirdamim, 1940) 27.10–28.1.
- 181 G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, [1960] 1965) 41.
- 182 Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism*, 41.
- 183 Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 18; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham. Introduction, texte slave, traduction et notes*, 58.
- 184 Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 267.
- 185 Grözinger, “The Names of God and the Celestial Powers,” 56.
- 186 Grözinger, “The Names of God and the Celestial Powers,” 56.
- 187 Grözinger, “The Names of God and the Celestial Powers,” 61–62.
- 188 Schäfer et al., *Synopse*, 164.
- 189 Schäfer notes that

a dramatic scene (§390, with a parallel in §399) describes how Metatron blocks the ears of the holy creatures with the “fire of deafness” so that even they cannot hear God – nor hear Metatron, uttering the ineffable name. This is doubly ironic: first, because there is no reason why the holy creatures, the bearers of the throne, should not hear God speaking: note that in *Hekhalot Rabbati* they were the most beloved creatures of God (next to Israel) and in constant dialogue with their master. Now they are demoted not only in their relationship to Israel but also to the highest angel of all, Metatron. And second, because the text hastens to continue with the revelation of precisely this or these secret name(s) that the holy creatures are not allowed to hear.

Schäfer, *Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 296–297

- 190 Another Hekhalot passage in *Synopse* §385 also elaborates the liturgical role of the exalted angel:

when the youth enters below the throne of glory, God embraces him with a shining face. All the angels gather and address God as “the great, mighty, awesome God,” and they praise God three times a day by means of the youth.

Schäfer et al., *Synopse*, 162–163

- 191 Commenting on *Synopse* §734, Michael Swartz reflects that the transmission of the Name is closely tied in this textual unit to Metatron’s office as the mediator of the Tetragrammaton. He argues that,

here, as in the 3 *Enoch* chain, divine names, which are identified also as angelic names, are described as having been handed down at Sinai, through the chain of tradition. Here Metatron is not represented as the transformed Enoch who imparts secrets to Moses, but as the archangel whose name is like his Master’s.

M. D. Swartz, *Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996) 182

- 192 Idel, “Concepts of Scripture in Jewish Mysticism,” 159.
- 193 Schäfer, *Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 297.
- 194 Schäfer, *Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 297.
- 195 3 *Enoch* 48D:4–5 reads:

The Prince of Torah . . . gave them as a gift to Moses, as it is written, “The Lord gave them to me.” After that he remembered the Torah. How do we know he remembered it? Because it is written, “Remember the Torah of my servant Moses, to whom at Horeb I prescribed laws and customs for the whole of Israel”: “The Torah of Moses” refers to the Torah, the Prophets, and the Writings; “laws” refers to halakot and traditions; “customs” refers to haggadot and toseftas; all these were given to Moses on Sinai. These are the seventy names – each of them like the sacred name on the chariot, engraved on the throne of glory – which the Holy One, blessed be

he, took from his sacred name and bestowed on Metatron – seventy names by which the ministering angels address the King of the kings of kings in heaven above.

Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.314. On this passage see also Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 178ff.

196 Smith, “Prayer of Joseph,” 2.713; Denis, *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca*, 61.

197 Hayward, *Interpretations of the Name*, 217.

198 *Sefer Haqqomah* 164 reads: “the lad, whose name is Metatron, utters at that time in seven voices, in seventy voices, in living, pure, honored, holy, awesome, worthy, brave, strong, and holy Name.” Cohen, *The Shirur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*, 164. A similar motif can be found in the Hekhalot materials. Thus, *Synopse* §390 reads: “the youth whose name is Metatron then invokes, in seven voices, his living, pure, honored, awesome, holy, noble, strong, beloved, mighty, powerful Name.” Schäfer et al., *Synopse*, 164.

199 Philo’s *Conf.* 146 reads:

But if there be any as yet unfit to be called a Son of God, let him press to take his place under God’s First-born, the Word, who holds the eldership among the angels, their ruler as it were. And many names are his, for he is called, “the Beginning,” and the Name of God, and His Word, and the Man after His image, and “he that sees,” that is Israel.

Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, 4.89–91

Richard Hayward also notices that:

Philo’s words in *Abr.* 50–7 strongly suggest that, just as the three names Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are inseparably bound up with the divine Name given to human beings, so also the single name Israel is to be associated with the divine Name. He does not state this explicitly; but it is a natural inference from what he has said here and in other places in his writings.

Hayward, *Interpretations of the Name*, 184

200 Fossum, *The Name of God*, 314.

201 Fossum, *The Name of God*, 314.

202 *Dial.* 75:2 reads:

Consider well who it was that led your fathers into the Promised Land, namely he who was first named Auses [Hosea], but later renamed Jesus [Joshua]. If you keep this in mind, you will also realize that the name of him who said to Moses, My name is in him, was Jesus. Indeed, he was also called Israel. And he similarly bestowed this name upon Jacob.

St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho, trans. T. F. Falls and T. P. Halton, ed.

M. Slusser (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2003) 117

203 Fossum, *The Name of God*, 314.

204 Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 200.

205 Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 140.

206 On this connection, see McDonough, *YHWH at Patmos*; Mettinger, *In Search of God: The Meaning and Message of the Everlasting Names*, 33–36; Miller, *The Name of God*, 11–13; G. H. Parke-Taylor, *Yahweh: The Divine Name in the Bible* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975) 48–62.

207 Exod 33:18–20 reads:

Moses said, “Show me your glory, I pray.” And he said, “I will make all my goodness pass before you, and will proclaim before you the name, The Lord; and I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy. But,” he said, “you cannot see my face; for no one shall see me and live.”

208 Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 1.219; J. J. Collins, “Artapanus,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983–1985) 2.889–903 at 901.

- 209 G. Stroumsa, "A Nameless God: Judaeo-Christian and Gnostic 'Theologies of the Name'," in *The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, eds. P. J. Tomson and D. Lambers-Petry; WUNT 158 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003) 233.
- 210 Ephraim Urbach remarks, that

although Josephus does not cite the whole story of Artapanus, yet he also says "Then God revealed to him (= Moses) His name, which ere then had not come to men's ears, and of which I am forbidden to speak."

Urbach, *The Sages*, 1.125

- 211 *Josephus*; LCL; trans. H. S. J. Thackeray and R. Markus, 10 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965) 4.285.
- 212 J. Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*, SBLMS, 16 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1972) 144. Gager notices a similar development in magical papyri. See Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*, 140–145.
- 213 On the magical uses of the divine Name, see also L. Blau, *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen* (Strassburg: Trübner, 1898; 2nd ed.; Berlin: Lamm, 1914) 117–146; J. Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition. A Study in Folk Religion* (New York: Behrman, 1939) 90–97; Urbach, *The Sages*, 1.124–34; A. Fodor, "The Rod of Moses in Arabic Magic," *Acta Orientalia* 32 (1978) 1–21.
- 214 On this tradition, see H. J. Becker, "The Magic of the Name and Palestinian Rabbinic Literature," in *The Talmud Yerushalmi and Graeco-Roman Culture III*, ed. P. Schäfer; TSAJ, 93 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002) 3.393ff.
- 215 J. Neusner, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1986) 135.
- 216 Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 4.412. See also *Exod. Rab.* 1:29:

And he smote the Egyptian. With what did he slay him? R. Abuya said: With the fist; and others say that he took a clay shovel and cracked his skull. The Rabbis say that he pronounced God's name against him and thus slew him, for it is said: Sayest thou to kill me?

Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 3.37

- 217 The tradition about Moses' rod engraved with the Name has a very prominent place in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*. Thus, for example, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on Exod 2:21 reads:

When Reuel learned that Moses fled from Pharaoh, he threw him into a pit. But Zipporah, his son's daughter, provided for him in secret for ten years. At the end of ten years he took him out of the pit. Moses then went into Reuel's garden, and he gave thanks and prayed before the Lord who had performed miracles and mighty deeds for him. He noticed the rod that had been created at twilight, on which was clearly engraved the great and glorious Name with which he was to work wonders in Egypt, and with which he was to divide the Sea of Reeds, and bring water from the rock. It was fixed in the middle of the garden. And immediately he stretched forth his hand and took it.

McNamara et al., *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*, 166

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Exod 4:20 reads:

So Moses took his wife and his sons, mounted them on the ass, and went back to the land of Egypt. And Moses took in his hand the rod which he had taken from the garden of his father-in-law. It was of sapphire from the throne of glory; its weight was forty seahs, and the great and glorious name was clearly engraved on it, and with it miracles were performed from before the Lord.

McNamara et al. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*, 172

On the targumic and midrashic traditions of the divine Name engraved on Moses' staff, see M. Maher, "Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of Exodus 2.21," in *Targumic and Cognate*

Studies: Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara, eds. K. J. Cathcart and M. Maher; JSOTSS, 230 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) 81–99 at 93–95; McDonough, *YHWH at Patmos*, 128.

- 218 Exod 14:21: “Then Moses stretched out his hand over the sea. The Lord drove the sea back by a strong east wind all night, and turned the sea into dry land; and the waters were divided.”
- 219 McNamara et al. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*, 201. *Deut. Rab.* 3:8 attests to a similar tradition:

And when Israel came out of Egypt He wrought miracles for them only through water. Whence this? For it is said, The sea saw it, and fled (Ps 114:3). What did it see? R. Nehorai said: It saw the Tetragrammaton engraved upon [Moses’] staff and it parted. R. Nehemiah said: It saw, if one may say so, God’s hand, and it parted, as it is said, The waters saw Thee, they were in pain.

Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 7.76

See also *Midrash on Psalms* 114:9:

Another explanation of “the sea saw.” It saw the Ineffable Name engraved on the rod [of Moses], and it fled, as is said, And lift thou up the rod, and stretch out thy hand over the sea, and divide it (Exod 14:16).

Braude, *The Midrash on Psalms*, 2.221

- 220 It is intriguing that in the *Zohar* Moses’ rod is associated with Metatron. *Zohar* I.27a reads: “Similarly of Moses it is written, ‘And the staff of God was in his hand.’ This rod is Metatron, from one side of whom comes life and from the other death.” Sperling and Simon, *The Zohar*, 1.104.
- 221 Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 7.186. See also *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* to Deut 9:19: “At that very time five angels were sent forth from before the Lord, destroyers to destroy Israel: Anger, Wrath, Ire, Destruction, and Rage. When Moses, the lord of Israel, heard he went and recalled the great and glorious Name.” *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy*, ed. E. Clarke; ArBib, 5B (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998) 32.
- 222 McNamara et al., *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*, 206.
- 223 Lauterbach, *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*, 1.120.
- 224 On this tradition, see Fossum, *The Name of God*, 87–94; Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 77–78. In the Samaritan tradition, Moses himself might become the divine Name. Thus, *Memar Marqah* IV.1 unveils this mysterious identification: “Where is there a prophet like Moses and who can compare with Moses, whose name was made the name of his Lord?” Reflecting on this passage, Macdonald observes that “the name משה is held to be the same in essence as משה .” J. Macdonald, *Memar Marqah. The Teaching of Marqah*, BZAW, 84, 2 vols. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963) 2.137. On this, see also Fossum, *The Name of God*, 88. See also the *Samaritan Targum* to Exod 23:20–21.
- 225 The motif of the investiture with the divine Name is present also in the *Samaritan Liturgy (Defter)*, liturgical materials which praise the great prophet who clad himself in the Name of the deity. For these materials, see A. E. Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908).
- 226 *Memar Marqah* I.1 reads: “He said Moses, Moses, revealing to him that he would be vested with prophethood and the divine Name.” Macdonald, *Memar Marqah*. 2.4.
- 227 *Memar Marqah* I.9 iterates a similar tradition: “I have vested you with my Name.” Macdonald, *Memar Marqah*. 2.32; *Memar Marqah* II.12 reads:

Exalted is the great prophet Moses whom his Lord vested with His Name. . . . The Four Names led him to waters of life, in order that he might be exalted and honoured in every place: the name with which God vested him, the name which God revealed to him, the name by which God glorified him, the name by which God

magnified him. . . . The first name, with which Genesis opens, was that which he was vested with and by which he was made strong.”

Macdonald, *Memar Marqah*. 2.80–81

Memar Marqah IV.7:

O Thou who hast crowned me with Thy light and magnified me with wonders and honoured me with Thy glory and hid me in Thy palm and brought me into the Sanctuary of the Unseen and vested me with Thy name, by which Thou didst create the world, and revealed to me Thy great name and taught me Thy secrets.

Macdonald, *Memar Marqah*. 2.158

- 228 On coronation with the divine Name in later Jewish mysticism, see A. Green, *Keter: The Crown of God in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997) 42ff.
- 229 Macdonald, *Memar Marqah*, 2.31.
- 230 In his comments on the demiurgic significance of Metatron’s crown, Joseph Dan observes that

Metatron’s crown, as that of God, is not only a source of light for the worlds, but represents the principal power of the one who carries it: creation. The highest stage pictured here states that God Himself engraved on Metatron’s crown the letters with which the heavens and the earth and all their hosts were created. It thus follows that one who actually sees Metatron cannot but believe that he is standing before the one who carried out the actions with these letters, i.e., that the power inherent in them was utilized in the actual act of creation. . . . Due to this crown, Metatron tells R. Ishmael, all the upper forces submit to and are subject to him. When they see this crown, “all fall upon their faces . . . and are unable to look at me because of the glory and radiance and beauty . . . upon my head,” i.e., the appearance of Metatron among the heavenly hosts is like that of God Himself, with all falling upon their faces before him and unable to look at him because of this crown and the letters of creation engraved on it, letters in which are contained the divine power with whose force the world was created.

Dan, *The Ancient Jewish Mysticism*, 118

- 231 Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, 54.
- 232 Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 17.
- 233 *Jos. Asen.* 10:2: “[S]he ate no bread and drank no water.” C. Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985) 2.215; *Jos. Asen.* 10:17: “And this way Aseneth did for seven days and she ate no bread and drank no water in those seven days of her humiliation.” Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth,” 2.217. Cf. also *Jos. Asen.* 13:9; 18:3.
- 234 Scholars have noted that Aseneth’s hospitality to the visiting angel is reminiscent of Abraham’s hospitality in Genesis. As Andrea Lieber observes, “Aseneth offers to place a meal before the *anthropos*, in keeping with biblical traditions of hospitality associated with both Abraham in the Genesis narrative and Gideon in the book of Judges.” A. Lieber, “I Set a Table before You: The Jewish Eschatological Character of Aseneth’s Conversion Meal,” *JSP* 14 (2004) 63–77 at 68.
- 235 Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 17; Rubinkiewicz, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham en vieux slave*, 128; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham*, 58.
- 236 R. Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998) 123. Cf. also E. M. Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth*, *GAP*, 8 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000) 69. The angel’s reluctance to reveal his name to Aseneth might also point to his role as the angel of the Tetragrammaton.

237 Anathia Portier-Young notes,

observing that its breath is also like the breath of the mouth of her visitor, she infers that the honeycomb has emanated from his mouth, having come into being by his speech (16.9). The angel confirms her suspicion, smiling at her understanding; she now demonstrates knowledge of heavenly mysteries (16.12).

A. E. Portier-Young, "Sweet Mercy Metropolis: Interpreting Aseneth's Honeycomb," *JSP* 14 (2005) 133–157 at 139

238 Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth," 2.228.

239 Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth," 2.228.

240 Lieber, "I Set a Table Before You," 68.

241 See also Matt 3:4:

And the tempter came and said to him, "If you are the Son of God, command these stones to become loaves of bread." But he answered, "It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God."

242 Scholars have long noted a sharp opposition between the book of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic school, on the one hand, and the early anthropomorphic developments, on the other. In fact, the Deuteronomistic school is widely thought to have initiated the polemic against the anthropomorphic and corporeal conceptions of the Deity, which were subsequently adopted by the prophets Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah. Seeking to undermine ancient anthropomorphism, the book of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic school promulgated an anti-corporeal theology of the divine Name with its conception of the sanctuary or tabernacle as the exclusive dwelling abode of God's Name. Regarding these developments, see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 191–201; Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 124.

243 On the connections between Aseneth's meal and rites of the "washing of the mouth" (*mīs pī*) and the "opening of the mouth" (*pī pī*), see G. Bohak, "Aseneth's Honeycomb and Onias' Temple: The Key to Joseph and Aseneth," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A*, ed. D. Assaf (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994) 163–170; C. Burchard, "The Present State of Research on Joseph and Aseneth," in *Religion, Literature, and Society in Ancient Israel, Formative Christianity and Judaism*, eds. J. Neusner et al.; NPAJ, 2 (Lanham: University Press of America, 1987) 31–52; G. Y. Glazov, *The Bridling of the Tongue and the Opening of the Mouth in Biblical Prophecy*, JSOTSS, 311 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 37; M. Philonenko, "Initiation et mystère dans Joseph et Aséneth," in *Initiation*, ed. C. J. Bleeker; SHR, 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1965) 147–153; M. Schneider, "Joseph and Aseneth and Early Jewish Mysticism," *Kabbalah* 3 (1998) 303–344 [Hebrew]; M. Schneider, *Scattered Traditions of Jewish Mysticism: Studies in Ancient Jewish Mysticism in Light of Traditions from the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha, Hellenistic Literature, Christian and Islamic Sources*, SSLJM, 31 (Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2012) 11–79 [Hebrew]; Schneider, "Animation of the Cultic Statues, the Magic of Memory and the Pupil's Initiation," 49–66.

