Abstract

Images of Torah
From the Second Temple Period Through the Middle Ages

This dissertation investigates the religious phenomenon of the three images of Torah as a mediator between God and human beings which are manifest in Jewish and Christian sources from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods through the Middle Ages. This study conducts a philological-intertextual analysis and philosophical-theological examination, by following Idel's panoramic approach and the two senses of phenomenology of models that he offers—cross-fertilization between various traditions and subjective impressions. It examines the intertextual, theological, and hermeneutical relationships between various hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Wisdom, Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah* which are present in the aforementioned sources, while tracing their development throughout the history of Jewish thought. It demonstrates how the primitive forms of the three images of Torah manifested in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods were later developed into the full-fledged images of Torah that explicitly appear in the rabbinic, Jewish philosophical, and mystical traditions in the Middle Ages. This study not only provides critical insight into the continuity and development of the related ideas (e.g., the concepts of God and Torah) and of mystical experiences (e.g. the ideas of *devekut* or *unio mystica*) but also examine the significance of literary and hermeneutic strategies, which importantly function in formulating the images of Torah. The results of this examination suggest the necessity of close reevaluation of the developmental process, which involve a sophisticated combination of various literary, theological, and hermeneutical influences on the formulation of the three images of Torah. The conclusions provide explicit evidence of the continuity of an inner and hidden channel transmitting the shared ideas, which function in formulating the images of Torah as mediators along with the mechanism of *devekut* and *unio mystica* recurrent from the ancient (Second Temple) and rabbinic sources through the medieval philosophic and Kabbalistic sources. This study eventually provides not only a comprehensive and innovative way of depicting a clearer picture of the phenomenological features of these images of Torah but also offers critical theological and philosophical implications of the phenomenology of Torah in Jewish philosophy and Jewish mysticism.

Images of Torah

From the Second Temple Period Through the Middle Ages

by

Jeong Mun. Heo

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the Bernard Revel Graduate School of Jewish Studies

Yeshiva University

May 2021

Copyright © 2021
by
Jeong Mun. Heo

The committee for this dissertation consists of:

Jonathan V. Dauber, Ph.D., Professor (Chairperson), Bernard Revel Graduate School of Jewish Studies, Yeshiva University

Daniel Rynhold, Ph.D., Professor, Bernard Revel Graduate School of Jewish Studies, Yeshiva University

Richard Hidary, Ph.D., Professor, Bernard Revel Graduate School of Jewish Studies, Yeshiva University

Richard J. Clifford, Ph.D., Professor, School of Theology and Ministry, Boston College

Acknowledgements

Above all, I sincerely thank my esteemed supervisor, Professor Jonathan V. Dauber, as my model of a scholar for teaching me a great deal of Jewish mysticism and for his continuous commitment to my intellectual development, as well as for tireless support and encouragement throughout my studies. I thank for his wise guidance at every stage of the research and for his unwavering support and belief in me. He subjected the manuscript of the dissertation to a meticulous reading but also offered many suggestions and constructive critiques. He never stopped encouraging me and offering me his wise counsels and valuable comments, as well as patiently answering all the questions I had. I have benefited greatly from the deep and wide scopes of his wisdom and knowledge, and his invaluable teachings not only in the field of Jewish mysticism but also in the academic journey of my life. Without his help and wise guidance this dissertation would have not been the same! I hope these magnificent benefits will continue for years to come and, with great joy and gratitude, throughout my journey walking on the road of scholarship.

In addition, I have to thank the three readers who evaluated the final version and gave me invaluable comments. Without their excellent teachings and supports, this doctorate would surely have taken much more time.

I thank Professor Daniel Rynhold for his support and for providing me with a good basis in medieval Jewish philosophy. I have to recall that during the period of my studies at Revel, he looked after the progress of my studies as well as administrative and financial matters, and, as I admire, showed an exemplar of Jewish philosophy as a practical way of life, not as mere academic knowledge.

I thank Professor Richard Hidary for his support and critique and for giving me critical insight and sharing with his extraordinary knowledge of Rabbinic literature and for serving as a reader of my dissertation.

I thank Professor Richard J. Clifford for serving as a reader of my dissertation and for broadening my understanding of Hebrew Bible and Wisdom Literature. I am particularly honored and deeply grateful to him for reading my doctoral thesis again in addition to his guidance as an advisor for my ThM thesis and for giving me the opportunity to receive invaluable comments.

Furthermore, I thank my consultant, Benny Morduchowitz who is an English Professor, for editing the entire manuscript for stylistic matters. My gratitude extends to the Faculty of Bernard Revel Graduate School of Jewish Studies and its staff for the financial and administrative supports to undertake and complete my studies at Yeshiva University in New York. Finally, without these generous supports, this doctorate would surely have taken much more time. Without the support, encouragement, and friendship rendered by many people around me, to whom I sincerely wish to express sincere gratitude, this whole work and process could not have reached accomplishment.

Dedication

To my beloved father, Sang Jin. Heo,
and my beloved mother, Yeong Ja. Roh.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES x

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS x

INTRODUCTION 1

Originality, Significance and Critical Implications of this Research 1

Statement of Problem, Current Research and Critical Questions 2

Research Methodology: Grounding in Moshe Idel's Panoramic Approach 6

Idel's Phenomenology: Models and Panoramic Approach 6

Idel's Panoramic Approach: The History of Ideas based on Experience 17

Research Methodology with an Outline of Chapters 26

PART A: Images of Torah in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Periods 32

Chapter I: Hypostatic Notions of Torah in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Periods 32

The Conceptual and Historical Backdrops of Torah 33

Various Derivative Forms of Hypostatic Notions of Torah 49

Personified Wisdom in Proverbs 49

Personified Wisdom in Sirach, The Wisdom of Solomon, and Qumran Texts 58

Philo's Logos 68

The Johannine Logos 74

Memra 85

Shekhinah 97

Intertextual and Theological Nexuses between the Hypostatic Notions of Torah 102

Chapter II: The Images of Torah in Early Christianity and Multifaceted Judaism 1

Torah, the Foundation of Jesus as Personified Wisdom and Incarnate Logos 1

Jesus in the Gospels as a Derivative Form of the Hypostatic Notions of Torah 7

Jesus as Incarnate Logos in the Fourth Gospel 7

Jesus as Personified Wisdom in the Synoptics 10

Three Images of Torah: Angelic, Messianic, and God-like 14

An Angelic Image of the Hypostatic Notions of Torah 14

A God-like Image of the Hypostatic Notions of Torah 18

A Messianic Image of the Hypostatic Notions of Torah 40

Critical Findings and Implications: Exegetical and Phenomenological 57

Supposed Primitive Forms of the Images of Torah as a Mediator 57

Two Supposed Primitive Traditions: Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered 60

Phenomenological Implications 64

PART B: Images of Torah from the Second Temple Period to the Middle Ages 1

Chapter III: An Angelic Image of Torah in the Medieval Jewish Philosophical Tradition 3

The Continuity of Angelic Images of Torah: From the Logos to the Active Intellect 3

Angelic Images of Torah related to the Idea of Devekut to the Logos and Active Intellect 12

In Philonic Thought 12

The Idea of Devekut to the Active Intellect in the Thought of Maimonides 15

The Idea of Noetic Union: Maimonides, Gersonides, and Islamic Philosophers 21

Chapter IV: A God-like Image of Torah in the Medieval Jewish Mystical Tradition 1

The Continuity of God-like Images of Torah in the Sefirot 1

God-like Image of Torah related to the Idea of Unio Mystica to the Sefirot 23

In the Philonic Tradition 24

In the Bahiric and Geronese Traditions 30

In the Abulafian Tradition 36

In the Zoharic and Gikatillian Traditions 41

Critical Findings and Implications 50

Chapter V: A Messianic Image of Torah in the Jewish Philosophic and Mystical Tradition 1

The Continuity of Messianic Images of Torah 3

Messianic Image of Torah related to the Ideas of Devekut and Unio Mystica 13

In the Thought of Medieval Jewish Philosophers 13

In the Abulafian Tradition 19

In the Zoharic and Gikatillian Traditions 28

Chapter VI: Phenomenological Analysis of Images of Torah from the Second Temple Period through the Middle Ages 1

On the Angelic Image of Torah 2

On the God-like Image of Torah 6

On the Messianic Image of Torah 13

Reconsidering Idel’s Panoramic Approach: The Images of Torah as Model and Phenomenology 21

CONCLUSION 1

AFTERWORD 8

REFERENCES 1

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter I

TABLE 1. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WISDOM, AND TORAH IN RELATION TO ZION 59
TABLE 2. THE INTERTEXTUAL ALLUSIONS BETWEEN SIRACH, GENESIS, AND PROVERBS 61
TABLE 3. EVIDENCE OF QUOTATION OF SIR 24:23 FROM DT 33:4 62
TABLE 4. PREEXISTENT EVIDENCE OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WISDOM AND TORAH 62
TABLE 5. EVIDENCE OF PERSONIFIED WISDOM IN SIRACH AND WISDOM OF SOLOMON 63
TABLE 6. INTERTEXTUAL NEXUS BETWEEN PERSONIFIED WISDOM AND TORAH IN WISDOM OF SOLOMON 64
TABLE 7. EVIDENCE OF PERSONIFIED WISDOM IN RELATION TO TORAH IN QUMRAN TEXTS 67
TABLE 8. GEN 1:26-27, 2:7 IN THE LXX 69
TABLE 9. CHIASTIC STRUCTURE OF THE JOHANNINE PROLOGUE 78
TABLE 10. "STEP PARALLELISM" IN JN 1:1-5 79
TABLE 11. INTERTEXTUAL ALLUSIONS TO THE HYPOSTATIC NOTIONS OF TORAH 102

Chapter II

TABLE 12. INTERTEXTUAL EVIDENCE OF WISDOM AND TORAH IN THE MT AND LXX 2
TABLE 13. PARALLELISM BETWEEN WOMAN WISDOM AND WISDOM FOLLY 21
TABLE 14. CHIASTIC STRUCTURE OF PROV 9:7-9 24
TABLE 15. INTERTEXTUAL AND COMPOSITIONAL NEXUS BETWEEN PROV 1 AND 9 ON PERSONIFIED WISDOM 25
TABLE 16. INTERTEXTUAL AND COMPOSITIONAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROV 8 AND 9 26
TABLE 17. THE INTERTEXTUAL ALLUSIONS BETWEEN PROV 9 AND 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, AND 31 IN PROVERBS 27

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Primary Sources: Bible Texts, and Ancient Texts

Hebrew Bible/Mishnah/Talmud

1 Chr	1 Chronicles
1-2 Kgs	1-2 Kings
1-2 Sam	1-2 Samuel
Dan	Daniel
Dt	Deuteronomy
Eccl (or Qoh)	Ecclesiastes (or Qoheleth)
Esth	Esther
Ex	Exodus
Ezek	Ezekiel
Gen	Genesis
Hab	Habakkuk
Hag	Haggai
Hos	Hoshea
Isa	Isaiah
Jer	Jeremiah
Jl	Joel
Josh	Joshua
Lam	Lamentations
Lev	Leviticus
Mal	Malachi
Mic	Micah
Nah	Nahum
Neh	Nehemiah
Num	Numbers
Prov	Proverbs
Ps	Psalms
Zech	Zechariah
m.	Mishnah
b.	Babylonian Talmud
y.	Talmud Yerushalmi
’Abod. Zar.	Aboda Zarah
ʾAbot R. Nat.	Abot de Rabbi Nathan
B. Mes.	Bava Metzi’a
Ber.	Berakhot
Git.	Gittin
Ḥag.	Ḥagigah
Hor.	Horayot

New Testament, Philo, Plato Deuterocanonical works, Pseudepigrapha, Midrash, and Targums

Mt	Matthew
Lk	Luke
Jn	John
Heb	Hebrews
Cor	Corinthians
Col	Colossians
Gos. Tr.	The Gospel of Truth
Gos. Thom	The Gospel of Thomas
Philo: Abr.	Abraham
Agr.	Agriculture
Cher.	Cherubim
Conf.	De confusione linguarum
Decal.	De decalogo
Ebr.	De ebrietate
Fug.	De fuga et inventione
Gig.	De gigantibus
Her.	Quis rerum divinarum heres sit
Migr.	De migratione Abrahami
Leg. 1, 2, 3	Legum allegoriae I, II, III
Legat.	Legatio ad Gaium
Mos. I. II.	Vita Mosis I, II
Opif.	De Opificio Mundi
Plant.	De plantatione
Post.	De posteritate Caini
Praem.	De praemiis et poenis
QG 1, 2, 3, 4	Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin I, II, III, IV
QE 1, 2	Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum I, II
Sacr.	De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini
Somn.	De somniis I, II
Virt.	De virtutibus
1 Macc	1 Maccabees
Sir	Sirach
Wis	Wisdom of Solomon

Ḥul.	Ḥullin	Bar	Baruch
Kelim, B. Qam.	Kelim, Bava Qamma	Josephus: Ant.	Antiquities of Jews
Ketub.	Ketubbot	1 En.	1 Enoch (Ethiopic Apocalypse)
Mak.	Makkot	2 En.	2 Enoch (Slavonic Apocalypse)
Meg.	Megillah	3 En.	3 Enoch (Hebrew Apocalypse)
Menaḥ.	Menaḥot	Gen. Rab.	Genesis Rabbah
Mid.	Middot	Pesiq. Rab.	Pesiqta Rabbati
Ned.	Nedarim	Lev. Rab.	Leviticus Rabbah
Pesaḥ.	Pesaḥim	Num. Rab.	Numbers Rabbah
Qidd.	Qiddushin	*Tg. Onq.*	Targum Onqelos
Sabb.	Sabbot	*Tg. Ps.- J.*	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
Sanḥ.	Sanhedrin	*Tg. Neof.*	Targum Neofiti
Sukk.	Sukkah	*Frg. Tg*	Fragmentary Targum
Tanḥ.	Tanḥuma	LXX	The Septuagint

Journals, References Works, Series

AGAJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AJS Review	Association for Jewish Studies Review
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
DSD	Dead Sea Discoveries
EJJS	European Journal of Jewish Studies
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
JANER	Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions
JANESCU	Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JSJ	Journal for the Study of the Judaism
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSP	Journal of Scholarly Publishing
JSQ	Jewish Studies Quarterly
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JECS	Journal of Early Christian Studies
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
NT	Novum Testamentum
NTS	New Testament Studies
ResQ	Restoration Quarterly
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
VT	Vetus Testamentum
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

INTRODUCTION

Originality, Significance and Critical Implications of this Research

This dissertation seeks to investigate the religious phenomenon of the Torah as a mediator between God and human beings. In particular, it will examine images of the Torah as angelic, messianic and God-like in early Jewish and Christian sources from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. Additionally, the study investigates these images of Torah as they are manifest in the medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions, with the aim of discovering the ancient roots of the medieval conceptions in the Second Temple and Rabbinic-period material. In so doing, it provides a phenomenological analysis of the fundamental elements and meanings of each of the images of Torah as they are understood by medieval Jewish philosophers and Jewish mystics. By following Moshe Idel's panoramic approach towards the history of ideas, this study presents an innovative way of depicting a clearer picture of the development of the religious phenomena of these images of Torah as they appear in the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions. In keeping with Idel's research, which reconstructs a history of ideas that connects ancient and medieval Jewish sources and views, the significant implication of this study is that there is continuity between the images of Torah in ancient sources, on the one hand, and in medieval Jewish mysticism and philosophy on the other.

I will examine the images of Torah from three vantage points: 1) the manner in which these images reflect the Torah's role as a mediator between God and human beings; 2) the manner in which they relate to varying conception of *devekut*, i.e., communion or union with God; 3) the manner in which they are employed in the two different traditions: Jewish mystical and philosophical. In so doing, I will explore the concept of a mediator connecting God and human beings as it relates to

Torah's images, as well as the way this mediator functions in the experience of *devekut.* This study also offers critical evidence for specific instances of the intertextual and exegetical nexuses of the hypostatic notions of Torah, as well as for a more comprehensive blueprint of the developmental process of images of Torah. Furthermore, this study illuminates not only the theological and phenomenological relationships between the three images of Torah but also their implications in the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions as they emerged from the Second Temple period through the Middle Ages.

Statement of Problem, Current Research and Critical Questions

The dynamic interactions between God and human beings are crucial religious phenomena in many late antique religions. Exegetical, religious, philosophical, and mystical factors were intertwined in these dynamic interactions as were religious phenomena such as the personification of gods and deification of human beings. These phenomena produced various images of deities, and a substantial variety of types of relationships between God and human beings. Of particular significance was the concept of a mediator between God and human beings, which implies a critical attempt to narrow the distance between them. Certain concepts and images of the Torah as a mediator emerged out of philosophical and theological interactions between Jewish and Hellenistic traditions in the Second Temple Period. The images of Torah explicitly appear as hypostatic notions[1], such as Wisdom, Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah*, which are found in early Jewish and Christian sources.

---

[1] The origin and concept of hypostasis appears in Plotinus's hierarchical system. A hypostasis, which basically stands for substance or essence in metaphysics, is described as the Intellect generated by the One. See Pauliina Remes, "Neoplatonism," *Ancient Philosophies* 4 (Stocksfield, England: Acumen, 2008), 48-52. For Plotinus, the term hypostasis expresses immaterial and independent "entities" or higher spiritual "principles" of varying levels of existence. See also Plotinus, *Enneads* (Greek), trans. Arthur H. Armstrong (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015), I. 1.8.9-10; III. 8.9; V. 1.6.37-9; V. 3.13.1-6; V. 4.1; VI. 8.20.9-16; VI. 9.1.1-4. In a manner similar to the Neoplatonic concept of the Intellect as a hypostasis, there are the supposed forms of the hypostatic notions, such as Torah, Wisdom, Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah,* which mainly appear in the Jewish and Christian sources during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods, as well as the Active Intellect and the sefirot as the hypostatic entities that emerge from the One or *Ein Sof*, i.e., God, which mainly appear in the Middle Ages.

Interestingly, these hypostatic notions are profoundly connected to various biblical, philosophical, and mystical concepts of Torah. This informs the way the hypostatic notions function as mediators, as they also appear recurrently as three images of Torah: angelic, messianic and God-like.

In this context, critical evidence of two distinct traditions within ancient Jewish thought can be detected: a philosophical tradition centered on Greek Logos and a mystical tradition centered on Jewish Wisdom. On the one hand, the idea of Greek Logos, which is first presented as part of the cosmic process by the pre-Socratic Greek philosopher Heraclitus (535-475 B.C.E), appears in Philo of Alexandria's conception of the Logos as the intermediary between God and the cosmos. This idea of Greek Logos appears to convey an external and revealed function (e.g., speech), thereby leading to the development of a philosophical tradition that features some Jewish hypostatic notions, such as Philo's Logos and *memra* in Second Temple Jewish and Rabbinic sources, as well as the Incarnate Logos of the Johannine Gospel in early Christianity. Additionally, the idea of Logos appears to be identified with the idea of the Active Intellect, a cosmological mediator between God and human beings, which is prominent in the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition. The concept of the mediator illuminates the religious and mystical experiences, and allows for the idea of *devekut*, the noetic transformation or union between the human intellect and the Active Intellect. On the other hand, the idea of Jewish Wisdom appears in the Book of Proverbs, which sets forth two types of wisdom, practical wisdom as reflected throughout the text, and personified Wisdom as reflected in the hypostatic conception found in Prov 8:22-31. In particular, the idea of Jewish Wisdom appears to have an internal and hidden function (e.g., idea), which significantly leads to the development of a mystical tradition, by offering a conceptual framework for the emergence of the notion of an inner or spiritual realization. This idea of Jewish Wisdom appears to be identified with some Jewish hypostatic notions, such as personified Wisdom which was with God before creation, preexistent Torah, *shekhinah* in Second Temple Jewish and Rabbinic sources, and as Jesus in the Synoptics of the early Christian tradition. In addition, the idea of Wisdom appears to be profoundly related to the idea of the sefirot as kabbalistic symbols, which elucidate an inner divine system, and function as invisible and hidden mediators that connect God and human beings, in the medieval kabbalistic tradition. The idea of Wisdom as a hidden mediator plays a vital role in elucidating the ideal of *devekut* understood as *unio mystica*, which means a complete union of the human soul with the sefirot and God.

The interrelationships between the ideas of the Greek Logos and Jewish Wisdom in relation to the hypostatic notions became the critical object of constant and energetic discussion and has remained such in contemporary Judaism and Christianity. In particular, it is notable that two prominent scholars of Jewish mysticism, Gershom Scholem and Moshe Idel both examined the philosophical and mystical concepts and images of Torah manifest in the hypostatic notions, such as Wisdom and Logos, by tracing the history of ideas connecting ancient and medieval Jewish sources and concepts. Their constructions of a history of ideas of the ancient roots of significantly later traditions reveals possible associations between ancient and medieval traditions as they relate to the images of Torah. Both Scholem in *Origins of The Kabbalah* (*Ursprung und Anfänge der Kabbala*, 1962) and *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (1941), and Idel in *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (1990), view the history of Jewish mysticism as a necessary component of their studies. However, Idel's methodology is less concerned with integrating social and intellectual history than it is with focusing on structures of experiences, mystical techniques, and the relationship between theurgical practices and Jewish esotericism. This allows him to trace the associations and structures from antiquity through early Kabbalah even in the absence of clear historical points of contact. Idel depicts the inherent connections between ideas which form the inner structure of Jewish mysticism, while formulating a phenomenology of the traditions of Jewish mysticism, which concentrates on the study of experience, a topic that is lacking in previous scholarship. Following this logic, Idel hypothesizes that there is an inner history and a pre-history of Kabbalah which can be observed in the recurring patterns that appear in various corpuses of Jewish esotericism. In *Absorbing Perfections: Kabbalah and Interpretation* (2008), Idel places particular value on religious experience, while emphasizing that symbols are identified, created, and utilized by the mystic as an invitation to experience the divine—something that occurs through the mystical interpretation of the Torah, which connects God and human beings. For Scholem, symbols are just an alternative for that which cannot be expressed in human language, while for Idel, symbols transform language into the interlocked code that mediates religious experience and hermeneutics.