244 M. Idel, "Hermeticism and Judaism," in *Hermeticism and the Renaissance: Intellectual History and the Occult in Early Modern Europe*, eds. I. Merkel and A. G. Debus (Washington, DC: Folger Library, 1988) 59–76; M. Idel, *Golem: Jewish Magical and Mystical Traditions on the Artificial Anthropoid* (Albany: SUNY, 1990); T. C. Krulak, *The Animated Statue and the Ascension of the Soul: Ritual and the Divine Image in Late Platonism* (Ph.D. diss. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 2009). In relation to these rituals, animated by the divine names, Eric Dodds points out that "the magical papyri offer recipes for constructing such images and animating them . . . the image is to be hollow, like Psellus' statues, and is to enclose a magic name inscribed on gold leaf." E. R. Dodds, "Theurgy and Its Relationship to Neoplatonism," *JRS* 37 (1947) 55–69 at 63. Dodds further

notes that such manufacture of magical statuettes of gods was not “a new industry or a monopoly of the theurgists. It rested ultimately upon the primitive and widespread belief in a natural *συνπάθεια* linking image with original.” Dodds, “Theurgy,” 63.

- 245 G. Scholem, “The Idea of the Golem,” in *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism*, trans. R. Manheim (New York: Schocken, 1965) 159–165; E. L. Greenstein, “God’s Golem: The Creation of the Human in Genesis 2,” in *Creation in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, eds. H. Reventlow and Y. Hoffman; JSOTSS, 319 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) 219–239. In later rabbinic testimonies, not only Golem but also some infamous biblical idols are brought to life through the placement of the divine Name in their mouths. One story occurs in *Zohar* II.175a, in which the idol of King Nebuchadnezzar is vivified when a vessel of the Temple with the divine Name is put in its mouth:

King Nebuchadnezzar made an image of gold whose height was sixty cubits high and whose width was six cubits. Nebuchadnezzar said, “The image that I saw had a head of gold and belly of silver. . . . I will make one all of gold, so that a lower coronet of gold will be upon its head.” It has been taught: On that day he gathered all peoples, nations, and tongues to worship that image, and he took one of the vessels of the Temple upon which was engraved the Holy Name and put it in the mouth of that image, and it began speaking grandly until Daniel came and approached the image, and said, “I am the messenger of the supreme Lord. I decree upon you to leave here!” He invoked the Holy Name, and that vessel came out, and the image fell and broke.

D. Matt, *The Zohar: Pritzker Edition*, 12 vols. (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003) 5.520

PRE 55 suggests that another infamous biblical idol – the golden calf – was created with the help of the divine Name; it reads:

They broke off their earrings which were in their own ears, and they gave (them) to Aaron, as it is said, “And all the people brake off the golden rings which were in their ears” (Exod 32:3). “Which were in the ears of their wives” is not written here, but “which were in their ears.” Aaron found among the earrings one plate of gold upon which the Holy Name was written, and engraved thereon was the figure of a calf, and that (plate) alone did he cast into the fiery furnace, as it is said, “So they gave it me: and I cast it into the fire, and there came out this calf.” It is not written here, “And I cast them in,” but “And I cast it in the fire, and there came out this calf.” The calf came out lowing, and the Israelites saw it, and they went astray after it.

Friedlander, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, 354–355

For in depth discussion of this tradition, see Scholem, *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism*, 182; Glazov, *The Bridling of the Tongue and the Opening of the Mouth in Biblical Prophecy*, 382.

- 246 Schüle, “Made in the ‘Image of God,’” 13–14.
 247 Beckerleg, *The “Image of God” in Eden*, 2.
 248 H. Niehr, “In Search of Yhwh’s Cult Statue in the First Temple,” in *The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, ed. K. van der Toorn; CBET, 21 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997) 73–95 at 93.
 249 H.-P. Müller, “Neue Parallelen zu Gen 2,7: zur Bedeutung der Religionsgeschichte für die Exegese des Alten Testaments,” in *Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East: Festschrift E. Lipinski*, eds. K. van Lerberghe and A. Schoors; OLA, 65 (Leuven: Peeters, 1995) 195–204 at 199–201.
 250 Berlejung, *Die Theologie der Bilder*, 412.
 251 Beckerleg, *The “Image of God” in Eden*, 22. On this see also W. Wifall, “The Breath of His Nostrils: Gen 2:7b,” *CBQ* 36 (1974) 237–240; Boden, *The Mesopotamian Washing of the Mouth (mīs pi) Ritual*, 171.

- 252 In both texts, the spiritual feeding has salvific and eschatological significance. It returns a human seer to the protological condition when the protoplast was fed by the splendor of the Shekinah. As Ira Chernus rightly noted, this tradition of the protoplast's spiritual nourishment appears to be reflected also in *3 Enoch*. Chernus, *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism*, 75–76. Thus, *3 Enoch* 5:3 says that “the first man and his generation dwelt at the gate of the garden of Eden so that they might gaze at the bright image of the Shekinah.” Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.259. An early witness to the protoplast's feeding on the divine Glory might also be reflected in *2 Enoch*, in which the Deity orders the angel to open the heavens so Adam will gain access to the vision of Glory.
- 253 Concerning these traditions, see Idel, *Golem*, 31, 91–92, 103, 139.
- 254 Cf. also *Jos. Asen.* 12:5: “My mouth is defiled from the sacrifices of the idols and from the tables of the gods of the Egyptians.” Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth,” 2.221.
- 255 *Jos. Asen.* 10:12–13: “And Aseneth hurried and took all her gods that were in her chamber, the ones of gold and silver who were without number, and ground them to pieces and threw all the idols of the Egyptians through the window.” Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth,” 2.218. Cf. also *Jos. Asen.* 13:11:

Behold now, all the gods whom I once used to worship in ignorance: I have now recognized that they were dumb and dead idols, and I have caused them to be trampled underfoot by men, and the thieves snatched those that were of silver and gold.

Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth,” 2.223

4 The epistemology of divine presence and pseudepigraphical attribution

Pseudepigraphical attribution

The personification of divine knowledge in early Judaism and, especially, in the Jewish pseudepigrapha, creates a situation in which the divine theophany is conditioned by the story and the persona of the exemplar who undergoes a transformation from a human seer to an embodiment of the divine manifestation. These developments can provide a new understanding of the practice of pseudepigraphical attribution in Jewish apocalyptic materials, a phenomenon which has puzzled students of ancient Judaism for a long time.

In recent decades, there has been an increase in scholarly publications devoted to the phenomenon of pseudepigraphical attribution, which was widespread in the early Jewish milieu¹ and surrounding ancient cultures.² Among some general explanations for the practice, “the desire for financial gain,”³ “the motive of pure malice,”⁴ “the motive of modesty,”⁵ and “the interests of dramatic composition”⁶ are often listed. Peculiarities in the transmission of various literary works in ancient cultures have also been suggested as a possible reason.⁷ Furthermore, it has been noted that pseudepigraphical attribution was sometimes used for *ex eventu* prophecy, a literary practice widespread in the ancient world.⁸ Still, some other studies attempted to explain the popularity of pseudepigraphy in the Jewish milieu by drawing attention to peculiar features of the Jewish religious mindset, interpreting the praxis of pseudepigraphy in the light of the idea of corporate personality.⁹ Other approaches tried to consider the specific social conditions of the early Jewish apocalyptic movement in which pseudepigraphical attribution gains its popularity. In this instance, the practice could serve as a protective shield for the authors’ identity in the time of persecution.¹⁰

Another perspective on the practice of the pseudepigraphical attribution is the so-called psychological approach.¹¹ This method considers “ecstatic or oracular identification as a primary vehicle of pseudonymity in religious writings.”¹² According to Charles Stang, this approach argues that

a pseudonymous author had a special kinship with the ancient sage or seer under whose name he wrote, and that pseudonymous writing served to collapse or “telescope” the past and the present, such that the present author and the past luminary could achieve a kind of contemporaneity.¹³

Regarding the history of this approach in American and continental scholarship, Stang recounts that “the scholar who brought this approach to the English-speaking scholarly community was D. S. Russell,¹⁴ although the background for his approach can be found among a handful of German scholars, including Friedrich Torm,¹⁵ Joseph Sint,¹⁶ and Wolfgang Speyer.”¹⁷ In recent years, however, scholarly interest in this method has been steadily declining. Stang points out that “this approach has seen its fortunes fall, to some degree: once the most popular explanation, it is now very much on the defensive.”¹⁸

The most influential explanation for the practice of pseudepigraphy in recent years has been tied to the concepts of power and authority¹⁹ that such attribution granted to its authors.²⁰ Eva Mroczek observes that this perspective in recent years has become the dominant way of understanding the practice of pseudepigraphical attribution in antiquity.²¹ In this conceptual framework, new revelations were understood to be “attributed to great figures – such as Moses, Enoch, Ezra, or David – in order to imbue new traditions with an authority they would not have if they were circulated anonymously or in the name of their true author.”²² Proponents of this approach emphasise that “the function of pseudepigraphy. . . [was] to strengthen the work’s authority” by placing prophecies “in the mouth of the ancient patriarch or prophet to make them more convincing.”²³ These studies remind us that for the ancients authority was situated in the past, which meant that authority and antiquity were closely interrelated.²⁴ Hindy Najman summarises the gist of this attitude by proposing that for the ancients “the only passable roads to textual authority led through the past.”²⁵ The practice of pseudonymously attributing a text to past exemplars, in her opinion, helped to recover an idealised past.²⁶ According to Najman,

by extending a discourse attached to a founder of an earlier period, writers in the late Second Temple period and even after the destruction of the Second Temple are able to authorize and link their new texts to old and established traditions and founders.²⁷

While the aforementioned avenues tied to the concepts of power and authority were deemed to be productive, recent debates on the nature of pseudepigraphical attribution have neglected other options, especially those related to the cultic dimension of divine knowledge and divine presence that was formative for Jewish apocalypticists. In contrast, our study demonstrates that the cultic context plays a paramount role in the creation of the pseudepigraphical exemplars’ exalted profiles in the *Kavod* and the *Shem* paradigms of the divine presence. The sacerdotal dimension profoundly effects the exemplar’s cultivation and transmission of the divine knowledge which are inseparable from his mediation of the divine presence. This cultic aspect, however, has been consistently ignored by students of the Jewish pseudepigrapha in explanations of pseudepigraphical attribution. Furthermore, the broader Near Eastern cultic context of Jewish pseudepigraphical traditions of divine presence has also not received sufficient scholarly attention. Our previous investigation demonstrated the importance of the divine

image and Name traditions in the construction of the pseudepigraphical exemplars' identities as personifications of the divine presence and mediators of divine knowledge. In light of this, we should now examine the ancient Near Eastern cultic traditions where various divine representations serve as the main conduits for the transmission of divine knowledge and presence.

Near Eastern cultic images and the divine presence

In recent decades, there has been a dramatic shift in the scholarly understanding of ancient Near Eastern traditions about the divine images and how they cultivated the divine presence. Current scholarly approaches reflect a move from a negative attitude toward ancient Near Eastern cultic statues, epitomised in the apologetic rhetoric of some biblical narratives,²⁸ to a more nuanced understanding of divine images as paradoxical conduits of the divine presence. Michael Hundley argues that in ancient Near Eastern cultic milieus, the divine presence was

concretized and localized in the form of a cult image. More than simply living in a space marked off as sacred, the deity was persuaded, often through elaborate rituals, to in some way inhabit a tangible, human-made form, its cult image.²⁹

Also, in recent years, there have been consistent efforts to challenge the traditional status of Near Eastern cultic images as mere “representations” or “religious pictures” of a deity. One of the main advocates of this new approach, Angelika Berlejung, suggests that “a cultic statue was never solely a religious picture, but was always an image imbued with a god, and, as such, it possessed the character of both earthly reality and divine presence.”³⁰ Stephen Herring reiterates the same position, noting that

šalmu does not mean statue, relief, or sculpture – or, at least not the way we understand these terms. The concept of “portrait” as a replica of the referent is inaccurate since it is not a natural replica but conventionally coded and culturally mediated representation.³¹

The understanding of a cultic image as a representation is rooted in a Greek philosophical legacy, which profoundly affected the mainstream Western concept of mimesis or imitation.³² Yet, some experts object to approaching Near Eastern cultic images through the spectacles of mimesis. Zainab Bahrani argues that

the axiomatic notion that representation is a means of imitating real things in the world must be set aside, as much as possible, in dealing with works of art from Near Eastern antiquity, even if this means risking an emphasized alterity with all its consequences. . . . [In the ancient Near Eastern cultures] visual representation functioned according to a system unrelated to mimesis or preceptualism. Therefore, even the term representation carries

certain meanings that might be considered a natural aspect of image making but have the potential of turning into obstacles when applied to a study of Mesopotamian images.³³

In her comments on the aesthetics of ancient Near Eastern cultic images, Bahrani argues that

rather than being a copy of something in reality, the image itself was seen as a real thing. It was not considered to resemble an original reality that was present elsewhere but to contain that reality in itself. Therefore, instead of being a means of signifying an original real thing, it was seen as ontologically equivalent to it, existing in the same register of reality.³⁴

Bahrani further asserts that in ancient Near Eastern cultures *šalmu* was clearly understood as “a part of a configuration that enables presence through reproduction”³⁵ as it “becomes a real manifestation.”³⁶ Instead of using terminology of “representation” or “imitation,” Bahrani suggests that the Near Eastern divine image is better understood as “a mode of presencing,”³⁷ envisioned as “a doubling or a multiplication,” and not as “a copy in the sense of mimetic resemblance,” rather representing “a repetition, another way that the person or entity could be encountered.”³⁸

At the end of her study Bahrani concludes that the Near Eastern cultic image should be approached “in terms of a metonymy of presence”³⁹ in which the presence is never a plenitude or unique because it always carries a measure of absence.⁴⁰ She argues that

rather than approaching it in terms of mimesis, a mimesis that is distinctive of a post-Greek metaphysics and closely linked to the notion of a possible pure phoneticism, this function of the image can be read or understood as part of a system of circulation of presence, difference, and deferment.⁴¹

In this perspective the cultic image was not a representation of the deity, but rather it was the embodied divine presence. According to Benjamin Sommer,

a *šalmu*, then, did not merely direct the worshipper’s mind toward a god who dwelled in some other sphere; it did not depict the god. Rather, once the *mīs pī* or *pīt pī* ritual was complete, the divine presence entered into the statue, and the *šalmu* was the god.⁴²

It is difficult, if not impossible, from the modern epistemological situation, to comprehend exactly how each individual cultic image attained the fullness of the divine presence.⁴³ Gebhard Selz admits that the ancient conception of divine presence “seems problematic, even contradictory to us, but evidently was not to the mind of ancient man.”⁴⁴

Indeed, these conundrums surrounding Near Eastern cultic images illustrate the inherent limitations of modern Western epistemologies which are unable to resolve the paradox of the divine presence in cultic images. In this regard, Bahrani asserts that one of the stumbling blocks is “the larger ontological binary system of Western metaphysics that distinguishes between a signifier and a stable signified”⁴⁵ which is unable to grasp “the ontological worldview of the ancient Near East where the distinction between object and referent was not as clear as it is today.”⁴⁶

Another obstacle is that ancient Near Eastern cultures operated with different presuppositions about what constitutes “reality.” The great sumerologist Thorkild Jacobsen draws attention to this crucial issue, which, in his opinion, separates a modern human being from its ancient counterpart. This prevents the moderns from comprehending the true meaning of cultic images in ancient societies. The modern mind assigns a different ontological status to the “spiritual” world which, Jacobson believes is different from the ancient perception of “spiritual” reality. Jacobsen suggests that

we moderns – most of us at least – live in two intersecting worlds, the world of tangible things and the world of intangibles; we are dualists, of mind and of matter, of material and of spiritual. As to what is real, our main criterion is that of coherence. A dream may be extremely vivid and the dream experience may seem very real; yet, if on awakening we find that it stands in no causal connection with the stream of experience before we went to sleep, we dismiss it as unreal, it was a dream merely. For the ancients there was no such dismissal. Their world was one, they were monists. They too distinguished between experience when awake and dreams, but to them the difference was not, as for us, one of kind, that is, real or unreal, but one of degree.⁴⁷

Similarly, Herring argues that “the ancient Mesopotamians did not recognise a distinct separation between the material and spiritual world; a distinction taken for granted today.”⁴⁸ Jacobsen further highlights the difference between the ancient perception of reality and the modern paradigm, acknowledging that

as ideas may come slowly to mind and then be realized in action, we distinguish between the idea and its realization sharply. Not so the ancients. For them it was a single process of an existent gradually becoming more and more substantive, enduring, and lasting. Since things and events thus exist before they become in our terms “real,” they can be sensed, much as a doctor can tell the existence of a disease from its symptoms before its actual outbreak.⁴⁹

Jacobsen illustrates this gradual “becoming” through transformative rituals which brought Near Eastern cultic statues to life. He highlights that in the course of such ceremonies

the statue mystically becoming what it represents, the god, without, however, in any way limiting the god, who remains transcendent. In so “becoming,” the statue ceases to be mere earthly wood, precious metals and stones, ceases to be the work of human hands. It becomes transubstantiated, a divine being, the god it represents. This incredible ability to become transformed was achieved through special ritual acts and through the power of the word to create and change reality.⁵⁰

The important concept introduced here in relation to the Near Eastern cultic images is “transubstantiation.”⁵¹ Jacobsen points out that

the god – or rather the specific form of him that was represented in this particular image – was born in heaven, not on earth. In the birth the craftsmen-gods that form an embryo in the womb gave it form. When born in heaven it consented to descend and to “participate” in the image, thus transubstantiating it. The image as such remains a promise, a potential, and an incentive to a theophany, to a divine presence, no more.⁵²

Approaching Near Eastern cultic images through the concept of transubstantiation might raise objections from some audiences because this term has been used for centuries by Catholic theologians to describe the real presence of Christ’s body and blood in the Eucharist.⁵³ However, the analogy is useful since it elucidates the ancient concept of the divine presence in modern religious praxis. Although this understanding of the divine presence survives in modern culture only as an incomprehensible mystery,⁵⁴ it nevertheless serves as an enduring memorial of the ancient rationality of the divine presence. The ancient mentality encapsulated in the theology of the Eucharist is an important gateway into the divine presence in ancient Near Eastern cultures. Stephen Herring argues that “the benefit of this analogy is that many in the West are intimately familiar with it.”⁵⁵

Developing Jacobsen’s insights, Michael Dick insists that the Eucharistic analogy, where the bread and wine during the ritual become the real presence of Jesus, while still subsisting under the appearance of bread and wine, “helps us understand the theology of the ancient Near Eastern cult image,” since “by the words of the Eucharistic prayer and the invocation of the Holy Spirit (in Orthodox tradition), the bread and wine ‘made by human hands’ become the real presence of Jesus.”⁵⁶

Importantly, in the Eucharist, the bread and wine are not merely symbolic “representations” of God but his “real presence.” To illustrate this difference, Dick references a tradition in Theodore of Mopsuestia’s *On Matthew 26:26*:

He (Jesus) did not say, “This is the symbol of my body and blood”; but ‘this is my body, and this is my blood,’ teaching us not to see the nature of the object, for, in becoming Eucharist, the objects are changed into the body and blood of Christ.⁵⁷

Furthermore, the Eucharistic tradition of the divine presence provides an important key to unlock another perplexing enigma of Near Eastern cultic images, namely, how multiple cultic representations⁵⁸ appearing in multiple locations can manifest a single deity.⁵⁹ Dick writes that “the Eucharistic species are not coterminous with the heavenly Jesus, so that the Eucharistic presence can be found simultaneously in churches throughout the world or within several chapels in the same church.”⁶⁰

Reflecting on the modern limitation of grasping the ancient concept of the divine presence, Dick suggests that

the difficulty of reconciling heavenly and earthly presences lies with the modern mind, which directed by the fear of logical contradictions has problems reconciling these elements. . . . There was a similar problem in the history of eucharistic theology, wherein many objected, how could Christ be both “at the right hand of the Father in heaven and in the Eucharist in various churches on earth?”⁶¹

Exploring the paradoxes of the divine presence in Near Eastern cultic images enables us to better understand how the pseudepigraphical exemplars mediated the divine presence. We should now proceed to investigate these connections.