In Idel's view, Scholem overemphasizes the doctrinal aspect of theosophic Kabbalah, which is based on the historical presentation of ideas and functions. In line with his focus on doctrine over experience, Scholem emphasizes the influences and centrality of Gnostic myths in evaluating various mythic aspects appearing in Rabbinic and medieval Kabbalistic texts. In contrast, Idel assumes a qualitative distinction between Gnostic mythic aspects and rabbinic and kabbalistic ones. He particularly values the experiential aspect, while tracing the existence of internal channels transmitting the phenomenological ideas (e.g., the images of Torah, and the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica*) based on religious experience, which develop *from within* ancient Jewish mystical roots and extend through the medieval kabbalistic traditions. By this logic, Idel further tries to reconstruct a more comprehensive system, which conveys the doctrinal and experiential aspects based on a linguistic and kabbalistic symbolism.

This system appreciates the reoccurrence of various ideas that contain older and newer patterns and structures, among various sources (e.g., philosophical, Rabbinic, and Kabbalistic sources) throughout this history of Jewish thought. In this context, Idel proposes a panoramic approach, which synthesizes the various interactions between different traditions through the investigation of the full range of textual resources from the ancient, medieval, and post-medieval sources. This panoramic approach allows for additional analyses and comparisons in order to attain a holistic appreciation of the history of ideas from the texts of Jewish mysticism. In this sense, this approach is primarily based on an ahistorical perspective, which places more emphasis on reconstructing holistically the experiential aspects in the development of Jewish thought, than on tracing the historical development of one tradition. Nonetheless, Idel tries to discover, in a historical fashion, the links between the conceptual structures of mediaeval Jewish mystical and philosophical traditions and sources from antiquity. In this vein, Idel appears to offer an authentic Jewish phenomenology *from within* by following a methodological eclecticism while simultaneously tracking the history of ideas in the Jewish mystical and esoteric traditions.

Following Idel's phenomenological methodology, in this dissertation, I propose to show a concrete example which clearly illustrates more clearly the connections between the images of Torah in Second Temple Judaism and those in medieval Judaism. In particular, the purpose of the study is to present a new model of the development of and interaction between the images of Torah (as angelic, messianic, and God-like) between God and human beings**,** as mediated by the idea of *devekut*. As noted, these images of the Torah are prominently found in ancient Jewish sources that describe Wisdom and Greek sources that describe Logos. Thus, this study emphasizes the relationship and connectivity between ancient Jewish, Greek, and Christian thought, on the one hand, and medieval Jewish mysticism and Jewish philosophy on the other. This study particularly provides important evidence of specific instances of the dynamic interactions of the images of Torah in the two traditions: Jewish mystical and philosophical traditions from the Second Temple period to the Middle Ages. Furthermore, it will contribute to the understanding of Jewish religious phenomena, providing a wider history of Jewish ideas related to Torah's images in a broader phenomenological perspective. The results will not only suggest the importance of a further phenomenological examination of the ongoing developmental process of Torah's images in relation to the idea of *devekut*, but will also encourage a philosophical and theological rediscovery of the existence of similar phenomena in Judaism and Christianity through a detailed reconsideration of their relationship to Torah's images.

Research Methodology: Grounding in Moshe Idel's Panoramic Approach

Idel's Phenomenology: Models and Panoramic Approach

In order to trace the history and continuity of the religious phenomena of the three (angelic, God-like, and messianic) images of Torah, which were dynamically developed from the Second Temple period through the Middle Ages, I will employ Idel's panoramic approach, which reconstructs a history of shared ideas that were manifest and developed in ancient and medieval Jewish sources. It is notable that Idel retraces the history of ideas which appear in the Jewish mystical traditions by reappraising various critical problems created by Scholem's chronological research of Kabbalah.[2] Idel, in *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (*KNP*), tries to clarify terms, including "history (of religion)," "(Jewish) mysticism," and "(religious) experience" that were used by Scholem in *Origins of The Kabbalah* (1962) and *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (1941).[3] Scholem's approach integrates the history of ideas into the historical platform of social and intellectual movements and organizes the major concepts and themes in the history of Jewish mysticism.[4] Scholem prioritizes historical or diachronic research for the emergence of particular traditions or models, by historically arranging various traditions into the major trends of Jewish mysticism.[5] By this logic, Scholem appears to define in a limited fashion the Kabbalah as a traditional term for Jewish mysticism, esotericism, and its teachings since the early Middle Ages (i.e., around the 12th century). Unlike Scholem's historical approach, Idel places more emphasis on reconstructing the experiential aspects of the history of Jewish mysticism, while uncovering new historical connections that the historical approach misses.[6]

In this vein, Idel emphasizes inquiry into the various manifestations of spiritual and religious phenomena based on experience, such as *devekut*, theurgy, and magic, within the entire Jewish mystical corpus from antiquity to the post-medieval periods.[7] Idel thereby underlines the necessity of investigating various traditions and schools of Kabbalah, which appear in the vast corpus of writings that emerge from "elaborate bodies of mystical thought" reflecting "comprehensive approaches rather than brief insights or remarks."[8] In *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (*KNP*), Idel thereby concretizes his theory of phenomenology by elaborating on two senses of phenomenology in order to present an overview that explicates various issues regarding religious phenomena significant to the modern scholars. The first sense of phenomenology addresses "these multi-faceted aspects" within various traditions in the history of Jewish thought, while rejecting "a particular narrative that organizes them as a history."[9] Along these lines, Idel elucidates the first sense of phenomenology in his later study, *Ascensions on High in Jewish Mysticism*:

---

[2] Moshe Idel, "Subversive Catalysts: Gnosticism and Messianism in Gershom Scholem's View of Jewish Mysticism," in *The Jewish Past Revisited: Reflections on Modern Jewish Historians*, ed. D. Myers and D. Ruderman (New Haven: Yale University Press,1998), 39-76.

[3] Gershom Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah,* ed. R. J. Zwi. Werblowsky, trans. Allan Arkush (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1987), 1-3; idem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism,* 3rd Rev. ed. (New York: Schocken Books, 1941), 1-39. For Scholem, history and (Jewish) mysticism are inseparable, and Jewish mysticism is essentially involved with the history of religion.

[4] Scholem, *Major Trends*, 1-39, 244-48. For instance, he studies the relationship of the Expulsion from Spain to the emergence of messianism.

[5] In *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, Scholem's historiography catalogues the doctrines and philosophical principles that can be gleaned from the mystical writings.

[6] Idel, "Introduction," in *Messianic Movements in Israel*, ed. Aharon Z. Eshkoli (Hebrew; Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1987), 9-28.

[7] Daniel Abrams, "Phenomenology of Jewish Mysticism: Moshe Idel's Methodology in Perspective," *Kabbalah*: *Journal for the Study of Jewish Mystical Texts*, 20, no. 215 (2009): 81.

> Phenomenological approaches consist of attempts to extrapolate from religious documents the specifically religious categories that organize major religious discourses. Derived from a certain extent from the philosophical approach of Edmund Husserl, particularly the need to bracket one's own presuppositions in order to allow an encounter with the phenomenon, these are the most non-reductionist of approaches, since they do not presuppose that a theological, historical, or psychological structure is reflected in the religious documents….[10]

This implies that it is significant to cross-examine various religious sources from a phenomenological perspective. Insofar as he uses the term "model" in his early works, he appears to understand it as a particular idea or a recurring impression in interpreting religious systems of thought and phenomena.[11] He suggests oscillating between the various types and cases of models, so as to avoid misperceptions and generalizations.[12]

Idel reifies his theory of models in his later works, such as *Golem*. The nature of models in *Golem* appears to be critical not only for capturing the inner dynamics of religious life and literature from various traditions but also for examining the object of study in a scientifically accurate manner.[13] The advanced theory of models therefore appears to be helpful in evaluating various traditions insofar as it captures recurring ideas in the religious phenomena. Idel thereby appears to actively utilize the models as building blocks, which contain a multiplicity of approaches and meanings, and allow for more specific categorization within a larger program of phenomenology.[14] As Abrams notes, Idel's advanced theory of models not only preserves the epistemic values of models which can claim a degree of accuracy in approximating the object of study but also apprehends the inner dynamics of religious experiences.[15]

---

[8] Ibid., 21, 33.

[9] Idel, *KNP*, 30.

[10] Idel, *Ascensions on High in Jewish Mysticism: Pillars, Lines, Ladders* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2005), 7-8.

[11] Idel, *KNP*, xvii, 268.

[12] Ibid. Jonathan Garb also appreciates the use of models for creating an imaginative perspective connecting existing disciplines with new questions and implications, although he warns of a methodology of models, which can cause "an unnecessary mediation as artificial constructs between the scholar and the readers of the text" in the study of Kabbalah. See Garb, *Manifestations of Power in Jewish Mysticism: From Rabbinic Literature to Safedian* Kabbalah (Hebrew; Jerusalem, Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2005), 62-3.

[13] Idel, *Golem: Jewish Magical and Mystical Traditions on the Artificial Anthropoid* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1990), xv-xxx.

By this logic, Idel concretizes the second sense of phenomenology, which emphasizes "the subjective impression of the scholar of Jewish mysticism in assessing the main themes and character of the unsystematic presentations of traditions in various periods which conceal a deeper organization of ideas."[16] The subjective impression particularly appreciates the concept of "perspectivism," which can analyze an inherent structure of an experience. Perspectivism is primarily grounded in the concept of "a distanciation" involved with "a serious acquaintance with other religious systems and the possibility to address it from the perspective of another culture."[17] The subjective impressions based on perspectivism thereby allow for scholars not only to appreciate a unique pattern of thought found in a text but also to identify various traditions (or models), which emerge from the texts themselves.[18] The conception of models formulated by contemporary scholars has a tendency not only to reify an element found prominently in the texts but also to extend to other texts that have some resemblance to these elements.[19] In this sense, Idel further elaborates the concept of a structure of ideas, which can be detected by subjective impressions, and are an element in the models. By this logic, Idel's more sophisticated theory of models recognizes the hermeneutic independence of the ancient, medieval and modern interpretations, and simultaneously the discrepancy between them.

---

[14] Idel, "Subversive Catalysts," 39-76.

[15] Abrams, 82-83.

[16] Idel, *KNP*, 34-5. Through tracking the development of the terms in relation to their various meanings within historical and literary contexts, Idel provides "a typology of religious or mystical phenomena which serve the scholar in appreciating models."

[17] Idel, *Ascension on High*, 11-13. Idel, however, notes that "This distanciation should not mean a total adherence to 'alien' structures, as occurs in the application of various forms of psychology… but rather the use of a flexible approach that is capable of modifying the analysis of Kabbalah… Methods—perspectivism included—are no more absolute than their objects or subjects" (13).

[18] Idel, *KNP*, 26, 28, 34-5. Idel's second sense of phenomenology is qualitatively different from the standard perspective of the modern scholars.

[19] Idel, "On the Meanings of the Term *Kabbalah*- Between the Ecstatic and the Sefirotic Schools of Kabbalah in the 13th Century," *Pe'amim* 93 (2002): 41 (Hebrew).

This implies that models presuppose an inner structure in which there are intrinsic connections between religious ideas and practices, which latently existed in ancient sources, and the inner structure thereby can be found through a historical reconstruction of thoughts and experiences of the Kabbalists and modern scholars. The ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* in relation to the images of Torah, which I will examine in this study, can, therefore, be categorized as one of the inner structures, which is constituted as a building block of models, and connects the concepts of human beings and God. In this context, Idel constructs an ideational model which can uncover the inner structures.[20] The ideational models particularly scrutinize the creative imagination (of the Kabbalists), which atomizes (i.e., reconfigures, remythologizes, and reinterprets) the texts, and creates a new meaning and function for earlier ideas.[21] In this sense, while analyzing the religious phenomena in their natural states, Idel necessitates a functional implementation of models as "approximations" that are contrived and operated by the scholars' systems and works.[22]

By this logic, Idel further elaborates the recurring patterns and orders of thought in the models, which play a critical role in determining the structure of ideas (in the models) within various traditions in the phenomenology of Jewish mysticism.[23] Abrams, explaining Idel's position, epitomizes the two purposes of models: 1) to discern "semantic structures that can be useful in examining through large amounts of material in order to identify the main moves and relationships between religious rites, experiences and traditions"; 2) to uncover the "unique program of study" presented "in kabbalistic scholarship in analyzing the materials differently from his predecessors and thereby shifting the agenda of its study."[24] In this sense, as Abrams notes, Idel's phenomenology of models appears as "the model(s) of models," i.e., "simulation models," which can help readers independently analyze and evaluate additional primary sources in the study of other different models.[25] This protects the scholars from hermeneutically and ideologically being confined to one model, while encouraging them to produce continuously new and various models. For instance, Idel exemplifies a new model of "sonship" by analyzing the various categories and interpretations from the ancient Jewish and rabbinic perspectives and exegeses which lack a "theological or systematic-orientated mind" in terms of a dynamic ("panoramic" or "clustered') approach.[26]

---

[20] Idel, *Hasidism: Between Ecstasy and Magic* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1994), 23-24. Idel warns that in this sense the structure can be a preconceived structure, which can be imposed onto the process of observing the phenomena. Idel further explains the two senses of the structure by making a qualitative distinction: 1) "creativity of the scholar in building a system of ideas negotiates meaning for the reader within the context of modern scholarship and the historiography of ancient practices and thought"; 2) "apologetic of the modern times which only nominally intervene in the natural structures that were functioning within the religious systems."

[21] Idel, "Kabbalah, Hieroglyphicity and Hieroglyphs," *Kabbalah* 11 (2004): 11-47; idem, *Absorbing Perfections*, 58, 79, 225, 436.

[22] Abrams, 46-7.

[23] Idel, "On Some Forms of Order in Kabbalah," *Daat* 50-52 (2003), xxxi-lviii. Idel notes that "Models are more comprehensive patterns, whose structure, or order, signifies ideals and models of activities" (xxiv).

> I thereby suggest a dynamic approach to the history of Jewish mysticism, one that assumes a multiplicity of separate developments and cross-currents, and recognizes the importance of tensions, frictions, even sharp antagonisms and, more rarely, syntheses between these vectors, rather than a theological approach that finds the defining moments of religion or mysticism in static concepts.

This dynamic, or panoramic, approach assumes a necessity of additional analyses of the traditions according to other possible models even after the historical, thematic, and phenomenological investigations have been exhausted. This approach embraces the benefits of models, which reify prominent elements (i.e., structures, patterns, and orders) from the texts, and extends them to other similar texts through the cross-examinations of various traditions and subjective scholarly impressions.[27] It also encompasses history and experience, while establishing the historical connections between ancient, rabbinic, and kabbalistic traditions. Above all, this approach formulates a more comprehensive theory of models that consist of structures of thinking and practice in Kabbalah throughout the trajectories of the history of Jewish mysticism.

---

[24] Idel, *KNP*, 17-34; Abrams, 82. For Idel, the purpose of the model is to synthesize different traditions based on the structures, patterns and orders of ideas. He uses this synthesis to produce a new model or system, which does not ostensibly exist in the texts, but results from the analysis and estimation of the relationships between various data.

[25] Abrams, 82-3.

[26] Idel, *Ben: Sonship and Jewish Mysticism* (London: Continuum; Jerusalem: Shalom Hartman Institute, 2007), 4, 616-18. This means that Idel develops his theory of models into a panoramic approach, in terms of the variety of phenomenological approaches to models.

[27] Ibid., 10-11. Abrams (24) notes that Idel's phenomenology of models functions as scholarly impressions or "intuition" of recurring structures, patterns, and orders of thought, and of themes (or myths) from having studies the various texts. This approach not only allows for comparisons and interactions between different models but is also helpful for a scholarly analysis which attempt to understand and synthesize the various models into a

Through this panoramic approach, Idel develops his phenomenology of Jewish mysticism into a more sophisticated methodology for appreciating the complex reoccurrence and interaction of history, ideas, traditions, and religious practices.[28] For instance, in *Messianic Mystics*, his theory of messianism as a model demonstrates the interface between the key concepts of the history, experience, and phenomenology of Jewish mysticism.[29] Idel elaborates the notion of messianism as a model, which reflects a historical and phenomenological continuity between its biblical and rabbinic articulations and the subsequent discourses, and continuously recurred, in various permutations, through the interaction and development of Jewish messianism and mysticism. Idel thereby allows for the model of messianism to be placed within a wider system of the Jewish mystical traditions while securing the distinctions between various traditions necessary to construct a broader history of Kabbalah.[30]

Specifically, Idel concretizes his panoramic approach to the models of Kabbalah by placing Abulafia's ecstatic Kabbalah at the center of his phenomenology of Jewish mysticism, as a correction to Scholem's approach to Kabbalah.[31] By contrast, Scholem overemphasizes the doctrinal aspect of theosophic Kabbalah and places ecstatic Kabbalah within the limits of the history of theosophic Kabbalah.[32] Scholem focuses on discovering the major concepts and themes in the study of Jewish mysticism, especially focusing the development of theosophic Kabbalah in accordance with the continuity of a history of socio-political movements. This approach is found in many places in his

---

larger and more cohesive system that absorbs various structures, patterns, and orders of thought. See also Abrams, 66, 82, 87, 90.

[28] Abrams, 40.

[29] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 61-65. For instance, Abulafia's synthesis of messianism and prophecy alludes to a new model of phenomenological innovation in Jewish mysticism.

[30] Ibid., 35-57.

[31] Ibid., 35-37, 97-100.

[32] Scholem, *Major Trends*, 119-55.

work and is particularly clear in two volumes, *On Kabbalah and Its Symbolism* (1965) and *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (1991).[33] Scholem thereby understands the ecstatic Kabbalah as a deviation from the theosophic Kabbalah formulated by the medieval kabbalists in the Middle Ages, rather than as a approach with its own integrity. In contrast, Idel denies the centrality of theosophic Kabbalah, while investigating the different structures of ideas, which are significant within the forms of theosophic Kabbalah and the dynamic phenomena of thirteenth century Kabbalah.[34] As Abrams notes, Idel specifically highlights the rise of the individual, Abraham Abulafia, in the thirteenth century, which brought out "innovation and creativity with the effects of mobility, literary revisions, and the decline of named and geographic authorities" in Kabbalistic thought.[35] Strikingly, Abulafia's experiential focus clarifies a clear distinction between two schools in the thirteenth century Kabbalah in terms of the phenomenology of models. It also clarifies the significant influence of the Abulafian approach on the structure of thought of subsequent figures, such as R. Joseph Gikatilla.[36] Idel's methodological assumption of "a diversity of kabbalistic interpretative levels" describes "one of the major catalysts for the vigorous development of both theosophical and ecstatic Kabbalah in the last quarter of the thirteenth century."[37]

In addition to theosophic-theurgic and ecstatic-mystical model, Idel analyzes a magical-talismanic Kabbalah as a model, which can be identified within the history of kabbalistic thought and literature.[38] This, expansion to various models and traditions, is a prime example of the panoramic approach. Idel, thus, extends the phenomenology of two schools (a mystical-ecstatic model and theosophic-theurgic model) of Kabbalah in the thirteenth century into three models of Kabbalah: mystical-ecstatic model, theosophic-theurgic model and magical-talismanic model.[39] Idel further constructs a broader system which can encompass other subdivisions within the three models of Kabbalah. He thereby asserts the necessity of a further reconstruction of ideas in order to not only substantiate the relationship between ancient (Second Temple) materials, Rabbinic materials, and Kabbalistic literature and its interpretations, but to also uncover their appropriate explanations through embracing their distinctive perspectives:

---

[33] Scholem, *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1965); Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah*, trans. Joachim Nuegroschel, ed. Jonathan Chipman (New York: Schocken Books, 1991).

[34] Idel, "The Contribution of Abraham Abulafia's Kabbalah to the Understanding of Jewish Mysticism," in *Gershom Scholem's Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism 50 Years After: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on the History of Jewish Mysticism*, eds. Peter Schäfer and Joseph Dan (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 119. Idel also analyzes the phenomenon of multiple versions of kabbalistic works amongst theosophic kabbalists in the thirteenth century, all while emphasizing the literary, exegetical, and theological difference between the two schools.

[35] Abrams, 53. Abulafia serves as not only an active contributor within the development of mystical experiences of the divine but also as a catalyst to motivate a new system through the reordering and recombination of ideas and practices. See Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 70-71.

[36] Idel, "Historical Introduction," in *Joseph Gikatilla, Sha'arei Orah: Gates of Light*, trans. Avi Weinstein (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1994), xxviii.

[37] Ibid., xxx.

> Undoubtedly, I have used texts from a variety of sources, which belong to different corpora: the Hekhalot literature, midrashic-Talmudic literature, Pseudepigrapha, German Pietism and forms of Ashkenazi esotericism, Kabbalistic literature of various types,—Jewish and Christian—and at times even late Hasidic texts. Despite the great differences in the character of these sources, it is necessary to use them in order to complete the picture of ancient Jewish conceptualizations which were suppressed and whose fragments have been scattered. Even though there appears to be no organic connection between these sources, in my view, there is such a connection, despite everything. These genres are the extensions of early Jewish thought, which reached various corpora in different forms… Therefore, the reconstruction of ideas that exist behind the texts is not just a matter of calling up anew the thought patterns that have already been formulated and written about in lost works, but is also necessary when reconstructing concepts that were not explicitly expressed in antiquity....[40]

In this sense, Idel tries to trace and analyze ignored or hidden texts within various traditions in the development of Jewish mysticism. He thereby builds his own theory of models, identifying the existence of a primitive form of the medieval theosophic doctrines, which already appeared in ancient Jewish mystical (and Rabbinic) sources and which are intertwined with various theological and philosophical ideas. In this vein, as noted earlier, Idel's ahistorical approach places more emphasis on reconstructing experiential aspects, which nevertheless allows for the discovery of new historical understanding missed by the traditional historical approach.[41] This approach acknowledges not only the hermeneutic independence and internal integrity of the experiential and theoretical aspects of the ancient, medieval and modern interpretations, but also simultaneously supports "the cross-fertilization of traditions."[42] Idel argues that Kabbalah emerged from within ancient, rabbinic, and medieval Jewish mystical sources on the basis of its affinity to the ideas and innovative orientations of these sources, rather than the result of the intrusion of Gnosticism into Jewish esoteric circles.[43] Idel, by pursuing "methodological eclecticism," invites "various new perspectives to the study of Jewish esotericism and mystical phenomena," which were excluded from previous studies of Kabbalah, while rejecting the impacts of "political, hermeneutic or religious" ideologies.[44] He delves into the kabbalistic treatment of rabbinic thought and sources, which allows him to offer not only a textual map of the subterranean traditions connected to the midrashim but also serves as a prerequisite for the analysis of the large corpus of rabbinic traditions. He traces historically the internal continuity of myth and mystical ideas within Jewish mystical traditions, which can be detected from antiquity through post-medieval Kabbalistic literature. In order to prove the existence of hidden channels of ideas and traditions (or models) in the history of Jewish mysticism, Idel tries to reconstruct a new history of myths from the medieval kabbalistic perspective effectively assuming that medieval

---

[38] Idel, *Hasidism: Between Ecstasy and Magic*, 18; idem, *Kabbalah and Eros* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 214-21. As Abrams, 42-44, notes, it is clear that *Hasidism: between Ecstasy and Magic* is a more mature formulation of the impressions categorized in *KNP*.