Pseudepigraphy and the ritual of the amputation of the hands

Although a Near Eastern cultic statue was made by human hands – in vivification ceremonies, the memory of human authorship was eliminated through a ritual of the symbolic “cutting of the hands” of the craftsmen with knives made from tamarisk wood⁶² and the craftsmen’s own denial of their authorship of the cultic image in an oath.⁶³ The Mesopotamian ceremonies of bringing a cultic statue to life, therefore, “served both to purify a newly made divine image and, simultaneously, to disconnect that image from its human fashioners.”⁶⁴ Angelika Berlejung explains that

this rite of separation is accompanied by an assertory oath by the craftsmen who each swear (differently according to their profession and patronate god): “I did not make (it, i.e. the statue); (I swear) I did not [make (it), and]. Ninildu, (who is) Ea, the god of the carpenter, [has made it].”⁶⁵

Afterwards, the priest bound their hands and, in a symbolic act, “cut them off” with a sword of tamarisk wood.⁶⁶ Berlejung suggests that this

rite and oath are meant to annihilate all traces of the statue’s earthly origin. The making of the image which had taken place in both heaven and earth has now been divested of its earthly qualities and reduced to the heavenly sphere.⁶⁷

An important aspect of this ritual is the notion of the “heavenly craftsmen,” to whom the earthly masters surrender their authorship. In this ritual, the authorship of a cultic image shifts from the earthly to the divine realm as the mundane craftsmen’s hands are symbolically cut off with wooden knives or swords.

This process can be compared with the praxis of pseudepigraphical attribution found in Jewish apocalyptic accounts, where human writers surrender their authorship to otherworldly exemplars. In both traditions, the main intent of the rite pertains to the cultivation of the divine presence. In order to fully manifest the divine presence and knowledge, a material embodiment or a literary version of the exemplar’s “cultic statue” is severed from the identities of their human creators. Their hands must be “amputated” at the final stage of the masterpiece’s creation, in order to unify it with the otherworldly patron. And like in their Near Eastern cultic counterparts, in Jewish pseudepigraphical accounts the otherworldly exemplar becomes the sole author for the conduit of the divine presence after it is initially fashioned by the earthly adepts’ hands.

For our study, it is important that the heavenly figure envisioned in the Near Eastern cultic traditions as a patron of the craft is similar to Enoch’s or Moses’ roles as heavenly scribes. Indeed, the two processes of surrendering authorship and reassigning it to otherworldly figures are strikingly similar. The goal of both is to enable the artifact to regain fully the divine presence. As we already learned, some stories of pseudepigraphical exemplars act as records of the divine images’ “vivifications.” Their purpose was to fashion a new type of divine image or a paradoxical statue of divine knowledge, which fully manifested the divine presence on earth, similar to Near Eastern cultic relics. Examples of these cultic “statues” occur in the *Primary Adam Books*, *2 Enoch*, the *Ladder of Jacob*, and many other early Jewish accounts. The hands that crafted these cultic narratives are amputated through pseudepigraphical attribution. This enabled otherworldly exemplars, such as biblical patriarchs and prophets, to fully manifest the divine presence and knowledge to their human adepts. By cutting the hands of the earthly custodians of the mediatorial trends, linked to the names of Enoch, Jacob, or Moses, a new story of the ancient character becomes more than a mere representation. Released from the captivity of mimesis, this novel revelation becomes a part of the “statue of knowledge” – an uninterrupted continuum for the mediation of the divine presence by the exemplar.

Reassigning the image’s authorship is equally crucial for both the Mesopotamian sacerdotal milieu and Jewish pseudepigraphical traditions, in which the exemplars assumed the cultic role of the *imago Dei*. Stephen Herring reminds us that

the *šalmu* only becomes a valid substitute after a transformational process. Not merely through corresponding function can that object be considered a valid substitute or extension; the “image” must go through a process in which it is encoded with those signifiers that make up the essence, or destiny, of the referent.⁶⁸

Zainab Bahrani also recalls that after the consecration ceremony, “the statue, which had by then become a god, was no longer referred to as *šalmu*, the Akkadian word for image or statue.”⁶⁹

The event of the pseudepigraphical attribution thus becomes a necessary step in the Jewish narrative version of the vivification ritual where the cultic image, or in this case, the exemplar, is brought into existence. The hand of the earthly literary authors must be “amputated” so that the literary work could be connected with its otherworldly owner. Apocalyptic stories, similar to Mesopotamian accounts, preserve the memory of rituals that depict the hands of the earthly masters being severed. The narrative remnants of this “amputation of the hands” occur in many Jewish pseudepigraphical stories when an earthly seer becomes suddenly identified with his or her heavenly version and undergoes the transition from a human visionary to an otherworldly exemplar. In the narrative fabric of the pseudepigraphical story the “amputation” of the human hands happens precisely at the moment when the seer unexpectedly assumes the divine presence fully. These paradoxical transitions often puzzle modern interpreters.

The Mesopotamian traditions about the symbolic severing of the human fashioners’ hands also provide an additional insight into the praxis of pseudepigraphy which illustrates its importance not only for attribution of social authority to a given text or revelation but also to the process of sacralisation of the revelation. It is possible that in the ancient mind, after the human hands are completely severed from a religious text or artifact, only then can it become divine revelation. The ritual of amputation highlights an important role of human anonymisation in the economy of a revelation’s representation of the divine presence. Through this ordeal, a disclosure becomes fully connected with the otherworldly patron’s essence and power. Scholars of early Judaism, who argued for the importance of power and authority in pseudepigraphy, have often missed this function of sacralisation in pseudepigraphical attribution which plays a significant role in many early Jewish accounts.

Epistemology of the divine presence

Our study suggests that the complex and often paradoxical relationship between God’s presence and the divine image in ancient Near Eastern milieus is relevant to the ongoing investigation of pseudepigraphical exemplars who act as eschatological versions of the *imago Dei* in Jewish apocalyptic accounts. Through elaborate transformative rituals, the biblical patriarchs and prophets were transubstantiated into ontological extensions of the divine presence. These rituals reveal a distinct “cultic” way of mediating the divine presence and, consequentially, divine knowledge. This is different from the transmission of knowledge through a discursive media in scribal and sapiential trends. This distinct way of the cultivation and transmission of knowledge can be designated as the “divine presence’s epistemology” or “cultic epistemology.” This epistemological approach applies to both the divine image traditions and to the divine Name trend, since in the *Shem* paradigm, the Name fulfills the same functions as the *imago Dei*.

In Jewish traditions, the human body became the *mesu*-tree material used to produce new cultic images of the deity. Translated human beings embodied in the biblical patriarchs and prophets came to be the cultic statues of God during their inductions into the office of the eschatological image of God or the hypostasis of the divine Name. Unlike Near Eastern cultic statues whose inner experience of transubstantiation remained concealed from the human eye, the initiations and metamorphoses of the pseudepigraphical heroes provide a unique glimpse into the dynamics of vivified cultic statues, now from the firsthand reports originated from the “statues” themselves. The direct testimonies from the biblical exemplars that became personified cultic images reveal that the epistemology of the cultic statue’s production is exceedingly complex. While many scribal and sapiential pseudepigraphical accounts clearly demarcate the subject of knowledge from the object of knowledge, the initiations into the divine image or Name reveal a peculiar epistemological framework where the subject and object of knowledge are dissolved into a single entity. This occurs, for example, in some Jewish visionary accounts where the exemplar represents both the subject and the object of the vision. In these accounts, the exemplar is often depicted as a beholder of the theophany and the theophany itself. In light of these dynamics, the process of anonymisation and reassignment of authorship takes a more radical turn in pseudepigraphical accounts than in the Near Eastern traditions of the cultic images. While, in the latter, the “craftsmen” of the divine presence always remain in an external position, in the former they are often themselves transitioned into the embodiment of the divine presence through elaborate routines of identification with their heavenly counterparts.⁷⁰

This highlights the unique epistemological framework in which the “earthly versions” of pseudepigraphical patrons were transformed from the learning subject into becoming knowledge itself, thus overcoming the dichotomy between an epistemological subject and object. Through an interaction with the divine presence, the exemplar’s nature and form undergo a dramatic metamorphosis which makes him the ontological mirror of this theophanic reality. In many pseudepigraphical accounts, therefore, the heroes progress in the course of the story from beholding the theophanic events to embodying the divine theophanies and then to personifying the divine presence and knowledge. The transformation of an exemplar into an embodied theophany provides another crucial insight into the dynamics of pseudepigraphical attribution. In an ancient theological worldview, where the subject and object of the divine knowledge are blurred and even dissolved, there is an additional reason for the praxis of pseudepigraphy. In this epistemological architecture, the transmission of ultimate divine mysteries cannot be accomplished without the exemplar’s embodiment of the divine knowledge.

This also facilitates a different perspective of the divine theophany itself. The theophany is not a rigid, frozen object but an everchanging reality, in which its beholder eventually dissolves into the theophanic event. Paraphrasing Hans-Georg Gadamer’s famous dictum, a theophany fulfills its purpose only if its beholder loses himself or herself in it.

These epistemological peculiarities offer additional insights into the enigmatic praxis of pseudepigraphy. In the cultic epistemology of the divine presence the subject and object of divine knowledge collapses. This collapse also occurs in the concept of authorship. To an ancient mind, as a beholder of the divine presence becomes an embodied theophany, a seeker of knowledge must also become the embodiment of knowledge.

This is different from our contemporary notions of author and authorship which presuppose that the object of knowledge and the subject of knowledge are not the same. In our conventional structure, knowledge is posited as the subject's property. Knowledge is an object that belongs to the creative subject who generated and cultivated it.

This may be why some Jewish pseudepigraphical traditions that were conceived in the aesthetics of the Near Eastern cultic images remain largely misunderstood in contemporary epistemological settings. Such settings often imagine an exemplar solely as a "mule" who delivers divine knowledge externally to his or her earthly adepts. This situation often occurs in scribal and sapiential traditions. This is why Jewish scribal and sapiential ways of the divine knowledge's transmission are more transparent for a modern mind. In them, even if this knowledge becomes a part of an adept's intellect and memory, the gap between the subject and object of knowledge is still firmly maintained.

Jewish divine mediators and the divine presence epistemology

The limitation of our modern mind in understanding the transference and cultivation of the divine presence in ancient Mesopotamian, Jewish, and Christian milieus also profoundly affects current approaches to Second Temple mediatorial figures. To remedy this, the same set of epistemological insights that we have uncovered in our investigation of the pseudepigraphical exemplars must now be applied to the divine mediators in general. The process of paradoxical transference and delegation of the divine presence to mediatorial figures in the context of Israelite monotheism remains a puzzling issue in recent scholarship. Yet, the paradox of transference cannot be resolved in the prevailing epistemological frameworks. The futility of scholarly debates illustrates the limits of our modern rationality to grasp the delegation and cultivation of the divine presence in multiple cultic "hosts." The modern mind has also similar difficulties in understanding the multiplicity of Near Eastern cultic images.

Many of the seminal studies about Jewish mediators have been conducted from the viewpoint of Christian traditions that attempt to understand divine mediation through the lens of later Christological beliefs. However, it is more appropriate to approach Second Temple mediators, and especially their roles in mediating the divine presence and knowledge, from the point of view of Near Eastern "divine image" traditions. This is especially necessary for exemplars whose stories, like Enoch's, are rooted in Near Eastern sacerdotal traditions.

A “divine presence epistemology” also provides alternative insights into how the divine presence could be simultaneously present in multiple mediatorial figures.⁷¹ The multiplicity of enigmatic agents that embody the divine presence often flummoxes interpreters when viewed within the scope of monotheistic Judaism. Furthermore, these figures are often explored through later Christological and trinitarian developments that seek to emphasise the uniqueness of divine personhood. In fact, much of the research done on early Jewish divine mediators has been conducted from the perspective of the later Christological trends that replaced Near Eastern notions of divine presence and divine representation with Platonic counterparts, such as mimesis. Instead of taking a “step forward” to later Christian developments, a “step back” to Near Eastern roots of mediatorial trends may provide a better understanding of how multiple figures simultaneously mediated the divine presence.

Scholars have proposed that the fluidity of cultic images found in ancient Near Eastern milieus was challenged in the Hebrew Bible by the postulation of a single divine embodiment located in a certain place. Benjamin Sommer argues that while “the biblical authors responsible for the Pentateuch’s JE narratives and various scribes and poets with some connection to the northern kingdom”⁷² accepted the possibility that God “could have many bodies and a fluid self,” the Deuteronomic and Priestly layers of the Hebrew Bible rejected this possibility.⁷³ According to Sommer, “these same traditions regard divine embodiment as fixed, and they strongly condemn the stelae and *‘asherahs* so crucial to the notion of multiplicity of divine embodiment.”⁷⁴

In this respect, the multiplicity of divine mediators and “divine fragmentation” in extra-biblical pseudepigraphical accounts may constitute an alternative model that is deeply rooted in ancient Near Eastern cultic traditions.

Notes

- 1 Michael Stone argues that pseudepigraphical attribution was essential in the Hellenistic-Roman period. He states that

much literature of the Hellenistic-Roman period was pseudepigraphic, a phenomenon that has been studied frequently. The motives for it were complex. Eastern, oriental wisdom beguiled Hellenistic people and led to writings being fathered upon Nechepso, a legendary Egyptian king, or Zoroaster, the Persian sage. Old, learned traditions seemed to have had great authority just as later, works were attributed to Aristotle or Apollonius of Tyana.

Stone, “Pseudepigraphy Reconsidered,” 2

- 2 In the Greco-Roman milieus the use of pseudepigraphical attribution was not so overwhelming. Morton Smith suggests that

in the Greco-Roman tradition the material is mostly preserved as individual works by specified authors. . . . In the Israelite literary tradition, on the contrary, authors’ names are rarely reported and when they are reported the reports are almost always false.

M. Smith, “Pseudepigraphy in the Israelite Literary Tradition,” in *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh*, ed. S. J. D. Cohen; RGRW, 130.1 (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 1.55–72 at 57

- 3 B. M. Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," *JBL* 91.1 (1972) 3–24 at 5.
- 4 Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," 6.
- 5 Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," 7. Experts point out that in ancient literary milieus pseudepigrapha could be written as a literary exercise. On this, see W. Speyer, "Religiöse Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung," in *Pseudepigraphie in der heidnischen und jüdisch-christlichen Antike*, ed. N. Brox; Wege der Forschung, 484 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977) 195–263; L. Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles*, HUT, 22 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986) 15.
- 6 Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," 8.
- 7 Bruce Metzger points to errors during copying or transmission as a basis of pseudepigraphical attribution including "an erroneous attribution of authorship in connection with treatises written by different authors who had identical names, or closely similar names." Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," 10. Metzger suggests that when

scribes copied a manuscript that contained a miscellaneous assortment of writings by several authors, there was the ever-present chance of attributing some or all of them to the chief author in the collection, or to the one who happened to be named at the beginning of the manuscript.

Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," 10

- 8 John Collins observes that

this device of prophecy after the fact, authorized by a venerable pseudonym, is well known throughout the Hellenistic world from Persia to Rome. On the one hand, it conveys a sense that history is pre-determined, since it could be predicted centuries in advance. On the other, it inspires confidence in the real prediction with which these prophecies typically conclude.