[39] Idel, "The Magical and Neoplatonic Interpretations of the Kabbalah in the Renaissance" in *Jewish Thought in the Sixteenth Century,* ed. B. Cooperman (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), 186-242. In this study, Idel explores the function of language as talismanic vessels that could draw down the divine efflux, while examining similarities and differences with other models throughout the history of Jewish mysticism.

[40] Idel, *The Angelic World: Apotheosis and Theophany* (Hebrew; Tel Aviv: Miskal-Yedioth Ahronot, 2008), 149-51. This is quoted from Abrams' translation of the original Hebrew. See Abrams, 39-40.

---

[41] Abrams, 145-46.

[42] Idel, "Orienting, Orientalizing or Disorienting the Study of Kabbalah: 'An Almost Absolutely Unique' Case of Occidentalism," *Kabbalah: Journal for the Study of Jewish Mystical Texts* 2 (1997): 13-47; Abrams, 39, 70-71, 78.

[43] Idel, *KNP*, 6, 21, 33. Heinrich Graetz tries to prove the origin of the Kabbalah as a reaction against the radical rationalism of Maimonides, while David Newmark finds the origin of Kabbalah in an "internal dialectic" in the development of philosophical ideas within Judaism. See Graetz, *Geschichte Der Juden Von Den ältesten Zeiten Bis Auf Die Gegenwart, Aus Den Quellen Neu Bearb* (Leipzig: O. Leiner, 1897-1911), 385-402; David Neumark, *Geschichte Der Jüdischen Philosophie Des Mittelalters* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1907), 179-236. As noted earlier, Scholem, in contrast to Graetz and Neumark, proposed a historical approach to the origins of Kabbalah from an external source, i.e., Gnosticism. See Scholem, *Major Trends*, 52-53; idem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*, 14-19. By this logic, he refuses a philological and historical nexus between the kabbalistic and ancient Jewish mystical concepts. In this sense, he does not accept Samuel Belkin's thesis of a philological nexus between Philo and the Kabbalistic sources. See Samuel Belkin, "Philo and the Zohar," *JJS* 10 (1959): 23-44, 113-35.

[44] Abrams, 10, 39-42, 71.

Kabbalists are correct to view their traditions as already present in ancient Jewish texts. This necessitates the mythologization of ancient Jewish mystical and rabbinic traditions.[45]

Idel uses a method of inquiry that takes into account the literary and cultural context of the ancient and Rabbinic texts and the mystical aspects of Rabbinic sources.[46] Idel's critical article, "Rabbinism and Kabbalism: On G. Scholem's Phenomenology of Judaism" (1991), investigates the relationship of Rabbinic literature to Kabbalistic literature while identifying the hidden myths and mythic aspects of ancient and Rabbinic sources *from within* medieval Kabbalistic sources.[47] For instance, to uncover rabbinic and midrashic traditions he studies the works (e.g., a unique literary form of commentaries to rabbinic *aggadot*) of Geronese Kabbalists, such as R. Ezra and R. Azriel, and the works of the Castilian Kabbalists, such as R. Moses de Leon, R. Joseph Gikatilla.[48] These later works, which interpret rabbinic ones, allow Idel to recognize the presence of mythologized and theurgic descriptions of the divine in Rabbinic literature itself. As Idel explains, leading medieval rabbinic figures, such as R. Abraham ben David, would not have relied on foreign sources while presenting the mystical and mythic aspects as the secrets of the Torah.[49] This corroborates that the major concepts and mythic elements of the sefirotic system—even if not all of its particular details—evolve from the preexistent conceptions regarding an inner structure of the divine in ancient Jewish mystical tradition, which was latently present in aggadic sources scattered in the Rabbinic corpus.

---

[45] Idel, *Kabbalah and Eros*, 28-29; Abrams, 38.

[46] Idel emphasizes the relationship between the rabbinic and the mystical attitudes by explaining the mystical aspects of the Torah, which appear in writings of rabbinic figures. See Idel, "Torah: Between Presence and Representation of the Divine in Jewish Mysticism," 201.

[47] Idel, "Rabbinism versus Kabbalism: On G. Scholem's Phenomenology of Judaism," *Modern Judaism* 11, no. 3 (1991): 281-96. Idel's study, by opposing Scholem's historical thesis regarding the possible influences and interactions of the sources, has significant implications for the positions of rabbinism and kabbalism within the history and phenomenology of Jewish mysticism.

[48] I will examine in detail the works and features of these figures later in this study.

[49] Idel, "The Attitude to Christianity in Sefer ha-Meshiv," *Immanuel* 12 (1981): 77-95 (Hebrew); idem, "Notes on Medieval Jewish-Christian Polemics," *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 3 [4] (1984): 689-98 (Hebrew); idem, "Jewish Mysticism and Muslim Mysticism," *Mahanayyim* 1 (1992): 28-33 (Hebrew); idem, "Orienting, Orientalizing or Disorienting the Study of Kabbalah," 13-47; idem, "Jewish Kabbalah in Christian Garb," in *Kabbalah in Italy, 1280-1510*: *A Survey* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 227-35; idem, "Jewish Mysticism among the Jews of Arab/Moslem Lands," *Journal for the Study of Sephardic and Mizrahi Jewry* 1 (2007): 14-38.

On the basis of this theory, Idel validates the possibility of the existence of an internal (or hidden) channel of transmission of various ideas, and of shared hermeneutic positions between various traditions transferred from antiquity through the Middle Ages. Ultimately, his ahistorical and synchronic approach substantiates that the dynamic nature of ancient Jewish mystical and rabbinic traditions is a central factor of a theosophic (mythic) and philosophical program in kabbalistic tradition. In all, this approach corroborates that the reconstruction of the history of ideas in the manner in which he undertakes it plays a critical role in bridging the gap between ancient (Second Temple), rabbinic (midrashic-talmudic) and kabbalistic traditions.

Idel's Panoramic Approach: The History of Ideas based on Experience

Idel's reconstruction of the history of ideas in the history of Jewish thought is focused on discovering the ancient roots of kabbalistic ideas in earlier mystical and mythical sources while identifying Kabbalah as a genuine ancient esoteric tradition.[50] He, however, does not claim that there is one authentic tradition from antiquity, which can prompt an all-inclusive explanation for kabbalistic thought and practices in the Middle Ages. Instead, his panoramic approach presumes that the disparity we find when comparing ancient sources to medieval sources, suggests a possibility of the existence of additional concealed traditions in antiquity which were eventually transmitted to medieval Kabbalists. By this logic, Idel focuses on constructing an "inner-history" of ideas, which emerges from religious experiences recorded in writings of ancient Jewish mystics and rabbinic figures.[51] He, in this sense, departs from "a traditionally formulated history of ideas" of the type described by Scholem, while formulating a new system of "inner-history" of ideas and experiences, which reevaluates a variety of texts and their literary creativity.[52] He focuses on appreciating and interpreting the texts and phenomena derived from within their own context in order to reconstruct this "inner-history" in Jewish mysticism:

---

[50] Idel, *KNP*, 31-33. Idel notes that modern scholars' reconstructionist method resonates with the medieval kabbalists' reconstruction of ancient and 'subterranean' traditions that reemerged in later times.
[51] Idel, "The Contribution of Abraham Abulafia's Kabbalah," 126.
[52] Idel, "'The Window of Opportunities' of Kabbalah: 1270-1290," *Da'at: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy & Kabbalah* 48 (2002): 5-32.

> Therefore, it is as fruitful to discuss kabbalistic phenomena in contradiction to one another as to give a chronological account. The unfolding of the key concepts that characterized and directed kabbalistic activity and thought, their exposition as atemporal modes, and the understanding of their interplay in various Kabbalistic schools is 'inner' history of Kabbalah or of Jewish mysticism, just as the temporal description can be considered the 'outer' history.[53]

Idel implies that a primitive form of mystical ideas that already existed in ancient and pre-Kabbalistic texts can be traced through a reconstruction of the ideas (i.e., an inner structure and pattern) of the Kabbalists.[54] This approach eventually leads to the formulation of a more conceptually unified structure of ideas and experiences between Kabbalistic texts and seemingly unrelated motifs in ancient texts.[55]

Ithamar Gruenwald, along these lines, argues for the continuity between ancient prophecy and mystical ideas in the Scripture as a primitive form, and *merkavah* mysticism as a full-fledged form (which conveys both an apocalyptic and spiritualized esotericism in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages).[56] Gruenwald also delineates the term "experience" as key to understanding a broad spectrum of themes that will allow scholars to uncover the essence of ancient sources, especially the Scripture.[57] He thereby emphasizes that the mystical study (e.g., the theophany and angelology) of Scripture and the Talmudic and Midrashic literature is a pivotal starting point in the study of Jewish mysticism, as well as for the expansion of the scopes of phenomenological studies, which investigate mystical experiences and hermeneutical strategies.[58] In this same vein, Idel delves into the history of religious (or mystical) experiences in the esoteric dimensions of Kabbalah, which are implicitly grounded in the ancient Jewish mystical and rabbinic traditions.[59] Unlike Scholem's historical interpretation, Idel appreciates an inner channel of mystical experience, which contains the dynamics of models (including structures, patterns, and orders), even while he still bases his analysis on philological and historical tools.[60] Idel constructs a way of amalgamating experiences and hermeneutics, although he recognizes a qualitative difference between the texts or religious experiences of the kabbalists and the theory and hermeneutics of the modern scholars. As Daniel Abrams notes, Idel thereby investigates "the interpretative experiences of the medieval kabbalists from the text" and "an encounter with God as the divine secrets."[61]

---

[53] Idel, "On Binary 'Beginnings' in Kabbalah Scholarship," *Aporematha. Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte Band* 5 (2001): 329.
[54] Ibid. Idel emphasizes the possibility of approaching ancient materials with the help of structures (including pattern, order, and mode) preserved in Kabbalah. As noted earlier, Scholem primarily presupposes that there is no direct philological nexus between the ancient sources and Kabbalistic sources. See Scholem, *Origins of Kabbalah*, 5-7
[55] Idel, *KNP*, 33.
[56] Ithamar Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (Leiden-Köln: Brill, 1980), 73-74; idem, "Reflections on the Nature and Origins of Jewish Mysticism," in *Gershom Scholem's Major trends in Jewish mysticism 50 years after: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on the History of Jewish Mysticism*, 48. In this discussion, Gruenwald traces the developments of the apocalyptic aspects as a particular transitory and interpretative apparatus, which was manifest from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods through the Middle Ages.
[57] Ibid.