J. J. Collins, "Pseudepigraphy and Group Formation in Second Temple Judaism," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. E. G. Chazon and M. E. Stone (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 43–58 at 43

Emil Schürer also notes that

a much cherished literary genre was pseudepigraphic-apocalyptic prophecy, where exhortation is based on special revelations which the authors claim to have received concerning the future destinies of Israel. Pseudepigraphy, i.e. the placing of the revelations in the mouths of the great men of the past, endowed the admonitions and consolations with special prestige and great authority.

E. Schürer, G. Vermes, and F. Millar, *The History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, 5 vols. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973–87) 3.1.179

- 9 See D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964) 89ff; H. W. Robinson, *Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964); J. W. Rogerson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality: A Reexamination," *JTS* 21 (1970) 1–16; Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles*, 7ff.
- 10 See P. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975) 252. For critical assessment, see J. J. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 39.
- 11 One of the main articulators of the "psychological" approach in continental scholarship, Wolfgang Speyer, often labeled this experiential mode of the pseudepigraphical

attribution as “echte religiöse Pseudepigraphie” (real religious pseudepigrapha). Speyer pointed out that this

form of writing, where a god is considered to be the author of the written monument, can be called mythical or religious pseudepigrapha. It is real as long as the belief in a god as a revealer is experienced alive.

W. Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum* (Munich: Beck, 1971) 36

Speyer pointed to the ancient roots of such a practice, noting that

this form of writing has always existed in the ancient Near East and especially in Israel. Yahweh speaks in the “I-sayings,” Moses is only the mediator of the speech of God, the revelation of God, like later the prophets and the apocalypticists.

Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung*, 36

According to Speyer,

if the image of being grasped/seized leads further to an identification of the writer with the imagined, inspiring spirit, which can be a god, an angel, or a God-beloved sage of antiquity, the “true religious pseudepigraphy” results. In this case, the human author is completely engulfed by the personal power that inspires him.

W. Speyer, “Fälschung, pseudepigraphische freie Erfindung und ‘echte religiöse Pseudepigraphie,’” in *Pseudepigrapha I. Pseudopythagorica, Lettres de Platon, Littérature pseudépigraphique juive*, ed. K. von Fritz (Vandoeuvres-Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1972) 333–366 at 359; quoted in C. M. Stang, *Apophysis and Pseudonymity in Dionysius the Areopagite: “No Longer I”* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) 47

- 12 D. G. Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition*, WUNT, 39 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 7.
- 13 Stang, *Apophysis and Pseudonymity*, 41–42.
- 14 Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*, 132.
- 15 F. Torm, *Die Psychologie der Pseudonymität im Hinblick auf die Literatur des Urchristentums* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1932).
- 16 J. A. Sint, *Pseudonymität im Altertum, ihre Formen und ihre Gründe* (Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag, 1969).
- 17 Stang, *Apophysis and Pseudonymity*, 47.
- 18 Stang, *Apophysis and Pseudonymity*, 47.
- 19 Stone points out that:

we may say that pseudepigraphy provided a way of handling the authoritative written tradition of the past. In this respect it was parallel to the exegetical tradition in function, although differing from it in content. Both exegesis and pseudepigraphy were instruments for relating to the normative written tradition and for aggiornamento, updating of it. Both techniques drew upon the authority of the written tradition. In that sense, they are both secondary to it, even if the apocalypses claim the authority of revelation.

Stone, “Pseudepigraphy Reconsidered,” 10

- 20 Some important categories, which emerged in these recent debates, include the notions of “exemplar,” “exemplarity,” “legacy patterns,” and “a discourse linked to the founder.” On these categories, see H. Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*, JSJSS, 77 (Leiden: Brill, 2003); H. Najman, *Past Renewals: Interpretive Authority, Renewed Revelation and the Quest for Perfection*, JSJSS, 53 (Leiden: Brill, 2010); H. Najman, *Losing the Temple and Recovering the Future: An Analysis of 4 Ezra* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

- 21 E. Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) 52. Metzger also emphasises the element of authorial authority in the production of the pseudepigrapha: “Still other literary forgeries and/or pseudepigrapha were produced when, for diverse reasons, various compositions were attributed to important figures of antiquity.” Metzger, “Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha,” 10. “Besides such assignments for the sake of convenience, very frequently literary frauds were perpetrated in the interest of securing greater credence for certain doctrines and claims.” Metzger, “Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha,” 11.
- 22 Mroczek, *Literary Imagination*, 52.
- 23 M. Bernstein, “Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; STDJ, 28 (Leiden: Brill, 1998) 1–26 at 6.
- 24 John Collins notes that “the device of pseudepigraphy offered many advantages to writers of the Hellenistic period, most obviously the prestige of antiquity.” Collins, “Pseudepigraphy and Group Formation in Second Temple Judaism,” 43.
- 25 Najman, *Secending Sinai*, 15.
- 26 H. Najman, “How Should We Contextualize Pseudepigrapha? Imitation and Emulation in 4 Ezra,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, eds. A. Hilhorst, E. Puech, and E. J. C. Tigchelaar; JSJSS, 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2007) 532.
- 27 Najman, “How Should We Contextualize Pseudepigrapha?” 532. Martin Hengel suggests that “the pseudepigraphic form necessarily became a firm rule for Jewish apocalyptic, since the apocalyptists’ unheard of claim to revelation could only be maintained by reference to those who had been endowed with the spirit in ancient times.” M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) 1.205.
- 28 Irene Winter observes that:

nowhere is the power of sacred images more evident than in the energies required to argue against them in biblical texts: from the prohibition against the making and worship of images in the Ten Commandments (Exodus 20:4–5) to the passionate denunciations of Isaiah (30:22; 44:9–20; 46:6) and Ezekiel (23:30), reiterated in Psalm 115, 1 Corinthians 8:4, and throughout the exegetical literature.

I. J. Winter, “‘Idols of the King’: Royal Images as Recipients of Ritual Action in Ancient Mesopotamia,” *JRitSt* 6 (1992) 13–42 at 13

- 29 Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*, 140.
- 30 Berlejung, “Washing the Mouth,” 46. Winter claims that the cultic image is “not standing for but actually manifesting the presence of the subject represented.” Winter, “Idols of the King,” 14.
- 31 Herring, “A ‘Transubstantiated’ Humanity,” 485. Zainab Bahrani states that:

the reason for steering away from the word portrait when discussing *šalmu* should be in the implied separation between sitter and portrait, inherent in its use. The portrait is a copy of the real person (whether one thinks of it as encoded or pure). *šalmu*, on the other hand, has the potential of becoming an entity in its own right, a being rather than a copy of a being.

Bahrani, *The Graven Image*, 125

- 32 Hundley shows that:

in the modern western world, the relationship between sign and referent, in our case between a deity and its image, is often one of mimesis. The image is merely a copy of the original, which points to the real but contains none of its essence. In other words, although it looks like the original and reminds one of it, it is of a different order entirely. In the ancient Near Eastern world, images often seem to have

been something entirely different, something much more than mere imitation. The image in particular was frequently considered part of the real, partaking of its essence yet doing so without diminishing that of the original. In a divine cult image, one encountered a deity not just as a resemblance but also in reality, without in any way diminishing the deity in all its heavenly plenitude. In fact, the image enhanced the divine plenitude by extending the deity's sphere of influence to the city and increasing cultic veneration.

Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*, 149–150

33 Bahrani, *The Graven Image*, 122.

34 Bahrani, *The Graven Image*, 127.

35 Herring notes that:

the image in ancient Mesopotamia should not be conceptualized as a mere statue or monument, since modern conceptions of portraiture are too often attached to those readings. *Ṣalmu* is not a replica but is conventionally and arbitrarily motivated by means of a rite of constitution, or transformation. Moreover, the separation between the image and the referent is not at all apparent. After the transformational ritual, the image becomes an extension or manifestation of the referent.

Herring, "A 'Transubstantiated' Humanity," 488–489

36 Bahrani, *The Graven Image*, 131.

37 Bahrani, *The Graven Image*, 135.

38 Bahrani, *The Graven Image*, 135.

39 Reiterating Bahrani's argument, Hundley concludes that:

in order to achieve a plenitude of presence, one accumulates metonymic representations of the divinity and, under the auspices of ritual, combines them so that the cult image becomes a fully functioning divine locus, without in any way diminishing the deity in its heavenly plenitude.

M. B. Hundley, "Divine Fluidity? The Priestly Tests in their Ancient Near Eastern Contexts," in *Text, Time, and Temple: Literary, Historical, and Ritual Studies in Leviticus*, eds. L. Trevaskis, F. Landy, and B. Bibb (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2015) 16–40 at 26

40 Bahrani, *The Graven Image*, 205.

41 Bahrani, *The Graven Image*, 205.

42 Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 21. Sommer further notes that:

it is clear that a divine statue in Mesopotamian thinking was no mere sign pointing toward a reality outside of itself. Rather, the *ṣalmu* was an incarnation, whose substance was identical with that of the God; through a specific ritual what had been a physical object became a body of the god.

Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 22

Michael Hundley comes to a similar conclusion by observing that "once culturally enlivened, the statue becomes the same god on earth as in heaven."

Hundley, "Divine Fluidity?," 26

43 Hundley argues that:

each divine manifestation in the form of an image is also both essentially the same as the original and distinct from it. Likewise, the fullness of the original entity is found not only in that original, but also in all its various copies.

Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*, 148

44 G. J. Selz, "'The Holy Drum, the Spear, and the Harp': Toward an Understanding of the Problems of Deification in Third Millennium Mesopotamia," in *Sumerian Gods and Their Representations*, eds. I. J. Finkel and M. J. Geller; CM, 7 (Groningen: Styx, 1997) 183.

45 Bahrani, *The Graven Image*, 121.

- 46 Herring, "A 'Transubstantiated' Humanity," 480.
 47 Jacobsen, "The Graven Image," 18–19.
 48 Herring, "A 'Transubstantiated' Humanity," 482.
 49 Jacobsen, "The Graven Image," 20.
 50 Jacobsen, "The Graven Image," 22–23.
 51 On the history of the term, see J. Goering, "The Invention of Transubstantiation," *Traditio* 46 (1991) 147–170.
 52 Jacobsen, "The Graven Image," 29. Herring concludes that "the Akkadian *šalmu*, then, does not refer to a mere statue of a deity or a king. Instead, what we are dealing with here is a complicated ontological belief, where, by means of a transformative ritual, the 'real'; presence of the referent is transubstantiated into the representation with the result that the representation exists as a valid substitute of said referent." Herring, "Divine Substitution," 25.
 53 Jaroslav Pelikan has written that "at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, the doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist achieved its definitive formulation in the dogma of transubstantiation." J. Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine, Vol. 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600–1300)* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978) 268.
 54 Ralph McMichael highlights this gap between the "Eucharistic presence" and our modern understanding of "presence" by noting that "Christ comes among the Eucharistic assembly in ways that do not comply with conventional presence. His Eucharistic presence transcends the conceptual boundaries we draw between presence and absence." R. McMichael, *Eucharist: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: Continuum, 2010) 36. He further notes that "Christ's presence is not the product of a thought experiment; we do not approach him through an extension of ideas." McMichael, *Eucharist: A Guide for the Perplexed*, 40.
 55 Herring, *Divine Substitution*, 21.
 56 Dick, "The Mesopotamian Cult Statue: A Sacramental Encounter with Divinity," 51.
 57 Dick, "The Mesopotamian Cult Statue: A Sacramental Encounter with Divinity," 52.
 58 Hundley notes that

in various texts, especially in mythology, deities were typically addressed holistically, such that a single deity could have multiple manifestations. While humans possess a single body that can only be in one place at a time, the gods were thought to be capable of simultaneously occupying multiple different bodies and manifesting in multiple different locations. . . . In fact, ancient Near Eastern deities could concurrently inhabit multiple different statues, even multiple images in the same temple. In addition to highlighting divine prestige, multiple images seem to have allowed for a division of labor. For example, while one image was used on procession, another could remain in the temple to receive regular service. . . . Rather than possessing a fixed amount of presence or power that had to be divided between manifestations (as the previous paragraph may suggest), ancient Near Eastern deities appear to have been divisible without diminishment, such that each could theoretically possess the full complement of divine powers.

Hundley, "Divine Presence in Ancient Near East," 210

Hundley further suggests that

nonetheless, while each could be fully divine, each was not the fullness of the deity. Rather, the cult image was but one of a deity's many manifestations or aspects. Divine plenitude instead lay in the aggregate, the accumulation of a deity's multiple manifestations, names, and potencies.

Hundley, "Divine Presence in Ancient Near East," 211

- 59 Sommer demonstrates that

in Mesopotamian religions, divine bodies differ from nondivine ones in that a deity's presence was not limited to a single body; it could emerge simultaneously in several

objects. This multiplicity of embodiment becomes clear in the Akkadian ritual texts that describe the activation of an idol or (to use a less loaded term) a divine image (Akkadian, *šalmu*).

Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 19

On this, see also B. Porter, "The Anxiety of Multiplicity: Concepts of Divinity as One and Many in Ancient Assyria," in *One God or Many: Concepts of Divinity in the Ancient World*, ed. B. Porter (Casco Bay, ME: Casco Bay Assyriological Institute, 2000) 236.

60 Dick, "The Mesopotamian Cult Statue: A Sacramental Encounter with Divinity," 54.

61 Dick, "The Mesopotamian Cult Statue: A Sacramental Encounter with Divinity," 56.

62 Regarding the ritual, Walker and Dick note that

ritual attempts to disassociate the cult image from human artisans are very developed in both the Babylonian and the Nineveh ritual tablets of *mīs pī*. There the artisans have their hands "cut off" with a wooden tamarisk sword while swearing that they did not make the image but that their respective craft deities had. The tools are wrapped in the body of a sacrificed sheep and thrown into the river to denote a return to Nudimmud (Ea), the craft god. In STT 200. . . we have the artisans' oath disavowing making the god. . . . Despite the work of human artisans on the cult image, it remains the "work of the god." The gods control and determine: (1) choice of the workers involved, (2) the place, (3) the time, and (4) the "birth" of the god.

C. Walker and M. Dick, "The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Mesopotamian *Mīs Pī* Ritual," in *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth: The Making of the Cult Image in the Ancient Near East*, ed. M. Dick (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999) 114–115

63 Jacobsen points out that during the ritual,

the goldsmith swears an oath, saying: "The God Gushkinbanda, Ea of the goldsmiths, verily made it. I did not make it!" Then the carpenter who fashioned the wooden core of the statue has the same done to him and swears that Nin-ildu, Ea of the carpenters, made it, not he.

Jacobsen, "Graven Image," 23

64 J. L. Kugel, *The God of Old: Inside the Lost World of the Bible* (New York: Free Press, 2003) 85. Regarding the disconnection of the statue from its human authors, Herring notes that

the *mīs pī* ritual was a significant attempt to distance the cult image from its human, earthly origin. Thus, at a critical point in the ritual, the cultic image was separated from the workshop and the workers who crafted it. At this stage the statue was "brought to the riverbank, where it was ritually regressed to the time it began as a tree and watered, so that it could be reborn." At the riverbank, the craftsmen's tools were thrown into the river (the watery abode of Ea) and, later, the craftsmen had their hands ritually cut off. . . . The point of these ritual acts . . . is clear: the fact that the statue is the work of human hands is ritually denied and thus magically made nonexistent, nullified.

Herring, *Divine Substitution*, 75–76

65 Berlejung, "Washing the Mouth," 62. For the texts of the ritual, see Walker et al., eds., *The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia*, 80, 151; Walker and Dick, "The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Mesopotamian *Mīs Pī* Ritual," in *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth: The Making of the Cult Image in the Ancient Near East*, 81, 100.

66 Berlejung, "Washing the Mouth," 62.

67 Berlejung, "Washing the Mouth," 62.

68 Herring, "A 'Transubstantiated' Humanity," 491.

69 Bahrani, *The Graven Image*, 171.

70 On these dynamics, see Orlov, *The Greatest Mirror*.

71 Hundley notes that

in light of the often multiple simultaneous manifestations of a single deity, one might suspect that each manifestation was a diluted form of the single deity. In other words, the more forms a deity occupied simultaneously, the less of the deity's potency each form would possess. However, there is no evidence that deities were imagined to possess a fixed amount of power. Instead, each manifestation could potentially possess all of the deity's powers in equal measure. . . . In fact, multiplying manifestations generally makes the deity and each of its manifestations more, not less, potent.

Hundley, "Divine Fluidity?," 19–20

72 Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 58.

73 Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 58.

74 Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 58.

Conclusion

Previous studies have demonstrated that the ancient Jewish literary environment operated with several paradigms of authorship and pseudepigraphical attribution. Some of these models were not uniquely Jewish since they were also practiced in other cultural and religious milieus. While scribal and sapiential contexts of pseudepigraphical production and authorial attribution have received proper attention in recent studies, the cultic context of pseudepigraphical traditions and, especially, the cultic profiles of pseudepigraphical exemplars in relation to the praxis of pseudepigraphical attribution have been largely ignored. This study has attempted to fill in this gap by exploring the cultic dimension of pseudepigraphy and its relationship with the divine presence and the divine theophanic knowledge.

This study has demonstrated that Jewish pseudepigraphical exemplars often functioned as aural and visual “icons” of the divine presence. Their mediation of the divine presence in turn created a specific epistemological framework in which an exemplar functioned as both the personification of the divine knowledge and as the “icon” of the theophanic mysteries that reveal the deity’s form and attributes.

The unique epistemological situation of the embodied divine knowledge elucidates the cultic dimension of pseudepigraphical attribution. In this cultic framework, the pseudepigraphical exemplar acts not only as a scribal or a sapiential mediator who transmits divine knowledge “externally” in writings or oral instructions but also as the hypostasis of knowledge, the epistemological organism, who functions as a cultic “statue” of the divine knowledge. Similar to Near Eastern cultic images, the mediator’s cultic “edifice” can be “constructed” in every generation and in every cultural milieu in order to serve as a living organism of the divine presence and knowledge.

Our study has explored how the exemplars’ role as the “statue” of divine theophanic knowledge was developed in two major Jewish paradigms of the divine presence: the visual *Kavod* trend and the aural *Shem* tradition. The cultic realities underlined in these two paradigms are pivotal backgrounds for the construction of the exemplars’ identities as the eschatological *imago Dei* and the hypostasis of the divine Name.

Our close exploration of the pseudepigraphical cultic traditions illustrates that pseudepigraphical attribution in some cases bears similarities to the process of a cultic statue's creation and vivification, occurring in Near Eastern rituals of the "washing of the mouth" and the "opening of the mouth." In these ancient routines, the earthly authorship of the cultic image was anonymised through the ritual of the "hand amputation" and then attributed to a heavenly patron of the cultic statue. The practice allowed the material artifact to be transubstantiated into a living conduit of the divine presence and knowledge. A similar process appears in Jewish pseudepigraphical accounts. As our study has demonstrated, the cultivation of the divine presence was widespread in antiquity, appearing in the Mesopotamian milieu and also in Egyptian and Greco-Roman religious environments. The practice of maintaining the divine presence through cultic images is adapted in the frameworks of Jewish biblical and extra-biblical accounts via the traditions of the image of God and the divine Name. These appropriations are most clearly visible in the construction of the pseudepigraphical exemplars' identities as the eschatological *imago Dei*.

This book attempts to elucidate another, often neglected, mode of the theophanic knowledge's transmission in which the mediator serves as the hypostasis of the divine presence and knowledge installed in heaven as the divine Image, Face, or Name. These entities represented the fullness of the divine revelation in the mind of Jewish apocalypticists and mystics. We also explored the elaborate rituals and initiations in which human adepts transitioned into their roles as the hypostases of the divine presence and knowledge.

The portrayals of the pseudepigraphical exemplars undergoing an initiation in the cultic image of the deity might also have a pedagogical function, one that is "oriented toward transformation which an ancient reader was expected to reenact."¹ Through these stories earthly adepts were able to enter the dramatic ordeal which transformed them from a creature of blood and flesh into an immortal manifestation of the divine presence and knowledge. Readers of these pseudepigraphical works often find themselves in the midst of a transformational story which starts with an earthly adept's contemplation of God's theophany and which ends with him becoming the theophany himself.

Note

- 1 A. Kim Harkins, *Reading with an "I" to the Heavens: Looking at the Qumran Hodayot Through the Lens of Visionary Traditions*, Ekstasis, 3 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012) 73.

Bibliography

Texts and translations

- Agourides, Savas. "Apocalypse of Sedrach." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 1.606–613. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
- Albeck, Chanoch. *Midrash Bereshit Rabbati*. Jerusalem: Mekitse Nirdamim, 1940.
- Alexander, Philip. "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 1.223–315. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
- Andersen, Francis. "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 1.91–221. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
- Berman, Samuel. *Midrash Tanhuma-Yelammedenu. An English Translation of Genesis and Exodus*. Hoboken, NJ: KTAV, 1996.
- Blanc, Cécile. *Origène, Commentaire sur Saint Jean. Tome I (Livres I-V)*. SC 120. Paris: Cerf, 1966.
- Böttrich, Christfried. *Das slavische Henochbuch*. JSHRZ 5. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1995.
- Box, George Herbert and Landsman, J. I. *The Apocalypse of Abraham*. Edited, with a Translation from the Slavonic Text and Notes. TED 1.10. London and New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918.
- Braude, William. *The Midrash on Psalms*. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.
- Braude, William and Kapstein, Israel. *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana. R. Kahana's Compilation of Discourses for Sabbaths and Festal Days*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975.
- Brock, Sebastian. *St. Ephrem the Syrian, Hymns on Paradise*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990.
- Burchard, Christoph. "Joseph and Aseneth." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 2.177–247. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
- Charles, Robert Henry. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis*. London: Black, 1902.
- . *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.
- Charles, Robert Henry and Forbes, Nevill. "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch." In *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. H. Charles, 2.425–469. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Charles, Robert Henry and Morfill, William Richard. *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896.

- Charlesworth, James. "Prayer of Manasseh." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 2.625–637. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
- Clarke, Ernest. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy*. ArBib 5B. Colledgeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Cohen, Martin. *The Sh'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*. TSAJ 9. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985.
- Collins, John. "Artapanus." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 2.889–903. 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
- Colson, Francis Henry and Whitaker, George Herbert. *Philo*. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929–1964.
- Cowley, Arthur Ernest. *The Samaritan Liturgy*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908.
- Davies, William David and Allison, Dale. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Davila, James. *Hekhalot Literature in Translation: Major Texts of Merkavah Mysticism*. SJJTP 20. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Diez Macho, Alejandro. *Neophiti 1: Targum Palestinense MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968.
- Epstein, Isidore. *The Babylonian Talmud*. London: Soncino, 1935–1952.
- Falls, Thomas et al. *St. Justin Martyr. Dialogue with Trypho*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2003.
- Franko, Ivan. *Apokrifi i legendi z ukrains'kih rukopisiv*. Monumenta Linguae Necon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum (Ruthenicarum). 5 vols. L'vov: Shevchenka, 1896–1910.
- Freedman, Harry and Simon, Maurice. *Midrash Rabbah*. 10 vols. London: Soncino, 1961.
- Friedlander, Gerald. *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*. 2nd ed. New York: Hermon Press, 1965.
- Grossfeld, Bernard. *The Targum Onqelos to Deuteronomy*. ArBib 9. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- Haleem, Muhammad Abdel. *Qur'an*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Holladay, Carl. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. 3 vols. SBLTT 30. Pseudepigrapha Series 12. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.
- Jacobson, Howard. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*. 2 vols. AGAJU 31. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Jellinek, Adolph. *Bet ha-Midrash: Sammlung kleiner Midraschim und vermischter Abhandlungen aus der ältern jüdischen Literatur*. 6 vols. Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrmann, 1938.
- Kahana, Abraham. *Ha-Seferim ha-Hitsonim*. Tel Aviv: Masada, 1936–1937.
- Klein, Michael. *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to Their Extant Sources*. 2 vols. AnBib 76. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980.
- Klijn, Albertus Frederik Johannes. "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 1.615–652. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
- Knibb, Michael. *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Lauterbach, Jacob Zallel. *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael: A Critical Edition on the Basis of the Manuscripts and Early Editions with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2004.
- Lunt, Horace. "Ladder of Jacob." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 2.401–411. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
- Macaskill, Grant. *The Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*. SJS 6. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

- Macdonald, John. *Memar Marqah. The Teaching of Marqah*. 2 vols. BZAW 84. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963.
- Maher, Michael. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*. ArBib 1B. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Marcus, Ralph. *Philo. Questions and Answers on Exodus*. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: Heinemann, 1949.
- Matt, Daniel. *The Zohar: Pritzker Edition*. 12 vols. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003.
- McNamara, Martin. *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis*. ArBib 1A. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- . *Targum Neofiti 1: Deuteronomy*. ArBib 5A. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997.
- McNamara, Martin et al. *Targum Neofiti 1 and Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*. ArBib 2. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1994.
- Milik, Józef Tadeusz. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Mras, Karl. *Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica*. 2 vols. GCS 43.1–2. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1954–56.
- Müller, Detlef. *Die Bücher der Einsetzung der Erzengel Michael und Gabriel*. CSCO 225–226. *Scriptores Coptici* 31–32. Louvain: Secretariat du CorpusSCO, 1962.
- Neugebauer, Otto. “The ‘Astronomical’ Chapters of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (72–82).” In *The Book of Enoch, or I Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*. Edited by M. Black, J. C. VanderKam, and O. Neugebauer, 386–419. SVTP 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Nickelsburg, George and VanderKam, James. *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch: Chapters 37–82*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
- Novickij, P. *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda. Vosproizvedenie Sinodal'noj Rukopisi No 210*. St. Petersburg: Tipografia Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk, 1892.
- Odeberg, Hugo. *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch*. New York: KTAV, 1973.
- Olson, Daniel. *Enoch. A New Translation: The Ethiopic Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch*. North Richland Hills: Bibal Press, 2004.
- Philonenko-Sayar, Belkis and Philonenko, Marc. *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham: Introduction, texte slave, traduction et notes*. Semitica 31. Paris: Librairie Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1981.
- Pietersma, Albert et al. *New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Pypin, Aleksandr. *Lozhnye i otrechennye knigi russkoj stariny*. Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj literatury, izdavaemye Grafom Grigoriem Kushelevym-Bezborodko 3. St. Petersburg: Kulish, 1862.
- Resch, Alfred. *Agrapha: Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1906.
- Roberts, Alexander. “Irenaeus, Against Heresies.” In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by A. Roberts, J. Donaldson, and A. C. Coxe, 309–568. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885.
- Robinson, Joseph Armitage. *Origen, Philocalia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893.
- Rubinkiewicz, Ryszard. *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire*. ŻM 129. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1987.
- Sanders, E. P. “Testament of Abraham.” In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 1.871–902. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.

- Schäfer, Peter, Schlüter, Margaret and von Mutius, Hans George. *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*. TSAJ 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981.
- Schneemelcher, Wilhelm. *New Testament Apocrypha*. 2 vols. Cambridge and Louisville, KY: James Clarke & Co., Westminster, John Knox Press, 1991.
- Smith, Jonathan. "Prayer of Joseph." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 2.699–714. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
- Snell, Bruno. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta I*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Thackeray, Henry and Markus, Ralph. *Josephus*. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–65.
- Toepel, Alexander. "The Cave of Treasures." In *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Non-canonical Scriptures*. Edited by R. Bauckham, J. R. Davila, and A. Panayotov, 531–584. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013.
- VanderKam, James. *The Book of Jubilees*. 2 vols. CSCO 510–511. Scriptorum Aethiopicorum 87–88. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.

Secondary literature

- Alexander, Philip. "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch." *JJS* 28 (1977): 156–180.
- . "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch." In *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by M. E. Stone and T. A. Bergren, 102–111. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- Altmann, Alexander. "The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends." *JQR* 35 (1945): 371–391.
- Anderson, Gary. "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan." In *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays*. Edited by G. Anderson, M. Stone, and J. Tromp, 83–110. SVTP 15. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Anderson, Gary and Stone, Michael E. *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*. 2nd Revised ed. EJL 17. Atlanta: Scholars, 1999.
- Andrade, Nathaniel. "The Jewish Tetragrammaton: Secrecy, Community, and Prestige among Greek-Writing Jews of the Early Roman Empire." *JSJ* 46 (2015): 198–223.
- Annus, Amar. "On the Origin of Watchers: A Comparative Study of the Antediluvian Wisdom in Mesopotamian and Jewish Traditions." *JSP* 19 (2010): 277–320.
- . "The Mesopotamian Precursors of Adam's Garment of Glory and Moses' Shining Face." In *Identities and Societies in the Ancient East-Mediterranean Regions: Comparative Approaches. Henning Graf Reventlow Memorial Volume*. Edited by T. R. Kämmerer, 1–17. Münster: Ugarit, 2011.
- Arbel, Daphna. "'Seal of Resemblance, Full of Wisdom, and Perfect in Beauty': The Enoch/Metatron Narrative of 3 Enoch and Ezekiel 28." *HTR* 98 (2005): 121–142.
- Aster, Shawn Zelig. *The Phenomenon of Divine and Human Radiance in the Hebrew Bible and in Northwest Semitic and Mesopotamian Literature: A Philological and Comparative Study*. Ph.D. diss. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 2006.
- . *The Unbeatable Light: Melammu and Its Biblical Parallels*. AOAT 384. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2012.
- Bahrani, Zainab. *The Graven Image: Representation in Babylonia and Assyria*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- Baldermann, Ingo et al. *Die Macht der Bilder*. JBTh 13. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1999.
- Barc, Bernard. "La taille cosmique d'Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois premiers siècles après J.-C." *RSR* 49 (1975): 173–185.

- Baukhham, Richard. *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Essays on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Baynes, Leslie. *The Heavenly Book Motif in Judeo-Christian Apocalypses 200 B.C.E. – 200 C.E.* JSJSS 152. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Beale, Gregory. *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2008.
- Becker, Hans-Jürgen. "The Magic of the Name and Palestinian Rabbinic Literature." In *The Talmud Yerushalmi and Graeco-Roman Culture III*. Edited by P. Schäfer, 391–407. TSAJ 93. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Beckerleg, Catherine Leigh. *The "Image of God" in Eden*. Ph.D. diss. Harvard University, Cambridge, 2009.
- Begg, Christopher. "Rereading of the 'Animal Rite' of Genesis 15 in Early Jewish Narratives." *CBQ* 50 (1988): 36–46.
- Belleville, Linda. *Reflections of Glory: Paul's Polemical Use of the Moses-Doxa Tradition in 2 Corinthians 3.1–18*. JSNTSS 52. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan. "Exegetical Notes on Cosmology in the Parables of Enoch." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by G. Boccaccini, 143–150. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Berger, Klaus. *Das Buch der Jubiläen*. JSHRZ 2.3. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1981.
- Berlejung, Angelika. "Washing the Mouth: The Consecration of Divine Images in Mesopotamia." In *The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by K. van der Toorn, 45–72. CBET 21. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- . *Die Theologie der Bilder: Herstellung und Einweihung von Kultbildern in Mesopotamien und die alttestamentliche Bilderpolemik*. OBO 162. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1998.
- Bernstein, Moshe. "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls." In *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon, 1–26. STDJ 28. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Bietenhard, Hans. *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*. WUNT 2. Tübingen: Mohr, 1951.
- Blau, Lajos. *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*. Strassburg: Trübner, 1898.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Deuteronomistic Contribution to the Narrative in Genesis—Numbers: A Test-Case." In *Those Elusive Deuteronomists. The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*. Edited by L. S. Schearing and S. L. McKenzie, 84–115. JSOTSS 268. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. "The Preexistence of the Torah: A Commonplace in Early Judaism or a Later Rabbinic Development?" *Henoch* 17 (1995): 329–350.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. WUNT 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990.
- Boden, Peggy Jean. *The Mesopotamian Washing of the Mouth (Mīs Pī) Ritual*. Ph.D. diss. Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, 1998.
- Bohak, Gideon. "Asenath's Honeycomb and Onias' Temple: The Key to Joseph and Asenath." In *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A*. Edited by D. Assaf, 163–170. Jerusalem: Magness Press, 1994.
- Borgen, Peder. *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*. NovTSup 10. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- . *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*. NovTSup 86. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Bousset, Wilhelm and Gressmann, Hugo. *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*. HNT 21. Tübingen: Mohr, 1926.

- Boustan, Raʿanan. *From Martyr to Mystic: Rabbinic Martyrology and the Making of Merkavah Mysticism*. TSAJ 112. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- . “The Study of Heikhalot Literature: Between Mystical Experience and Textual Artifact.” *CBR* 6.1 (2007): 130–160.
- Britt, Brian. *Rewriting Moses: The Narrative Eclipse of the Text*. JSOTSS 402. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Bucur, Bogdan. *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses*. SVC 95. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . *Scripture Re-Envisioned: Christophanic Exegesis and the Making of a Christian Bible*. BAC 13. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Bunta, Silviu. *Moses, Adam and the Glory of the Lord in Ezekiel the Tragedian: On the Roots of a Merkabah Text*. Ph.D. diss. Marquette University, Milwaukee, 2005.
- . “The Likeness of the Image: Adamic Motifs and Tselem Anthropology in Rabbinic Traditions About Jacob’s Image Enthroned in Heaven.” *JSJ* 37.1 (2006): 55–84.
- . *The Lord God of Gods: Divinity and Deification in Early Judaism*. Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and its Contexts 35. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2021.
- Burchard, Christoph. “The Present State of Research on Joseph and Aseneth.” In *Religion, Literature, and Society in Ancient Israel, Formative Christianity and Judaism*. Edited by J. Neusner et al., 31–52. NPAJ 2. Lanham: University Press of America, 1987.
- Burkes, S. “Wisdom and Law: Choosing Life in Ben Sira and Baruch.” *JSJ* 30 (1999): 253–276.
- Calabi, Francesca. *God’s Acting, Man’s Acting: Tradition and Philosophy in Philo of Alexandria*. Studies in Philo of Alexandria 4. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Calvert, Nancy Lynn. *Abraham Traditions in Middle Jewish Literature: Implications for the Interpretation of Galatians and Romans*. Ph.D. diss. University of Sheffield, Sheffield, 1993.
- Cassin, Elena. *La splendeur divine: Introduction à l’étude de la mentalité mésopotamienne*. Civilisations et Sociétés 8. Paris and La Haye: Mouton, 1968.
- Cejtlin, Raisa. *Staroslovjanskij slovar’ po rukopisjam X–XI vekov*. Moscow: Russkij jazyk, 1994.
- Chernus, Ira. *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism: Studies in the History of Midrash*. SJ 11. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982.
- Cohen, Martin. *The Šiʿur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1983.
- Collins, Billie Jean. “Cult Images in Hittite Anatolia.” In *Cult Image and Divine Representation in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by N. H. Walls, 13–42. ASOR 10. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2005.
- Collins, John. *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*. HSM 16. Missoula: Scholars, 1977.
- . *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. OTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . “Pseudepigraphy and Group Formation in Second Temple Judaism.” In *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. G. Chazon and M. E. Stone, 43–58. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . “Apocalyptic Eschatology in Philosophical Dress in the Wisdom of Solomon.” In *Shem in the Tents of Japhet: Essays on the Encounter of Judaism and Hellenism*. Edited by J. L. Kugel, 93–107. JSJS 74. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.