In *Absorbing Perfection: Kabbalah and Interpretation*, Idel specifically describes a process of arcanization, i.e., attributing an esoteric dimension to the canonical texts, which presupposes a contact with divine reality through an interpretative experience of the secret layers of a text.[62] He explains that mystical experience has two senses in interpretation: "an experiential moment" and "an ergetic act," which "allows understanding by the process of doing, which traces the interpreted text with valences of their own."[63] Wolfson also notes that experience and interpretation can be convergent on the basis of the linguistic theory according to which the language of the Biblical text for the Kabbalists is not merely an indirect medium for interpreting and expressing truths about the divine, but also becomes a direct vehicle for experiencing God.[64] Moreover, as he explains, the language of the letters of the Torah radically become a critical building block of kabbalistic hermeneutics through the atomization which breaks the text down to its letters.[65] The hermeneutic reading or interpretative experience of texts implies that the "meaning of the experience itself can be learned from discursive works composed at a later time," while establishing a "continuum between the [linguistic] techniques which induce mystical experience, the experience itself, and the literary product which results or follows from this experience."[66]

---

[58] Ibid., 38-42; Gruenwald notes that since the Talmudic and Midrashic literature have a large collection of material of a "mystical" (i.e., *ma'aseh merkavah*) and "spiritualistic" (i.e., religiosity and spirituality) nature, they should be included in the study of Jewish mysticism.
[59] Idel, *KNP*, 33; Ron Margolin, "Moshe Idel's Phenomenology and its Sources" *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* 6 (18) (2007): 41-2.
[60] Idel, "Rabbinism versus Kabbalism," 281-96.
[61] Abrams, "Phenomenology of Jewish Mysticism," 60-61; Idel, *KNP*, 75-88, 234-249. By contrast, Scholem seems to emphasize the identification between the doctrines found in the Kabbalistic literature and the intention and function of the acts of reading the medieval Kabbalists.
[62] Idel, *Absorbing Perfections: Kabbalah and Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 137-63.
[63] Abrams, 71.

In order to substantiate a new or important link between ancient and medieval sources that construct the edifice of medieval Jewish mysticism, Idel investigates the self-awareness of the medieval Kabbalists about the inner structures of ideas in ancient and rabbinic traditions, which are implicitly revealed in their writings and exegeses. Specifically, he analyzes Abulafia's self-awareness that his own form of Kabbalah is based on the spirit of the ancient mystical writings that reflect the ancient literary forms and experiential elements.[67] Idel thereby reconstructs the self-awareness of the medieval Kabbalist that might have influenced the association "between bodies of literature and their hermeneutic keys."[68] By this logic, he assumes that the medieval Kabbalists restored the inner and hidden structures of ideas found in ancient sources, while enhancing their intents and meanings in a new literary context, which modern readers can recover on their own terms. On the basis of the subjective impression based on perspectivism, as noted earlier, he asserts that the medieval Kabbalists regarded Kabbalah as "a genuine ancient tradition which is an esoteric interpretation of Judaism," and consciously accumulated “the scattered keys of Jewish esotericism” already present in ancient texts, reinterpreted them, and even reconstructed new works of Jewish esotericism.[69] He thereby corroborates the existence and continuity of Jewish esotericism regarding experience and interpretation throughout the trajectories of the history of Jewish mysticism.

---

[64] Elliot R. Wolfson, "The Hermeneutics of Visionary Experience: Revelation and Interpretation in the Zohar," *Religion* 18 (1988): 311-45; idem, "Forms of Visionary Ascent as Ecstatic Experience," in *Gershom Scholem's Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism 50 years after: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on the History of Jewish Mysticism*, eds. Peter Schäfer and Joseph Dan (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 209-10. Wolfson notes that the interpretative and experiential modes are inseparable in the Kabbalistic sources.

[65] Ibid., 250-71.

[66] Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*, 37-8.

[67] Idel, "Radical Hermeneutics: From Ancient to Medieval and Modern Hermeneutics," *Atti Dei Convegni Lincei-Accademia Nazionale Dei Lincei* 135 (1998): 165-201. The phenomenological differences between the two schools are also documented in the history of later theosophic Kabbalists who reformed Abulafia's ideas and texts into their own works.

[68] Abrams, "Phenomenology of Jewish Mysticism," 79; idem, *The Book Bahir*, 7-8.

In addition, Idel provides evidence of the difference in their respective self-awareness regarding the ancient and rabbinic traditions that are at the basis of their thought (especially the idea of *devekut* as a primitive structure).[70] In the third chapter of *KNP*, which is a survey of the “Varieties of Devekut in Jewish Mysticism,” he restores the significance of the multitude of interpretations of *devekut* in kabbalistic literature that he suggests previous scholars have neglected due to historical biases that considered *devekut* as reflecting the values of a primitive forms of Jewish life and practice.[71] He emphasizes the significance of language as the vehicle of experience, such as *devekut*, theurgy, and magic, while analyzing various forms of hermeneutics about the inner-relationship of diverse ideas and religious experiences throughout the history of Jewish mysticism.[72]

Specifically, Idel notes that Abulafia's synthetic approach, which combines linguistic, experiential, and spiritual features, formulates a more comprehensive picture about the interrelationship between ancient and rabbinic traditions and the patterns of thinking and practice in Kabbalah.[73] He scrutinizes Abulafia’s ecstatic Kabbalah, which focuses on experiencing and achieving the unification, through *devekut* or *unio mystica*, of the human soul and the divine through the use of linguistic techniques and manipulation of the divine names, in contrast to the theosophic school of the thirteenth century Kabbalah.[74] He thereby explains a profound relationship between "a view elaborated in ancient Jewish texts which portrays the supernal realm in linguistic terms" and "a view that flourished among some forms of Jewish elite" in the late 13th century."[75] By this logic, Idel tries to reconstruct the religious phenomenon of *devekut* in a wide range of trajectories of Jewish mysticism from antiquity through post-medieval texts. Idel specifically evaluates Abulafia's idea of *devekut* as part of the diachronic reconstruction of a religious phenomenology in the later medieval trajectories of Jewish mysticism.[76] He proposes a typology of *devekut*, which comprises three main types in accordance with its unitive concepts and images:

---

[69] Idel, *KNP*, 31-32; Moshe Halbertal, *Concealment and Revelation: Esotericism in Jewish Thought and its Philosophical Implications* (Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press; 2009), 69-74; Abrams, 79; idem, “The Literary Emergence of Esotericism in German Pietism,” *Shofar* 12 (1994): 67-85.

[70] Idel, *KNP*, 202-3. Idel compares the two types of Kabbalah and their respective mystical practices, which derive from the different historical and phenomenological religious thought and experience, in keeping with varying understandings of the divine names and sefirot. See Idel, “Defining Kabbalah: The Kabbalah of the Divine Names” in *Mystics of the Book: Themes, Topics, and Typologies*, ed. Robert A. Herrera (New York: Peter Lang, 1993,” 97-122.

[71] Idel, “Varieties of Devekut in Jewish Mysticism,” in *Kabbalah, New Perspectives*, 35-58; idem, “‘Unio Mystica’ as a Criterion: Some observations on ‘Hegelian’ Phenomenologies of Mysticism,” *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* 1 (2002): 19-41.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Idel, “Abulafia’s Secrets of the Guide: A Linguistic Turn,” A *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* 4 (1998): 495-528. Idel characterizes Abulafia’s syncretic appropriation of earlier sources and methods as a “perspectivism.”

> Explicitly mystical interpretations of *devekut* occur in Jewish medieval and postmedieval texts. Some of them may convey real mystical, possibly unitive, experiences; others may represent exegetical attempts to interpret sacred texts. There is no way to either confirm or negate the possibility that such types of experience existed among Jews, even before the written evidence on unitive experiences emerged. The fact that this happened, however, only after the appearance of philosophical terminology demonstrates that philosophical concepts were a garb used by mystics in order to articulate their experiences. I should like to propose a typology of concepts and images used to communicate the unitive perception of a mystical experience that will show the gamut of divine nomenclature in this domain. One can distinguish three main types of *devekut* terminology: Aristotelian, Neoplatonic, and Hermetic, according to the specific bodies of speculative literatures that generated the various themes."[77]

Idel elaborates on three main types of *devekut* in the following manner.[78] The Aristotelian type focuses on the concept of noetic union which necessitates the concept of a mechanical mediator, such as the Active Intellect, which connects God and human intellect.

---

[74] Idel, "Torah: Between Presence and Representation of the Divine in Jewish Mysticism," *Religion* 89 (2001): 197-235. Idel evaluates the continuum between the nature of the divine, the mystical experience itself, and the techniques for attaining mystical experience. He also develops the idea of *devekut* and *unio mystica* which is grounded in an ontological continuity between the Torah and the divine, and the concept of Torah as a hypostatic mediator.

[75] Idel, *Enchanted Chains*: *Techniques and Rituals in Jewish Mysticism*, eds. Harold Bloom and Daniel Abrams (Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2005), 75.

[76] Idel, "Abulafia's Secrets of the Guide: A Linguistic Turn," 310; Idel, "Defining Kabbalah," 106. Idel, however, does not claim that Abulafia himself was involved "in a phenomenological comparison for its own sake, but as a result of a polemical context."

[77] Idel, *KNP*, 39-42.

[78] Ibid. On the basis of Idel's three types of *devekut*, I will also discuss the different roles and features of *devekut* as they relate to the images of Torah later in this study.

This type can be found in "all Aristotelian schools—Greek, Arabic, Jewish, and Christian," and explicitly in the thought of Maimonides and Abulafia's ecstatic Kabbalah.[79] The Neoplatonic type focuses on the mystical union through the transformative theory of the human intellect (or soul) to the universal intellect (or soul) in an "ascent" direction.[80] This type predominantly can be gleaned from the Geronese Kabbalah, Hasidism, and even Islamic and Christian mysticism. The Hermetic type focuses on a magical practice (widely known as theurgy) which draws the powers and spirits of the divine into the human soul through the theurgical activities, such as prayer and performing commandments, in a "descent" direction. This type appears in the Geronese and Hasidic writings, and Neoplatonic and Hermetic treatises.[81] The three distinctive types and interpretations of *devekut*, as Idel notes, appear in a conceptual and terminological interplay, as a common interest. This reflects the widespread commitment to the concept of unitive religious experience throughout Jewish mystical writings and thought.

Unlike Scholem, who refused to acknowledge a direct relationship between Rabbinic Judaism and Kabbalah in favor of the Gnostic origin of Kabbalah, Idel emphasizes "theurgy as [a] necessary qualifier of theosophy" as "a hyper-correction to Scholem's idealism of theosophy as the doctrinal study of the heavens."[82] Idel demonstrates the role of theurgy in rabbinic texts, and thereby provides a new and distinctive perspective on the development of kabbalistic traditions and on the understanding of the arcanization of the scriptures.[83] In so doing, he emphasizes that the idea of *devekut* appears to play a role as a preparatory instrument for the theurgical purpose of achieving divine unity, which from a kabbalistic perspective requires the theurgic union of the sefirot.[84] He particularly elaborates on a theurgical impact of *devekut* upon the divine names (which leads to the unification of the sefirot) in the theosophical structure, and shows that these concepts are profoundly related to a rabbinic rhetoric and interpretation regarding theurgical operations of the Temple sacrifice.[85] On the basis of this logic, he theorizes a theurgical experience of *devekut* and *unio mystica*, which activates the divine powers by means of their reflections in human thought, and leads to the "interiorization" of the divine in an inner mental process of the Kabbalist as "a real mystical union with an *imago dei*."[86] He further discusses the symbolic implications of theurgical activities (prayer and performing the commandments) of the Kabbalist who interacts with the divine in an interplay between experience and interpretation.[87] Consequently, in order to establish the continuity of the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* from ancient and rabbinic traditions to the medieval kabbalistic tradition, Idel substantiates the existence of correlations between the theurgic, theosophic, and mythic thought in Kabbalah, and the theurgical understanding of the commandments as intended to influence divine unity, which he argues is already found in ancient Jewish mystical and rabbinic traditions.[88]

---

[79] Ibid., 40.

[80] Ibid., 41. Idel notes, that "The deep religious significance of this form of philosophy for mysticism has already been recognized in the cases of Islamic and Christian mysticism, and Kabbalah fully shares with these mystical systems a deep interest in Neoplatonism. "

[81] Ibid; idem, "The Magical and Neoplatonic Interpretations of the Kabbalah in the Renaissance," 186-242.

[82] Abrams, "Phenomenology of Jewish Mysticism," 41.

[83] Idel, *Absorbing Perfections*, 165-66. Idel distinguishes between "drawing down theurgy" and "universe-maintenance activity" in the emanative sense of the Neoplatonic system. Idel particularly analyzes the features of a theurgical language in relation to mystical experience, which are already manifest in ancient rabbinic and mystical texts and continue through late medieval Kabbalistic literature.

[84] Idel, *KNP*, 58.

In all, Idel's panoramic approach to the history of ideas, based on religious (or mystical) experiences, provides critical insight not only into the history of the concepts of Torah and images of Torah but also the continuity of the related essential ideas, such as *devekut* and *unio mystica*, and the concept of a mediator. It reinforces not only the antiquity of the thought and exegetical practices of the medieval mystics and their mystical depictions of experiencing God but also elucidates the exegetical and hermeneutical strategies based on the authors' theological intentions and philosophical frameworks, which dynamically formulated the three (angelic, God-like, and messianic) images of Torah manifest throughout the history of Jewish mysticism and religious thought. This thereby substantiates the developmental process of the images of Torah as a model, which I will emphasize in this study, while verifying their interactive and complicated recurrence found in the various layers of ancient (Second Temple), Rabbinic, and Kabbalistic literature.

---

[85] Ibid., 53-55.
[86] Ibid., 56. As Idel notes, the Zohar describes the state of *devekut* as a precondition for theurgic influence on the sefirotic system.
[87] Ibid., 39-42; idem, *Absorbing Perfection*, 59. Cf. Morris Faierstein, "God's Need for Commandments in Medieval Kabbalah," *Conservative Judaism* 36 (1982): 45-59.
[88] Idel, *KNP*, 156-57.

In this context, by grounding my research methodology in the panoramic approach, I will show concrete evidence of the continuity of the three images of Torah, as a more comprehensive model, as well as related ideas in the history of Jewish thought. As noted earlier, following Idel's first sense of phenomenology regarding models, I first examine the inter-relationships between various models of and traditions about the images of Torah from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods though the Middle Ages. I will also analyze the primitive forms of the images of Torah that were implicitly manifest in ancient, Second Temple, and Rabbinic sources through a philological and intertextual examination[89] of the hypostatic notions of Torah. I will thereby elucidate their intertextual and theological relationships within the supposed forms of two different (Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered) traditions which dynamically developed the three images of Torah.

On the basis of this primary analysis, following the second sense of phenomenology, which delves into the features of religious experience (i.e., *devekut* and *unio mystica*), I will investigate the particular exegetic and hermeneutic strategies, which actively utilize a literary device (a poetic and midrashic approach) and an exegetic apparatus (e.g., allegory and symbolism)[90] for formulating the images of Torah as a mediator that connects human beings and God. I will thereby corroborate the continuity of these recurring ideas regarding the images of Torah by comparing the primitive forms of the images of Torah in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods with the full-fledged forms in medieval Kabbalistic sources. In all, I will substantiate the continuity of the history of ideas regarding the three images of Torah within the development of two distinctive traditions throughout the history of Jewish thought. Moreover, the critical implications gleaned from analyzing the images of Torah will allow me to description of a new model—that of images of Torah—in accord with the panoramic approach. Consequently, I will reevaluate the formation and development of the images of Torah as a model based on religious experience, while appreciating their features and significance in the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions manifest from the Second Temple period through the Middle Ages.

---

[89] Gérard Genette, in *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), xviii, defines the intertextuality in "an undoubtedly restrictive manner" as "a relation of co-presence between two or more texts, that is to say, eidetically and most often, by the literal presence of one text within another." Intertextuality implies that the meaning of a text can be reformulated by the features of other texts, such as allusion, quotation, translation, pastiche, parody and so on. For instance, an author transforms a prior text, or a reader references a prior text in reading the other. Heinrich E. Plett, in *Intertextuality*, Research in Text Theory 15, eds. Janos S. Petofi and Hans-Peter Mai (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), 5-6, also notes that intertextuality studies an "intertext," i.e., "a text between other texts" (5), in a linguistic or cultural system in which the text exists. Plett also notes a twofold coherence: "an *intra*textual one which guarantees the immanent integrity of the text, and an *inter*textual one which creates structural relations between itself and other texts. The twofold coherence makes for the richness and complexity of the intertext, but also for its problematic status" (5). My use of the term "intertextuality" in this study follows the view of these scholars. David R. Klingler, in "Validity in the Identification and Interpretation of a Literary Allusion in the Hebrew Bible" (Ph.D Diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2010), 91-93, makes a distinction between intertextuality (a synchronic and reader-oriented method) and inner-biblical interpretation (a diachronic and author-oriented method). Considering the direction of phenomenological analysis, which examines the ideas based on the religious experience of readers and authors in this study, I utilize simultaneously the intertextual analysis and inner biblical interpretation.

Research Methodology with an Outline of Chapters

On the basis of Idel's panoramic approach, this study focuses not only on investigating the relationships and continuities between ancient and medieval Jewish sources and views concerning the images of Torah as a comprehensive model but also on providing concrete examples of their interactions and progressive development in relation to the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* throughout the history of Jewish thought. PART A has two Chapters (I, II). In Chapter I, I first will examine Torah's conceptual, historical, and philosophical backgrounds in the Second Temple period, in addition to analyzing the biblical, philosophical, rabbinic, and Jewish mystical concepts of Torah in the relevant sources. I will then discuss the historical and philosophical backgrounds of the shifting process from the Temple sacrifices to the focus on Torah and Torah study in the Second Temple and

---

[90] The philosophical allegory is primarily based on the existence of two (i.e., revealed and hidden) layers of truth in the scriptural texts, whereas the sefirotic symbolism transforms the scriptural texts into divine symbols for the sake of human comprehension. I will discuss in detail these hermeneutical apparatuses later in this study.

Rabbinic periods. In particular, I will examine not only the Hellenistic influences throughout the Second Temple period on the concepts of Torah in Jewish texts and contexts but also Second Temple Jewish and rabbinic approaches to the concepts of Torah as seen in Jewish biblical and rabbinic interpretations and exegetical practices. I will also summarize the critical findings and implications concerning the historical and philosophical centralization of Torah that is reflected in Jewish texts and contexts throughout the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. In addition, I will examine in detail the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Wisdom and Logos, while tracing the developmental process of the hypostatic notions of Torah and philosophical changes in the concepts of Torah and God. I first will look at how the concepts of Torah were related to various characteristics of personified Wisdom in the Wisdom literature, including the Qumran wisdom texts. On the basis of the profound relationship between Torah and personified Wisdom, I will examine the intertextual and theological relationship between the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah*. I will analyze the critical features of Philo's Logos, which is a synthesis between Jewish Wisdom and Greek Logos, and thereby elaborate the intertextual and theological relationships between personified Wisdom in the Wisdom literature and Jesus as Incarnate Logos in the Gospels (i.e., the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel) in early Christianity. Finally, I will elucidate the existence and interaction of the primitive forms of the two supposed traditions, Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered, by corroborating the twofold features: the Logos-centered hypostatic notions, such as Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, and *memra*, as well as the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions, such as personified Wisdom and *shekhinah*.

In Chapter II, I will evaluate not only the significance of the characteristics of various hypostatic notions of Torah but also the primitive forms of the three images of Torah as angelic, messianic, and God-like, as well as their roles and functions as mediators connecting God and human beings. I will delve into the intertextual, exegetical (linguistic, semantic, and thematic), and theological relationships between the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah. I will clarify the theological and philosophical nexus between the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as

Philo's Logos, personified Wisdom, the Johannine Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah*, while illuminating a critical implication for the profound relationships between the Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered traditions. This will allow me to discuss the manner in which Torah's images in the medieval Jewish mystical and philosophical traditions are already present in the primitive forms in the hypostatic notions of Torah manifest in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. On the basis of this examination, I will elucidate the critical implications for the three images of Torah, which are derived from the synthesis of the philosophical and mystical traditions. Furthermore, I will summarize the critical features of the primitive forms of the three images (angelic, messianic, and God-like) of the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, while discovering the points that these images share with similar hypostatic ideas, such as Wisdom and Logos. By comparing their images and activities, I will elaborate not only the concept and critical features of the three images of Torah as mediators but also the significance of two supposed primitive forms of the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions: Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. I will then discuss the existence and conceptual functions of what I will argue is a primitive form of *devekut* and *unio mystica* as a hermeneutic and phenomenological structure, which generates and formulates the images of Torah within several combined philosophical and theosophical frameworks and the profound interactions of the two supposed traditions.

PART B has four Chapters (III, IV, V, and VI) which investigate the medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions in relation to the three images of Torah. In Chapter III, I will examine the angelic images of Torah, which mainly appear in the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition by analyzing the concept of the Active Intellect in relation to that of *devekut* in the thought of Maimonides, Gersonides, and some Kabbalists, such as Abulafia and R. Isaac of Acre, who were influenced by Maimonides. Specifically, I first will demonstrate the continuity and relationship between the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, *memra,* and Metatron manifest in the Second Temple and late antique Jewish sources and the Active Intellect as a full-fledged form of the hypostatic notions in the medieval Jewish philosophical sources.

I will also examine their conceptions of noetic union (i.e., a state of ideal *devekut* to the Active Intellect and to the letters of the Divine Name), which combine biblical, philosophical, and kabbalistic perspectives. Through this examination, I will uncover the exegetical and hermeneutical implications of the angelic images of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions as a mediator, such as Philo's Logos and Active Intellect, while uncovering the theological and hermeneutical implications related to the idea of noetic union in the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition.