- Curtis, Edward Mason. *Man as the Image of God in Genesis in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Parallels*. Ph.D. diss. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1984.
- Dan, Joseph. *The Ancient Jewish Mysticism*. Tel-Aviv: MOD Books, 1993.
- . “The Name of God, the Name of the Rose, and the Concept of Language in Jewish Mysticism.” *Medieval Encounters* 3 (1996): 228–248.
- . “Concept of Knowledge in the *Shi’ur Komah*.” In *Jewish Mysticism: Late Antiquity*. Edited by J. Dan, 205–215. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1998.
- . “Seventy Names of Metatron.” In *Jewish Mysticism: Late Antiquity*. Edited by J. Dan, 229–234. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1998.
- Daniélou, Jean. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964.
- Davila, James. *Descenders to the Chariot: The People behind the Hekhalot Literature*. JSJSS 70. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Davis, Carl Judson. *The Name and Way of the Lord: Old Testament Themes, New Testament Christology*. JSNTSS 129. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- DeConick, April. “Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First-Century Christology in the Second Century.” In *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. Edited by C. C. Newman, J. R. Davila and G. S. Lewis, 308–341. JSJSS 63. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- DeLapp, Nevada Levi. *Theophanic “Type-Scenes” in the Pentateuch*. LHBOTS 660. London: Bloomsbury, 2018.
- Denis, Albert-Marie. *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca*. PVTG 3. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Deutsch, Nathaniel. *The Gnostic Imagination: Gnosticism, Mandaicism, and Merkabah Mysticism*. BSJS 13. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . *Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity*. BSJS 22. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Dick, Michael. *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth: The Making of the Cult Image in the Ancient Near East*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- . “The Mesopotamian Cult Statue: A Sacramental Encounter with Divinity.” In *Cult Image and Divine Representation in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by N. H. Walls, 43–67. ASOR 10. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2005.
- Dimant, Devorah. “The Sons of Heaven: The Theory of the Angels in the Book of Jubilees in Light of the Writings of the Qumran Community.” In *A Tribute to Sarah: Studies in Jewish Philosophy and Cabala Presented to Professor Sara A. Heller-Wilensky*. Edited by M. Idel, D. Dimant, and S. Rosenberg, 97–118. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994. [Hebrew]
- Dodds, Eric. “Theurgy and Its Relationship to Neoplatonism.” *JRS* 37 (1947): 55–69.
- Dodson, Joseph. *The “Powers” of Personification: Rhetorical Purpose in the Book of Wisdom and the Letter to the Romans*. BZNTW 161. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Donelson, Lewis. *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles*. HUT 22. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.
- Dozeman, Thomas. *God on the Mountain*. SBLMS 37. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.
- . “Masking Moses and Mosaic Authority in Torah.” *JBL* 119 (2000): 21–45.
- Dunn, James. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. London: SCM, 1980.
- Eichrodt, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.

- Endo, Masanobu. *Creation and Christology: A Study on the Johannine Prologue in the Light of Early Jewish Creation Accounts*. WUNT 2.149. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Eppel, Robert. "Les tables de la Loi et les tables célestes." *RHPR* 17 (1937): 401–412.
- Filoramo, Giovanni. *A History of Gnosticism*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. "4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christology." *DSD* 3 (1996): 236–252.
- . *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . *Jesus Monotheism, vol. 1. Christological Origins: The Emerging Consensus and Beyond*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2015.
- Fodor, Alexander. "The Rod of Moses in Arabic Magic." *Acta Orientalia* 32 (1978): 1–21.
- Fossum, Jarl. *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord. Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*. WUNT 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985.
- . *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology*. NTOA 30. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.
- . "The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis." In *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer, 1.529–539. 3 vols. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- Fowler, Mervyn. "The Meaning of *lipnê YHWH* in the Old Testament." *ZAW* 99 (1987): 384–390.
- Gager, John. *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*. SBLMS 16. Nashville: Abingdon, 1972.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees." In *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Edited by M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange, 244–260. TSAJ 65. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- García Martínez, Florentino and Tigchelaar, Eibert. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Gaylord, Harry. "How Satanael Lost His '-el.'" *JJS* 33 (1982): 303–309.
- Gieschen, Charles. *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. AGAJU 42. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . "The Divine Name in the Ante-Nicene Christology." *VC* 57 (2003): 115–158.
- . "The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by G. Boccaccini, 238–249. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . "The Divine Name as a Characteristic of Divine Identity in Second-Temple Judaism and Early Christianity." In *Monotheism and Christology in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Edited by M. V. Novenson, 61–84. NovTSup 180. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- Gilbert, Maurice. "L'élage de la Sagesse (Siracide 24)." *RTL* 5 (1974): 326–348.
- Ginzberg, Louis. *Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Glazov, Gregory. *The Bridling of the Tongue and the Opening of the Mouth in Biblical Prophecy*. JSOTSS 311. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Goering, Joseph. "The Invention of Transubstantiation." *Traditio* 46 (1991): 147–170.
- Golitzin, Alexander. "Recovering the 'Glory of Adam': 'Divine Light' Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Ascetical Literature of Fourth-Century Syro-Mesopotamia." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St Andrews in 2001*. Edited by J. R. Davila, 275–308. STDJ 46. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Goodman, David. "Do Angels Eat?" *JJS* 37 (1986): 160–175.

- Gordon, Cyrus. "Aramaic Magical Bowls in the Istanbul and Baghdad Museums." *Archiv Orientalni* 6 (1934): 319–334.
- Goshen Gottstein, Alon. "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature." *HTR* 87 (1994): 171–195.
- Green, Arthur. *Keter: The Crown of God in Early Jewish Mysticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Greenstein, Edward. "God's Golem: The Creation of the Human in Genesis 2." In *Creation in Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Edited by H. Reventlow and Y. Hoffman, 219–239. JSOTSS 319. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Grelot, Pierre. "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: Origine et signification." *RSR* 46 (1958): 5–26, 181–210.
- Grözinger, Karl. "The Names of God and the Celestial Powers: Their Function and Meaning in the Hekhalot Literature." *JSJT* 6.1–2 (1987): 53–69.
- Gruenwald, Ithamar. *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*. AGAJU 14. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- . *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*. 2nd ed. AGAJU 90. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Hall, Robert. "Pre-Existence, Naming, and Investiture in the Similitudes of Enoch and in Hebrews." *Religion and Theology* 18 (2011): 311–333.
- Halperin, David. *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Response to Ezekiel's Vision*. TSAJ 16. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988.
- Hamerton-Kelly, Robert. *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament*. SNTSMS 21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Hamori, Esther. "When Gods Were Men": *The Embodied God in Biblical and Near Eastern Literature*. BZAW 384. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Hannah, Darrell. *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*. WUNT 2.109. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Hanson, Paul. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Haran, Menahem. "The Shining of Moses's Face: A Case Study in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography [Exod 34:29–35; Ps 69:32; Hab 3:4]." In *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlstrom*. Edited by W. B. Barrick and J. R. Spencer, 159–173. JSOTSS 31. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984.
- Harlow, Daniel. "Idolatry and Alterity: Israel and the Nations in the Apocalypse of Abraham." In *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism. Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*. Edited by D. C. Harlow, M. Goff, K. M. Hogan, and J. S. Kaminsky, 302–330. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Hayward, Richard. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- . *Interpretations of the Name Israel in Ancient Judaism and Some Early Christian Writings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- Herring, Stephen. "A 'Transubstantiated' Humanity: The Relationship between the Divine Image and the Presence of God in Genesis i 26f." *VT* 58 (2008): 480–494.
- . *Divine Substitution: Humanity as the Manifestation of Deity in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Ph.D. diss. University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, 2011.
- . "Moses as Divine Substitute in Exodus." *CTR* 9 (2012): 53–68.
- . *Divine Substitution: Humanity as the Manifestation of Deity in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. FRLANT 247. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

- Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Hodges, Horace. *Food as Synecdoche in John's Gospel and Gnostic Texts*. Ph.D. diss. University of California, Berkeley, 1995.
- Hoffmann, Matthias. *The Destroyer and the Lamb: The Relationship Between Angelomorphic and Lamb Christology in the Book of Revelation*. WUNT 2.203. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Holdrege, Barbara. *Vēda and Torah: Transcending the Textuality of Scripture*. Albany: SUNY, 2012.
- Humphrey, Edith McEwan. *Joseph and Aseneth*. GAP 8. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Hundley, Michael. *Keeping Heaven on Earth: Safeguarding the Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle*. FAT 2.50. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- . *Gods in Dwellings: Temple and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East*. WAWSSBL 3. Atlanta: SBL, 2013.
- . "Divine Fluidity? The Priestly Tests in Their Ancient Near Eastern Contexts." In *Text, Time, and Temple: Literary, Historical, and Ritual Studies in Leviticus*. Edited by L. Trevaskis, F. Landy, and B. Bibb, 16–40. HBM 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2015.
- . "Divine Presence in Ancient Near East." *Religion Compass* 9.7 (2015): 203–215.
- Hurowitz, Victor. "The Mesopotamian God Image, from Womb to Tomb." *JAOS* 123 (2003): 147–157.
- . "What Goes in Is What Comes Out: Materials for Creating Cult Statues." In *Text, Artifact, and Image; Revealing Ancient Israelite Religion*. Edited by G. M. Beckman and T. J. Lewis, 3–23. BJS 346. Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2006.
- Hurtado, Larry. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- . *At the Origins of Christian Worship: The Context and Character of Earliest Christian Devotion*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Idel, Moshe. "Hermeticism and Judaism." In *Hermeticism and the Renaissance: Intellectual History and the Occult in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by I. Merkel and A. G. Debus, 59–76. Washington, DC: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1988.
- . *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1988.
- . *Golem: Jewish Magical and Mystical Traditions on the Artificial Anthropoid*. Albany: SUNY, 1990.
- . *Absorbing Perfections: Kabbalah and Interpretation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- . *Ben: Sonship and Jewish Mysticism*. London: Continuum, 2007.
- . "Concepts of Scripture in Jewish Mysticism." In *Jewish Concepts of Scripture. A Comparative Introduction*. Edited by B. D. Sommer, 157–178. New York: New York University Press, 2012.
- . "The Changing Faces of God and Human Dignity in Judaism." In *Moshe Idel: Representing God*. Edited by H. Tirosh-Samuelson and A. W. Hughes, 103–122. LCJP 8. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Jacobsen, Thorkild. "The Graven Image." In *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by P. D. Miller et al., 15–32. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Jastrow, Marcus. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. 2 vols. New York: Shalom, 1967.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Imago Dei. Gen 1, 26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*. FRLANT 76. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.

- Johnstone, William. "Reactivating the Chronicles Analogy in Pentateuchal Studies, with Special Reference to the Sinai Pericope in Exodus." *ZAW* 99 (1987): 16–37.
- Jolley, Marc. *The Function of Torah in Sirach*. Ph.D. diss. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, 1993.
- Kaplan, Chaim. "The Hidden Name." *JSOR* 13 (1929): 181–184.
- Kim Harkins, Angela. *Reading With an "I" to the Heavens: Looking at the Qumran Hodayot through the Lens of Visionary Traditions*. Ekstasis 3. Berlin: Walther de Gruyter, 2012.
- Kraemer, Ross. *When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Krulak, Todd. *The Animated Statue and the Ascension of the Soul: Ritual and the Divine Image in Late Platonism*. Ph.D. diss. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 2009.
- Kugel, James. *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1990.
- . "The Ladder of Jacob." *HTR* 88 (1995): 209–227.
- . *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- . *The God of Old: Inside the Lost World of the Bible*. New York: Free Press, 2003.
- Kulik, Alexander. *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham*. TCS 3. Atlanta: Scholars, 2004.
- Kulik, Alexander and Minov, Sergey. *Biblical Pseudepigrapha in Slavonic Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. WMANT 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.
- Lesses, Rebecca. *Ritual Practices to Gain Power: Angels, Incantations, and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism*. HTS 44. Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998.
- Levison, John. *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism from Sirach to 2 Baruch*. JSPSS 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- Lieber, Andrea. "I Set a Table Before You: The Jewish Eschatological Character of Aseneth's Conversion Meal." *JSP* 14 (2004): 63–77.
- Ludin Jansen, Herman. *Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Oslo: Dybwad, 1939.
- Lundberg, Marilyn. "The Mis-Pi Rituals and Incantations and Jeremiah 10:1–16." In *Uprooting and Planting: Essays on Jeremiah for Leslie Allen*. Edited by J. Goldingay, 210–227. LHBOTS 459. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Magliano-Tromp, Johannes. "Adamic Traditions in 2 Enoch and in the Books of Adam and Eve." In *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by A. A. Orlov, G. Boccaccini, and J. Zurawski, 283–304. SJS 3. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Maher, Michael. "Some Aspects of Torah in Judaism." *ITQ* 38 (1971): 310–325.
- . "Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of Exodus 2.21." In *Targumic and Cognate Studies: Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara*. Edited by K. J. Cathcart and M. Maher, 81–99. JSOTSS 230. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Maiburger, Paul. *Das Manna: Eine literarische, etymologische und naturkundliche Untersuchung*. 2 vols. ÄAT 6.1–2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983.
- Malina, Bruce. *The Palestinian Manna Tradition*. AGAJU 7. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- Mangan, Céline. "Wisdom, Torah and Creation in Targumic Literature." In *Biblical and Near Eastern Essays: Studies in Honor of Kevin J. Cathcart*. Edited by C. McCarthy and J. F. Healey, 143–153. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Marböck, Johannes. "Gesetz und Weisheit: Zum Verständnis des Gesetzes bei Jesus Ben Sira." *BZ* 20 (1976): 1–21.

- . *Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira*. BZAW 272. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.
- Marcus, Ralph. "On Biblical Hypostases of Wisdom." *HUCA* 23 (1950–51): 157–171.
- McDonough, Sean. *YHWH at Patmos: Rev. 1:4 in Its Hellenistic and Early Jewish Setting*. WUNT 2.107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- McMichael, Ralph. *Eucharist: A Guide for the Perplexed*. London: Continuum, 2010.
- Meade, David. *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition*. WUNT 39. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.
- Meeks, Wayne. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. NovTSup 14. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- . "Moses as God and King." In *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Ervin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Edited by J. Neusner, 354–371. SHR 14. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- Merkur, Dan. *The Mystery of Manna: The Psychedelic Sacrament of the Bible*. Rochester: Park Street Press, 2000.
- Mettinger, Tryggve. *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*. ConBOT 18. Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982.
- . *In Search of God: The Meaning and Message of the Everlasting Names*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Metzger, Bruce. "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha." *JBL* 91.1 (1972): 3–24.
- Meye Thompson, Marianne. *The God of the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Meyer, Rudolf. "Manna." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, 4.462–466. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
- Middleton, Richard. *The Liberating Image: The Imago Dei in Genesis 1*. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2005.
- Miller, Michael. "Folk-Etymology, and Its Influence on Metatron Traditions." *JSJ* 44 (2013): 339–355.
- . *The Name of God in Jewish Thought: A Philosophical Analysis of Mystical Traditions from Apocalyptic to Kabbalah*. New York: Routledge, 2015.
- Murray-Jones, Christopher. "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition." *JJS* 43 (1992): 1–31.
- . "The Temple Within: The Embodied Divine Image and Its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources." *SBLSP* 38 (1998): 400–431.
- Mowinkel, Sigmund. "Hypostasen." In *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 2.2065. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1928.
- Mroczek, Eva. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Müller, Hans-Peter. "Neue Parallelen zu Gen 2,7: zur Bedeutung der Religionsgeschichte für die Exegese des Alten Testaments." In *Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East: Festschrift E. Lipinski*. Edited by K. van Lerberghe and A. Schoors, 195–204. OLA 65. Leuven: Peeters, 1995.
- Münchow, Christoph. *Ethik und Eschatologie: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik mit einem Ausblick auf das Neue Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- Munoa, Philip. *Four Powers in Heaven: The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham*. JSPSS 28. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Murphy, Roland. "Israel's Wisdom: Dialogue Between the Sages." In *Light in a Spotless Mirror*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth and M. A. Daise, 7–25. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003.

- Najman, Hindy. "Angels at Sinai: Exegesis, Theology and Interpretive Authority." *DSD* 7 (2000): 313–333.
- . *Secending Sinai. The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSS 77. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "How Should We Contextualize Pseudepigrapha? Imitation and Emulation in 4 Ezra." In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by A. Hilhorst, E. Puech, and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, 529–536. JSJSS 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . *Past Renewals: Interpretive Authority, Renewed Revelation and the Quest for Perfection*. JSJSS 53. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . *Losing the Temple and Recovering the Future: An Analysis of 4 Ezra*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Neis, Rachel. "Embracing Icons: The Face of Jacob on the Throne of God." *Images: A Journal of Jewish Art and Visual Culture* 1 (2007): 36–54.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1986.
- Newsom, Carol. "4Q374: A Discourse on the Exodus/Conquest Tradition." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport, 40–52. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Niehr, Herbert. "In Search of Yhwh's Cult Statue in the First Temple." In *The Image and the Book: Ironic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by K. van der Toorn, 73–95. CBET 21. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- Noegel, Scott. "'Literary' Craft and Performative Power in the Ancient Near East: The Hebrew Bible in Context." In *Approaches to Literary Readings of Ancient Jewish Writings*. Edited by K. Smelik and K. Vermeulen, 19–38. SSN 62. Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2014.
- Nötscher, Friedrich. "Himmliche Bücher und Schicksalsglaube in Qumran." *RevQ* 1.3 (1959): 405–411.
- Oesterley, William Oscar Emil and Box, George Herbert. *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue: An Introduction to the Study of Judaism from the New Testament Period*. 2nd ed. London: Pitman, 1911.
- Olyan, Saul. *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism*. TSAJ 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.
- Oppenheim, Leo. "Akkadian *pul(u)h(t)u* and *melammu*." *JAOS* 63 (1943): 31–34.
- Orlov, Andrei. "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic Ladder of Jacob." In *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*. Edited by C. A. Evans, 259–76. 2 vols. SSEJC 10. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*. TSAJ 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- . "Vested with Adam's Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Macarian Homilies." *Christian Orient* 4.10 (2006): 498–513.
- . "Moses' Heavenly Counterpart in the Book of Jubilees and the Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by G. Boccaccini and J. Ibba, 131–144. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- . *Dark Mirrors: Azazel and Satanael in Early Jewish Demonology*. Albany: SUNY, 2011.
- . "The Sacerdotal Traditions of 2 Enoch and the Date of the Text." In *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by A. A. Orlov, G. Boccaccini, and J. Zurawski, 103–116. SJS 4. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- . *The Greatest Mirror: Heavenly Counterparts in the Jewish Pseudepigrapha*. Albany: SUNY, 2017.
- . *Yahoel and Metatron: Aural Apocalypticism and the Origins of Early Jewish Mysticism*. TSAJ 169. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

- . *The Glory of the Invisible God: Two Powers in Heaven Traditions and Early Christology*. JCTCRS 31. London: Bloomsbury, 2019.
- Parke-Taylor, Geoffrey. *Yahweh: The Divine Name in the Bible*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975.
- Patton, Corrine. “Adam as the Image of God.” *SBLSP* 33 (1994): 294–300.
- Paul, Shalom. “Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life.” *JANES* 5 (1973): 345–352.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine, vol. 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600–1300)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Perdue, Leo. *Wisdom and Creation: The Theology of Wisdom Literature*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1994.
- Philonenko, Marc. “Initiation et mystère dans Joseph et Aséneth.” In *Initiation*. Edited by C. J. Bleeker, 147–153. SHR 10. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Porter, Barbara. “The Anxiety of Multiplicity: Concepts of Divinity as One and Many in Ancient Assyria.” In *One God or Many: Concepts of Divinity in the Ancient World*. Edited by B. Porter, 211–271. Casco Bay, ME: Casco Bay Assyriological Institute, 2000.
- Portier-Young, Anthea. “Sweet Mercy Metropolis: Interpreting Aseneth’s Honeycomb.” *JSP* 14 (2005): 133–157.
- Quispel, Gilles. “Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition.” *ErJb* 22 (1953): 195–234.
- . “Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis.” *VC* 34 (1980): 1–13.
- . “The Demiurge in the Apocryphon of John.” In *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica: Collected Essays of Gilles Quispel*. Edited by J. van Oort, 43–76. NHMS 55. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . “Gnosticism,” In *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica. Collected Essays of Gilles Quispel*. Edited by J. van Oort, 155–174. NHMS 55. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Rau, Eckhart. *Kosmologie, Eschatologie und Lehrautorität Henochs*. Ph.D. diss. Hamburg University, Hamburg, 1974.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. “Heavenly Ascent, Angelic Descent, and the Transmission of Knowledge in 1 Enoch 6–16.” In *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*. Edited by R. S. Abusch and A. Y. Reed, 47–66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . *Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism: Collected Essays*. TSAJ 171. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- . *Demons, Angels, and Writing in Ancient Judaism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Reeves, John. *Trajectories in Near Eastern Apocalyptic: A Postbiblical Jewish Apocalypse Reader*. RBS 45. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Reeves, John and Reed, Annette Yoshiko. *Enoch from Antiquity to the Middle Ages, vol. 1. Sources from Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Reiterer, Friedrich. “The Interpretation of the Wisdom Tradition of the Torah Within Ben Sira.” In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*. Edited by A. Passaro and G. Bellia, 209–231. DCL 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Richter, Sandra. *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology: Lesakken semo sam in the Bible and the Ancient Near East*. BZAW 318. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
- Ringgren, Helmer. *Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East*. Lund: Håkan Ohlssons, 1947.
- Robinson, Henry Wheeler. *Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964.

- Rogers, Jessie. "‘It Overflows Like the Euphrates with Understanding’: Another Look at the Relationship Between Law and Wisdom in Sirach." In *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*. Edited by C. A. Evans, 1.114–121. 2 vols. SSEJC 9. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Rogerson, John William. "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality: A Reexamination." *JTS* 21 (1970): 1–16.
- Rohrbacher-Sticker, Claudia. "Die Namen Gottes und die Namen Metatrons: Zwei Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur." *FJB* 19 (1991–92): 95–168.
- Rowland, Christopher. "John 1:51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition." *NTS* 30 (1984): 498–507.
- Rowland, Christopher and Morray-Jones, Christopher. *The Mystery of God: Early Jewish Mysticism and the New Testament*. CRINT 12. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Runia, David. "Philo, Alexandrian and Jew." In *Exegesis and Philosophy: Studies on Philo of Alexandria*. Edited by D. T. Runia, 1–18. Aldershot: Variorum, 1990.
- . "Logos." In *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst, 528. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Russell, David Syme. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.
- Sacchi, Paolo. "The 2005 Camaldoli Seminar on the Parables of Enoch: Summary and Prospects for Future Research." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting of the Book of Parables*. Edited by G. Boccaccini, 499–512. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Sanders, Jack. "When Sacred Canopies Collide: The Reception of the Torah of Moses in the Wisdom Literature of the Second-Temple Period." *JSJ* 32 (2001): 121–136.
- Sanders, Seth. "Old Light on Moses’ Shining Face." *VT* 52 (2002): 400–407.
- Schäfer, Peter. *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorbildung*. SJ 8. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975.
- . *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism*. Translated by A. Pomerance. Albany: SUNY, 1992.
- . "Wisdom Finds a Home: Torah as Wisdom." In *Light in a Spotless Mirror*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth and M. A. Daise, 26–44. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003.
- . *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Schechter, Solomon. *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*. New York: Macmillan, 1909.
- Schnabel, Eckhard. *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul*. WUNT 16. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985.
- Schneider, Michael. "Joseph and Aseneth and Early Jewish Mysticism." *Kabbalah* 3 (1998): 303–344. [Hebrew]
- . *Scattered Traditions of Jewish Mysticism: Studies in Ancient Jewish Mysticism in Light of Traditions from the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha, Hellenistic Literature, Christian and Islamic Sources*. SSLJM 31. Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2012. [Hebrew]
- . "Animation of the Cultic Statues, the Magic of Memory and the Pupil’s Initiation." *Judaica Petropolitana* 3 (2015): 49–66.
- Scholem, Gershom. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. New York: Schocken, 1954.
- . *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, [1960] 1965.
- . "The Idea of the Golem." In *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism*. Edited by G. Scholem, 159–165. New York: Schocken, 1965.
- . *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism*. Translated by R. Manheim. New York: Schocken, 1965.

- . “The Name of God and the Linguistic Theory of the Kabbala.” *Diogenes* 79 (Fall 1972): 59–80; *Diogenes* 80 (Winter 1972): 164–194.
- . *Origins of the Kabbalah*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- . *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in Kabbalah*. New York: Schocken, 1991.
- Schüle, Andreas. “Made in the ‘Image of God’: The Concepts of Divine Images in Gen 1–3.” *ZAW* 117.1 (2005): 1–20.
- Schürer, Emil, Vermes, Geza and Millar, Fergus. *The History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. 5 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973–87.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. “Wisdom Mythology and the Christological Hymns of the New Testament.” In *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by R. L. Wilken, 17–41. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1975.
- Schwartz, Howard. *Tree of Souls: The Mythology of Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Schwienhorst-Schönberger, Ludger. *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22–23,33). Studien zu seiner Entstehung und Theologie*. BZAW 188. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990.
- Scott, Steven. “The Binitarian Nature of the Book of Similitudes.” *JSP* 18 (2008): 55–78.
- Segal, Alan. *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*. SJLA 25. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Selz, Gebhard. “‘The Holy Drum, the Spear, and the Harp’: Toward an Understanding of the Problems of Deification in Third Millennium Mesopotamia.” In *Sumerian Gods and Their Representations*. Edited by I. J. Finkel and M. J. Geller, 167–209. CM 7. Groningen: Styx, 1997.
- Seow, Choon Leong. “Face.” In *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst, 322. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Sinnott, Alice. *Personification of Wisdom*. SOTSMS. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
- Sint, Josef. *Pseudonymität im Altertum, ihre Formen und ihre Gründe*. Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag, 1969.
- Smith, Jonathan. “The Prayer of Joseph.” In *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Edited by J. Neusner, 253–293. SHR 14. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- Smith, Mark. “Divine Form and Size in Ugaritic and Pre-exilic Israelite Religion.” *ZAW* 100 (1988): 424–427.
- . *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Smith, Morton. “The Image of God: Notes on the Hellenization of Judaism with Especial Reference to Goodenough’s Work on Jewish Symbols.” *BJRL* 40 (1958): 473–512.
- . “Pseudepigraphy in the Israelite Literary Tradition.” In *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh*. Edited by S. J. D. Cohen, 1.55–72. RGRW 130.1. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Sommer, Benjamin. *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Sperling, Harry and Simon, Maurice. *The Zohar*. 5 vols. London and New York: Soncino, 1933.
- Speyer, Wolfgang. *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum*. Munich: Beck, 1971.
- . “Fälschung, pseudepigraphische freie Erfindung und ‘echte religiöse Pseudepigraphie.’” In *Pseudepigrapha I Pseudopythagorica, Lettres de Platon, Littérature pseudépigra- phique juive*. Edited by K. von Fritz, 333–366. Vandoeuvres-Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1972.
- . “Religiöse Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung.” In *Pseudepigraphie in der heidnischen und jüdisch-christlichen Antike*. Edited by N. Brox, 195–263. Wege der Forschung 484. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977.

- Sreznevskij, Izmail. *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka*. 3 vols. Moscow: Kniga, 1989.
- Stang, Charles. *Apophysis and Pseudonymity in Dionysius the Areopagite: "No Longer I"*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Stead, Christopher. *Divine Substance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Steenburg, David. "The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God." *JSNT* 39 (1990): 95–109.
- Sterling, Gregory. "'The Image of God': Becoming Like God in Philo, Paul, and Early Christianity." In *Portraits of Jesus: Studies in Christology*. Edited by S. E. Myers, 157–173. WUNT 321. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- . "Different Traditions or Emphases? The Image of God in Philo's *De Opificio Mundi*." In *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity*. Edited by G. Anderson et al., 41–56. *STDJ* 106. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Stone, Michael. "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the Books of Adam and Eve." In *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*. Edited by G. Anderson, M. E. Stone, and J. Tromp, 43–56. *SVTP* 15. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Pseudepigraphy Reconsidered." *RRJ* 9 (2006): 1–15.
- . "Enoch and the Fall of the Angels: Teaching and Status." *DSD* 22 (2015): 342–357.
- Stroumsa, Gedaliahu. "Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ." *HTR* 76 (1983): 269–288.
- . *Hidden Wisdom: Esoteric Traditions and the Roots of Christian Mysticism*. *SHR* 70. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . "A Nameless God: Judaeo-Christian and Gnostic 'Theologies of the Name.'" In *The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*. Edited by P. J. Tomson and D. Lambers-Petry, 230–244. WUNT 158. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Strugnell, John. "Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works." In *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman, 221–256. *JSPSS* 8. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Suter, David. "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by G. Boccaccini, 415–443. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Swartz, Michael. *Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Testuz, Michel. *Les idées religieuses du livre des Jubilés*. Geneva: E. Droz, 1960.
- Tobin, Thomas. "The Prologue of John and Hellenistic Jewish Speculation." *CBQ* 52 (1990): 252–269.
- Torm, Frederik. *Die Psychologie der Pseudonymität im Hinblick auf die Literatur des Urchristentums*. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1932.
- Trachtenberg, Joshua. *Jewish Magic and Superstition. A Study in Folk Religion*. New York: Behrman, 1939.
- Tuschling, Ruth. *Angels and Orthodoxy: A Study in Their Development in Syria and Palestine from the Qumran Texts to Ephrem the Syrian*. *STAC* 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Urbach, Ephraim. *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975.
- Van der Horst, Pieter and Newman, Judith. *Early Jewish Prayers in Greek*. *CEJL*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- VanderKam, James. *Enoch and the Growth of An Apocalyptic Tradition*. *CBQMS* 16. Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
- . "The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees." *DSD* 7 (2000): 378–393.

- Van der Toorn, Karel. "The Iconic Book." In *The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by K. van der Toorn, 229–248. CBET 21. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- Van Kooten, George. *Paul's Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity*. WUNT 232. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Vermes, Geza. "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies." *JJS* 26 (1975): 1–14.
- Villeneuve, André. *Nuptial Symbolism in Second Temple Writing, the New Testament, and Rabbinic Writings*. AJEC 92. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Volz, Paul. *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1934.
- Von Heijne, Camilla Hélena. *The Messenger of the Lord in Early Jewish Interpretations of Genesis*. BZAW 42. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.
- Waldman, Nahum. "The Imagery of Clothing, Covering, and Overpowering." *JNES* 19 (1989): 161–170.
- Walker, Christopher and Dick, Michael. "The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Mesopotamian Mīs Pi Ritual." In *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth: The Making of the Cult Image in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by M. Dick, 55–122. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Walker, Christopher et al. *The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Mesopotamian Mīs Pi Ritual: Transliteration, Translation, and Commentary*. SAALT 1. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 2001.
- Walls, Neal. *Cult Image and Divine Representation in the Ancient Near East*. ASOR 10. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2005.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- . "Kabod." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry, 7.22–38. 15 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974–2006.
- Widengren, Geo. *The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book*. UUA 7. Uppsala: Lundequist, 1950.
- Wifall, Walter. "The Breath of His Nostrils: Gen 2:7b." *CBQ* 36 (1974): 237–240.
- Wilson, Ian. *Out of the Midst of the Fire: Divine Presence in Deuteronomy*. SBLDS 151. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995.
- Windisch, Hans. "Die göttliche Weisheit der Juden und die paulinische Christologie." In *Neutestamentliche Studien für G. Heinrici*. Edited by A. Deissmann and H. Windisch, 220–234. UNT 6. Leipzig: J. C. Heinrichs, 1914.
- Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 43. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979.
- . *Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1985.
- Winter, Irene. "Idols of the King: Royal Images as Recipients of Ritual Action in Ancient Mesopotamia." *JRitSt* 6 (1992): 13–42.
- Wolfson, Elliot. "The Glorious Name and the Incarnate Torah." In *The Jewish Study Bible*. Edited by A. Berlin and M. Z. Brettler. Oxford: Oxford University Press, [1990] 1980.
- . *Through a Speculum That Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- . "The Image of Jacob Engraved upon the Throne." In *Along the Path: Studies in Kabbalistic Myth, Symbolism, and Hermeneutics*. Edited by E. R. Wolfson, 1–62. Albany: SUNY, 1995.

- . “Iconic Visualization and the Imaginal Body of God: The Role of Intention in the Rabbinic Conception of Prayer.” *Modern Theology* 12.2 (1996): 137–162.
- . “The Face of Jacob in the Moon: Mystical Transformations of an Aggadic Myth.” In *The Seductiveness of Jewish Myth*. Edited by S. D. Breslaur, 235–270. Albany: SUNY, 1997.
- . “Judaism and Incarnation: The Imaginal Body of God.” In *Christianity in Jewish Terms*. Edited by T. Frymer-Kensky et al., 239–253. Boulder: Westview Press, 2000.
- . “Iconicity of the Text: Reification of the Torah and the Idolatrous Impulse of Zoharic Kabbalah.” *JSQ* 11 (2004): 215–242.
- Wolfson, Harry Austryn. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947.
- Wortley, John. “Icons and Relics: A Comparison.” *GRBS* 43.2 (2002–2003): 161–174.
- Wright, Benjamin. “Torah and Sapiential Pedagogy in the Book of Ben Sira.” In *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of “Torah” in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by B. Schipper and D. Teeter, 157–186. *JSJSS* 163. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Zimmern, Heinrich. “Urkönige und Uroffenbarung.” In *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*. Edited by E. Schrader, 2.530–543. 2 vols. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1902–1903.

Index

- Aaron 55, 93–94, 109n93, 154n107, 164n245
Abraham 17n12, 47–48, 74, 107, 115, 120, 122, 130, 140, 142, 148n34, 154n103, 159n199
Adam: as divine Face 84–85; as divine image 30–36
Akae oath 117, 150n48
Alexander, P. 18n14, 42, 70n96, 71n118, 72n121, 104n8, 107n43, 109n89, 150n151, 153n83, 156n146, 157n158, 159n195, 165n252
amputation of the hands 172–174
Ancient of Days 125, 127, 155n135
Andersen, F. 21n39, 22n44, 70–71, 82, 86, 104–105, 109–111
Anderson, G. 25n87, 39–40, 42, 54, 65–68, 70–72, 77, 80, 104
angelic opposition 31, 36, 41–42, 46–52, 66n46, 72n120
angelic veneration 31–32, 36, 38, 41–42, 46, 53–55, 66n43, 69n86, 79n203, 85
Angel of the Lord 4, 113–137, 151n65, 153n88, 154n103
angelus interpres 1, 50, 88, 106n39
Annus, A. 4, 18n18, 68n58
Anthropos 109n103, 143, 148n28, 162n234
Aphrodite 20n35
apkallus 4
‘Arabot 18n13
Arbel, D. 33, 68n68
Ark 34
Aseneth 61n11, 142n233, 162n236, 163n237, 165n255
Asher 137, 140
Assyria 113

Babylon 51–52, 78n192, 113
Bahrani, Z. 16n5, 113, 146n9, 147n11, 168–169, 170, 174, 180n31, 181n33, 184

Bauckham, R. 154n113
Beckerleg, C. L. 65n34, 144, 164n247
Belleville, L. 56, 81n216, 94–95, 108
Ben–Dov, J. 149n43
Beqa oath 116
Berlejung, A. 60, 71, 144, 164n250, 168, 172, 180n30, 183
Bernstein, M. 180n23
Bezalel 11
Boccaccini, G. 22n46, 63n24, 70, 106, 148–149, 155n155
Bockmuehl, M. 16n7, 18
Bohak, G. 163n234
Bousset, W. 5, 16n9, 18n21
Boustan, R. 71n119, 107n48
Box, G. H. 5, 19n23, 152n79
Britt, B. 2, 15n2
Bucur, B. G. 79n198, 81n217, 105n27
Bunta, S. N. 31, 53, 67n50, 69n86, 75n155, 79n199

Calabi, F. 26n106
chariot 3, 67, 73n134, 91–92, 107n43
Charles, R. H. 16n9, 70n99, 77, 106n40
Chernus, I. 104n7, 165n252
Cohen, M. 70, 109–110, 130, 153n84, 154n104, 156–157, 159, 177
Collins, J. J. 7, 23–24, 66, 74, 79, 153, 159n208, 178n8, 180n24
cosmos 11–12, 14, 24n62, 59n1, 61n19
cultic epistemology 174–176

Dan, J. 102, 104, 110n109, 111n128, 129, 146n3, 153n84, 156n145, 162n230
danger motif 94, 97–98, 104, 135
Davila, J. 75n148, 107, 108n88
DeConick, A. 107n44
DeLapp, N. L. 96, 108n87
Demeter 20n35
demiurgic oath 117, 127

- Deuteronomic School 112, 118
 Deutsch, N. 89, 101, 105n17, 107n48,
 109–110, 131, 157n163
 Dick, M. 27, 60n6, 67n53, 171–172,
 182–183
 divine presence 60, 65, 68, 86, 89, 106,
 132, 150, 182
 divine presence epistemology 176–177
 divine voice 112–113
 Donelson, L. 178n5
 Dozeman, T. 15n2, 96, 108n86
 Dunn, J. 5, 19n25, 20–21n37
- Ea 172, 183n62
 Edom 51, 52, 78n192
 Egypt 60n2, 61n14, 93, 138, 154n100,
 160n217, 161n219
 Eichrodt, W. 146n3
 Enoch: as divine Face 85–90; as divine
 image 36–42; as divine Name 126–136
 epistemology, cultic 174–176
 Esau 51, 75n161, 78n189
 Eucharist 171–172, 182n53
 Eve 33, 42, 80n209
 exemplar: as cultic statue 173; as hypostasis
 of knowledge 185; as “mule” 176; as
 statue of divine knowledge 173, 185
 exemplarity 179n20
ex eventu prophecy 166
- Face, divine 83–111; and divine knowledge
 83–84
 Fletcher–Louis, C. 31, 34, 54, 62n23,
 63n24, 65n38, 66n46, 67n54, 69,
 79n202, 80n207, 82n238, 85, 104n14
 Flood 41
 Fossum, J. 35, 48, 69n81, 72n122, 73n136,
 76–79, 81n223, 112, 117–119, 121,
 123–124, 137, 146n9, 149–154,
 157n172, 159n200, 161n224
 frozen angel 32, 99
- Gabriel, archangel 38, 40, 86, 97, 105n23,
 110n115
 García Martínez, F. 16n9, 68n71
 Garden of Eden 29, 33, 57, 165n252
 Gieschen, C. 5, 8–9, 19n26, 20n33, 21n41,
 24–25, 86, 105n22, 106n39, 116, 119,
 123–128, 137, 147n10, 148n31, 151n66,
 152n68, 156n139, 159n205, 161n224
 Gilbert, M. 23n55
 Ginzberg, L. 105n19, 107n55
 Glory, divine 8–9, 15, 19n26, 32–35,
 43–44, 50, 53, 55, 63n26, 68n61,
 69n80, 79n202, 81n220, 83–84, 87,
 92, 94, 97–98, 100, 108–109, 121,
 131–133, 137–138, 142, 157, 165
- Golden Calf 93
 Golitzin, A. 69n77
 Goshen Gottstein, A. 81n221
 Greece 51, 52, 78n192
 Grözinger, K. 133–134, 156n141, 158n185
 Gruenwald, I. 110n113, 125, 155n126
- Hall, R. 9, 14, 25–26
 Halperin, D. 44, 73–74, 107, 154, 158n184
 Hamerton–Kelly, R. 21n43, 151
 Hamori, E. 2, 15–16n4
 Hannah, D. 117, 149n39
 Hanson, P. 178n10
 Haran, M. 106n42, 108n75
 Harlow, D. 122, 153
 Hayward, R. 47, 49, 75–77, 136, 157n160,
 159n197
hayyot 92, 98, 107, 134–135
 Head of Days 126
 heavenly books 1, 16n9, 29, 97
 heavenly craftsmen 173
 heavenly journey 38, 84
 heavenly tablets 1, 4, 21n43, 87–88
 Hengel, M. 69, 180n27
 Herod 155
 Herring, S. 61, 93, 108, 168, 170–171,
 173, 180n31, 181n35, 182n52
 high priest 45, 123, 130–131, 136,
 154n106, 157n171
 Himmelfarb, M. 154n102
 Holdrege, B. 114, 147n16, 148n19
 Holy of Holies 34, 73n134
 Holy Spirit 171
 Hundley, M. 59–60, 65, 68, 72–73, 168,
 180n29, 181n32, 182n58, 184
 Hurtado, L. 6, 10, 12, 20n34, 21n38,
 22n45, 25–26, 80n206, 121, 124,
 153n90, 155n114
 hypostasis terminology 4–5
- iconic knowledge 1–2, 10, 27, 29, 37,
 57–58, 83, 92, 95, 97, 99–100
 Idel, M. 17n11, 22n49, 101, 105n18,
 110n106, 115–116, 120, 135, 148n24,
 152n78, 158, 163n244, 165n253
 idolatry 28, 145
 idols 28, 67n49, 115, 145, 164n245, 165n254
 image, divine 13, 25–30, 32, 34, 36–37,
 41–69, 81–85, 90, 92, 104, 113, 116,
 120, 141, 144–145, 163–164, 173–174,
 185–186; and divine knowledge 27–30

- iqonin* 50, 55, 74n139, 94
 Isaac 47–48, 74n145, 84, 107n54, 116,
 124, 148n34, 159n199
 Ishtar 20n35
 Isis 20n35
 Israelites 93–94, 100, 108n71, 109n93,
 115, 122, 148n25, 150n47, 164n245
- Jabbok 49
 Jacob: as divine Face 90–92; as divine
 image 43–52; as divine Name 136–137
 Jacobsen, T. 60, 170–171, 182n52, 183n63
 Jervell, J. 8, 24n60, 80n211
 Jesus Christ 6, 53, 57, 63n24, 75n160, 125,
 137, 149, 171–172
 Joseph 140, 142
 Joshua 94–95, 108n76, 135, 159
- Kahana, A. 101, 109n101
Kavod 11, 32–35, 44, 53, 69, 77, 83, 96,
 105, 112–114, 118, 123, 142, 150n51,
 167, 185
 Kesbeel 116–117
 Kim Harkins, A. 186n1
 King of Tyre 33
 knowledge, divine 1–10, 13–15, 27–30,
 32, 36–37, 40–41, 57–59, 83–84,
 87–88, 95–99, 107, 112–116, 119, 127,
 132, 134–135, 142, 146n4, 166–168,
 173–176, 185
 Kore 20n35
 Kraemer, R. 162n236
 Kugel, J. 50, 74n139, 77–79, 183n64
 Kulik, A. 77n178, 153n97, 155n116,
 158n183, 162n232
 Kvanvig, H. 70
- ladder, heavenly 43–46, 49–52
 legacy patterns 179n21
 Lesses, R. 156n146
 Levison, J. 25n90, 69
 Lieber, A. 143, 162n234, 163n240
 light, divine 8, 12, 53–54, 56, 79, 92,
 106, 108
 likeness, divine 12, 28–35, 45, 49, 60n2,
 63n28, 64n30, 65n37, 67n49, 71n115,
 73n134, 77n183, 79n203, 84–86, 92,
 104n10
 Logos 10–15
 Lord of Spirits 126–127
 Lunt, H. 50, 77n175, 78n188
- Magliano–Tromp, J. 62n24, 63n24
 manna 122, 143, 153n98
- Marah 140
 Mastema 64n29
 Meade, D. 179
 Media 51–52, 78n192
 mediators, divine 7, 10–11, 14, 15n2, 40,
 58, 84, 88–89, 93, 95, 120, 123–126,
 128, 131–133, 135, 136–137, 158,
 179n11, 185–186
 Meeks, W. 57, 79n195, 80n211, 81n226
melammu 32, 68n58, 106n42, 108n61
 Mesopotamia 45, 48, 60–61, 69, 71,
 181n35
 Messiah 4, 18n14, 148–149, 155
 Metatron 17n13, 18n14, 37, 40–42, 55,
 86, 89–90, 97–98, 102–104, 105n19,
 106n43, 107n44, 109n92, 111n125, 114,
 119–136, 140–141, 147, 150–162; as
 divine Face 90; as embodiment of Torah
 135–136; as Lesser YHWH 120–121,
 123, 126, 128–129, 131–133, 156–157
 Methuselah 100
 metonymy of presence 169
 Mettinger, T. 112, 119, 146n6, 150n52,
 152n75, 159n206, 163n242
 Metzger, B. 178n3, 180n21
 Michael, archangel 30, 38
 Milik, J. 4, 18n17, 70
 Miller, M. 60, 114, 118, 123, 125,
 128–131, 145n2, 147n13, 151,
 154–157, 159
 mimesis 168–169, 173, 177, 180
 Minov, S. 77n178
 miracles 138–139, 160–161
 Morray–Jones, C. 34, 44, 68n70, 73,
 131, 157n174
 Moses: as divine Face 92–96; as divine
 image 52–57; as divine Name 137–141
 Mowinkel, S. 5, 19
 Mroczek, E. 167, 180n22
 mysteries 1, 3–4, 8–9, 13–16, 18n20,
 21n43, 37, 40, 57–58, 83, 87–88, 90,
 97, 102, 116, 134, 141, 163n237,
 175, 185
- Najman, H. 106, 167, 179n20, 180n25
 Name, divine 112–165; and divine
 knowledge 112–117; as epistemological
 organism 134
 Nebuchadnezzar 164n245
 Nechepso 177n1
 Neis, R. 43–46, 72n128, 74–75, 77n183,
 84, 91–92, 104n6, 107n48
 Newman, J. 75n157, 76n164
 Nickelsburg, G. 155n130

- Nile 140
Nineveh 183n62
- Odeberg, H. 86, 105n19, 132, 157n173
Oesterley, W. O. E. 5, 19n23
Olyan, S. 19n31, 106n32, 151n63
opening of the mouth 2, 28, 60, 144,
163n243, 186
Oral Law 73n134
- panim* 40, 49, 56, 85, 87, 91, 92, 107
Paradise 17n12, 34, 62n24, 63n28, 104n8
pargod 18n14, 40
Patton, C. 66n42, 67n49, 69n88
Peniel 87, 88, 105n32
Penuel 105n32, 106
Phanuel 87, 88, 105n32
Pharaoh 138, 160n217
Portier-Young, A. 163n237
power 19n26, 124, 125, 133, 155n122
prelapsarian humankind 28–29, 32, 35, 45,
53, 58–59, 85, 100, 145
Priestly Source 67
Promised Land 159
protoplast 30–33, 35, 38–40, 42, 48, 53,
56, 59, 69n86, 79n198, 82n234, 84–85,
165n252
pseudepigraphical attribution 3, 166–167,
173–177, 185–186
pseudepigraphy: and amputation of the
hands 172–174; and authority 167; as
cultivation of the divine presence 173;
psychological approach to 165–167; and
sacralization of revelation 174
- qlaster panim* 91, 107n54
Quispel, G. 72n122, 79, 101, 110n105,
151n62, 153n88
- radiance 32, 50, 80n209, 81n223, 92, 94,
96, 106–108, 162n230
Raguel 53
reality, spiritual 170–171
real presence 171
Red Sea 137, 139
Reed, A. Y. 16n6, 18n16, 69n89, 155,
157n165
Reeves, J. 16n6, 155–158
Reuel 160n217
Richter, S. 150n50, 151n57
Ringgren, H. 5, 8–9, 19n24, 20n36,
22–25, 68
Robinson, H. W. 76, 178n9
Rome 51, 72, 78, 178n8
- Rowland, C. 44, 73n133, 77n186
Runia, D. 10, 14, 25n82, 26n108
Russell, D. S. 167, 178n9, 179n14
- Sabbath 57
Sacchi, P. 155n130
Sammael 139–140
sar hannpanim 86–90, 100
Sariel 87–88, 105n29
Sar Torah 116
Satan 31, 36, 38–39, 49, 65–66, 69n86,
71n106
Satanael 63n26
Schäfer, P. 24, 69–70, 72n120, 75n148,
83–84, 104n2, 105n30, 107n46,
109–111, 132, 135–136, 157–160
Scholem, G. 6, 21n42, 101, 103, 105n24,
107n58, 109n103, 110n116, 114, 133,
146n4, 147n17, 148n22, 158n181,
164n245
Schüle, A. 28–29, 35, 61n13, 62n21,
65n34, 68n67, 69n85, 144, 164n246
Schürer, E. 178
Schüssler Fiorenza, E. 20n35
Segal, A. 10, 25n83, 72n122, 137,
156n152, 157n170, 159n204
Selz, G. 169, 181
Seow, C. L. 83, 104n1
Serah 140
Seth 65n38, 66n38
seventy names 114, 121, 134–136, 153n84,
157–159
Shekinah 19n31, 55, 72n120, 83–84, 94,
96–98, 104n8, 107n43, 109n92, 115,
142, 165n252
Sh'ur Qomah 37, 40, 97–98, 101–103,
109n103, 110n116, 115–116, 123, 134,
137, 159n198
Sinai 7, 17n12, 52, 55, 59, 81n226,
82n238, 94, 96, 122, 135–136, 158n191
Sint, J. 167, 179n16
Sisera 80
Smith, J. 75n159, 76n163, 105n32,
106n35, 155n124, 159n196
Smith, Mark 28, 61n18
Smith, Morton 81n211, 177
Sommer, B. 22n49, 45, 60n9, 75n147,
145n1, 146n8, 147n15, 151n53, 169,
177, 181–184
Son of God 75, 159n199, 163n241
Son of Man 4, 18n20, 125–128, 155n135,
156n135
Speyer, W. 167, 178–179
Stang, C. 166–167, 179n13

- stars 23, 35, 5n541, 53–55, 79n205, 180n205, 111n124, 127, 130, 141, 156n157
- statue, cultic 2, 27–28, 31–32, 45, 50, 60n8, 61n14, 65n33, 66n43, 69n86, 72n132, 115, 144, 168–169, 171–174, 181n42, 182n52, 183n63, 185–186
- statue of knowledge 134, 173
- Steenburg, D. 67n51, 85, 104n13
- Sterling, G. 10, 12, 25n87, 26n99
- Stone, M. E. 3, 16, 38–39, 57, 65–68, 70–72, 77n172, 81, 104, 177–180
- Stroumsa, G. 111n127, 138, 146n10, 154n109, 160
- Swartz, M. 158–159
- tabernacle 17n10, 97–98, 109n92, 134, 163
- Temple 15, 19, 23–25, 34, 38, 53, 57, 67–69, 75n159, 118, 130, 150n52, 151n57, 152n74, 164n245, 167, 176
- Ten Commandments 180
- theophany 1–3, 8, 16n4, 27, 44, 53, 60n4, 89, 92, 94, 97–103, 166, 171, 175–176, 186
- Tobin, T. 11, 14, 26n92
- Torah 6–7, 13, 15, 17–18, 21–24, 67n51, 72n120, 74n137, 76n164, 82, 84, 95–96, 103, 106–107, 114–116, 134–136, 147–148, 158; as anthropomorphic extent 22, 115, 135; as living organism 15, 22, 115
- Torm, F. 167, 179n15
- transformation 38, 57–59, 85–86, 89, 141–145, 175
- Tree of Life 6
- Uriel 48–49, 87–88, 105n29, 106n39, 136–137
- Van der Horst, P. 75
- VanderKam, J. C. 70, 75n161, 106, 148n33, 155
- Van der Toorn, K. 115, 148n25
- Van Kooten, G. 34, 61n20, 62n22, 66–69, 104n14
- veil 2, 55, 94, 100, 105n31, 108n70, 109n103
- Vermes, G. 105n29, 106n35
- visualization 27, 102
- Vreveil 87
- Walls, N. 60n6, 66n43
- washing of the mouth 2, 31, 60n10, 144, 163n243
- Watchers 4, 37
- Weinfeld, M. 68n58, 151n52, 163n242
- Wilson, I. 150n49, 151n52
- Winston, D. 10, 24n59, 25n86
- Winter, I. 180n28
- Wisdom 5–9
- Wolfson, E. R. 27, 44, 47, 60, 74n137, 77n177, 81–82, 92, 107–108, 148, 151
- Wolfson, H. A. 13, 26n102
- Yahoel 115–155
- Yom Kippur 136
- yorde merkavah* 83
- Zipporah 160n217
- ziz* 130, 154n107
- Zoroaster 177n1