In Chapter IV, I will examine the God-like images of Torah in the medieval Jewish mystical tradition by analyzing the hypostatic notions within the sefirot manifest in the thought of early and thirteenth century Kabbalists, such as the Geronese Kabbalists, as well as Abulafia, Moses de Leon, and Joseph Gikatilla. I first will analyze the interactions and continuities between the primitive forms of the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah in the Second Temple period and the transitional or full-fledged forms of the hypostatic notions of Torah in the late antique and medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions. In particular, I will focus on investigating the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions, such as *shekhinah* and *ḥokhmah,* which reflect the God-like images of Torah in the sefirotic system, by looking into the hermeneutic strategies that utilize linguistic symbolism in the works of the early Kabbalists. By investigating their approaches to the concepts of Torah, I will illuminate how they formulated the God-like images of Torah, which functioned as a hidden mediator connecting God and human beings, and the relationship of this image to *devekut* and *unio mystica* to the sefirot. I will also discuss the features of the hermeneutic apparatuses of allegory and symbolism, which are related to the formulation of the images of Torah, and which are prominently employed in the medieval Jewish mystical tradition.

In Chapter V, I will examine the messianic images of Torah, which appear in combination with the angelic and God-like images of Torah manifest from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods through the Middle Ages. In order to uncover the messianic images of Torah, I will examine the dynamic interactions between hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, *memra,* and *shekhinah*, which dynamically interacted and developed in late antique Jewish and Rabbinic literature as well as in Kabbalistic literature. Specifically, I will also examine the messianic thought of Geronese Kabbalah, Abulafia, the zoharic circle, and Gikatilla, while comparing and analyzing their strategies, which combine the messianic ideas and concepts with the angelic and God-like images of the hypostatic notions of Torah. I will further examine the theological, philosophical, and hermeneutical frameworks of these Jewish mystics, which create these messianic images of Torah—which conjoin with the angelic God-like images of Torah as apparatuses for experiencing the divine realms and God.

Finally, in Chapter VI, on the basis of Idel's panoramic approach, which assumes the existence of an inner channel of ideas based on religious experiences throughout the history of Jewish mysticism, I uncover the historical, exegetical, philosophical, and phenomenological relationships between the three images of Torah and their earlier precedents. On the basis of this investigation, I will examine the historical background for the development of Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions in relation to the images of Torah in the Middle Ages, while examining their continuity and connectivity with the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. I will analyze the significance of the three images of Torah (angelic, messianic, and God-like) as mediators, and describe how the various conceptions of a mediator continued to develop in the Jewish mystical and philosophical traditions from the Second Temple period through the Middle Ages. I will further elucidate critical findings and implications of the centrality of Torah and of its three images in the medieval Jewish philosophical and kabbalistic traditions, and the manner in which they are reverberations of the three images of the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah manifest in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. Furthermore, I will illuminate the exegetical and hermeneutical implications of the images of Torah, hypostatized and personified in Rabbinic midrashim about Sinaitic revelation and in later antique Jewish mystical sources, as a means of bridging ancient Jewish mysticism and medieval Kabbalah from the Second Temple period and the Middle Ages. Finally, I will elucidate the critical implications of the primitive forms of the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica*, which can substantiate the continuity and developmental process of recurring religious ideas and phenomena into their full-fledged forms in the Middle Ages. In all, I will also reevaluate not only the significance of the ideas and religious experiences of *devekut* and *unio mystica* in relation to the dynamics of three images of Torah but also their crucial meaning as a religious phenomenon reflected in the medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions**.**

In the conclusion, I will summarize the significant implications of my work as it relates to the critical factors regarding the images of Torah as a model in accordance with Idel’s two senses of phenomenology, and understanding the hermeneutical methodologies, which combine experience and interpretation in terms of a panoramic approach. I will suggest the need not only for a deeper phenomenological examination of the religious phenomena involved in the ongoing developmental process of the images of Torah in the history of Jewish thought but also for a wider future phenomenological investigation of the similar phenomena within Christianity and other religions.

PART A: Images of Torah in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Periods

Chapter I: Hypostatic Notions of Torah in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Periods

On the basis of Idel's panoramic approach noted in the Introduction, I will examine the historical and conceptual backgrounds of Torah while analyzing the interactions between various concepts of Torah: biblical, philosophical, rabbinic and Jewish mystical within various religious and ideological traditions during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. I thereby will investigate the process of development of the concept of Torah into various hypostatic notions, which are derivative forms of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah.* In so doing, I will examine their exegetical practices that helped formulated these forms of Torah and the intertextual and theological relationships between them as reflected in early Jewish and Christian sources, as well as in later Rabbinic sources. In the course of this examination, I will discuss the significant hermeneutical strategies (i.e., hypostatization and personification through allegory and symbolism), which dynamically formulate the concepts and images of Torah. This examination will provide critical insight not only into the primitive forms of the Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah but also thereby demonstrate the existence of the two supposed traditions—Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered—which were manifest during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. Furthermore, I will illuminate the conceptual relationships, interactions, and continuities of the hypostatic notions of Torah, bridging the gaps between ancient (Second Temple) and later rabbinic and Jewish mystical traditions, which were continuously developed from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods through Late Antiquity.

The Conceptual and Historical Backdrops of Torah

In its various usages in the Hebrew Bible, “Torah” usually appears to mean ‘Law.’ However, the programmatic discoveries of biblical criticism give a critical insight into various meanings of “Torah” in the Hebrew Bible and other early Jewish sources, beyond the simple equation between biblical references to Torah and the Pentateuch.[1] Indeed, it is conceivable that the biblical concept of Torah gradually developed as a term referring to a corpus that includes the teaching of the prophets and the Hagiographa during the Hellenistic period, largely before the Maccabean Revolt. The traditional concept of the Torah is as a name for “the Book of the Law of Moses” in Josh 8:31-32, 1 Kgs 2:3, 2 Kgs 14:6, Ezra 6:18, Neh 13:1, and “the Book of the Law of God” in Neh 8:8, and so forth. Jon D. Levenson implies the fluidity and change of the concept and meaning of Torah in the formative process of the Pentateuchal tradition, such as a re-composition of Gen 1- Ex 12, in the Second Temple period.[2] It is also crucial to note that the biblical concepts and meanings of Torah include the reproaches regarding the observance of the precepts, the reprimands and promises of the prophecies, the ethics of the Wisdom books, and the recorded history of Israel. In this context, I will briefly discuss not only the historical and conceptual backgrounds of Torah in relation to the concept of the Temple in the Second Temple period but also the influences of political and social factors. I will also consider the emergence and evolution of the hypostatic notions of Torah that are found during the Second Temple and early Rabbinic periods.[3]

---

[1] Jon D. Levenson, “The Sources of Torah: Psalm 119 and the Modes of Revelation in Second Temple Judaism,” in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*, eds. Patrick D. Miller, Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 560; Barnabas Lindars, “Torah in Deuteronomy,” in *Words and Meanings*, eds. P. R. Ackroyd (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 117-36. Biblical criticism mainly supports the position that large parts of the Pentateuch date from after the postexilic period.

[2] Levenson, “The Sources of Torah,” 560-1. Levenson shows that the author(s) of *Jubilees* regarded the Pentateuch as authoritative but not as definitive or fixed material, while considering its exegetical derivations. Cf. *Jub.* 1:27, 29. The fluidity of producing the Pentateuchal tradition in the Second Temple period, such as a re-composition of Gen 1- Ex 12, alludes to a possibility not only of divine inspiration even after the canonical prophets but also of a rabbinic concept of non-Pentateuchal Torah.

[3] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *From Text to Tradition: A History of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism* (Hoboken NJ: Ktav Pub. House, 1991), 3.

The stories of Abraham and Moses are fundamental to understanding the history of the emergence of the First and Second Temple in relation to the historical backgrounds of the Torah.[4] The idea of a portable tabernacle for God and his Torah eventually culminated in the establishment of the First and Second Temples on the basis of the covenantal relationship between the Israelites and God. Throughout the history of the Second Temple period, the Torah naturally became the basis and standard of people's lives, and many Jews decided to declare the Torah as the foundation of national, social and religious life. During the Hellenistic and even Hasmonean periods, Jewish people constantly had to make many efforts to survive as a minority ethnic and religious group in Jewish Palestine and the Diaspora, including Babylonia.[5] As Lawrence Schiffman points out, the most central aspect in the Second Temple period was the shift of the center of worship from Temple sacrifice to the study of Torah and prayer.[6] In particular, a diverse collection of the Jewish writings of Second Temple literature corroborates the authorization and canonization of the Hebrew Bible (i.e., Tanakh) which contains the Torah (Pentateuch), Prophets, and Writings, at around the time of the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E.[7] The collapse of the Second Temple in 70 B.C.E, which was a major event in Jewish history, had a huge impact on the social and religious dimensions of Jewish communities. Interestingly, during the late Second Temple period, the Qumran community appears to have been waiting for an idealized Jerusalem Temple.[8] However, unlike the expectation of the Qumran community, after the destruction of the Second Temple, a new Temple was neither rebuilt nor established. Instead, Schiffman notes both the emerging position of synagogues, which were developed as a significant institution, and the gradual dominance of the study of Torah and prayer instead of Temple sacrifice within Jewish Palestine.[9] The sacrifice and ritual purity of worship in the Temple were explicitly likened to prayers and Torah study in the two major institutions (the yeshivas and synagogues).[10] Prayers, which were usually conducted in the synagogue, played a very important role in Jewish religious life.[11] The liturgical prayers were seen as alluding to the rituals and priestly prayers of the Temple.[12] The prayers ultimately not only served the purpose of replacing the Temple sacrifices but also as an example of glorifying the Divine Name.[13] It is notable that in addition to prayers, more importantly, Torah study was conducted in both synagogues and yeshivas in the Diaspora.[14] The yeshiva means literally "sitting" and semanticaly refers to the activities of the academy with the sage and their pupils in the fixed order of seating. There are several synonyms for yeshiva: *bet ha-midrash* (lit. "the house of study"), *bet din* (lit. "the house of law"), *metivta* (the Aramaic rendering of yeshiva).[15] Interestingly, the Tannaim, who were Rabbinic sages in the Second

---

[4] The story of Abraham, who followed God's command to sacrifice Isaac on Mount Moriah (Gen 22:1-14), is recounted in the story of King Solomon's construction of the First Temple (II Chr 3:1).
[5] Schiffman, *From Text to Tradition*, 18-57, 62-66, 76-79, 80-88, 98-99.
[6] Ibid., 164. See also Gedalia Alon, *The Jews in Their Land in the Talmudic Age*, *70-640 C.E*, ed. Gershon Levi (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989, c1984), 46. Schiffman and Alon argue that the conception of Torah in ancient Judaism was gradually formulated in relationship to the religious and theological concepts of the Temple sacrifice, and it later dynamically interacted with the Hellenistic philosophies and cultures.
[7] Schiffman, 56-59, 88-91, 140. As Schiffman notes, "the canonization of the Torah already was completed by the time of Ezra and Nehemiah," (57) and "The Prophets was canonized late in the Persian period, probably by the start of the fourth century B.C.E." (58).
[8] Ibid., 135.

---

[9] Ibid., 166.

[10] It is conceivable that Torah study in the synagogues and yeshivas began to be significantly emphasized as an alternative tool and extension of the sacrifices in the Temple, and it has been gradually developed in the two institutions until institutional yeshivas arose in the later Talmudic period.

[11] Stefan C. Reif, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 65-72. As representative passages of prayer in the Old Testament, there are Gen 28:20-22; Ex 32:11-14; Num 12:13; Dt 26:1-12; 1 Sam 1:1-28; 1 Kgs 8:22-53; Neh 1:4-11. In addition, other well-known biblical prayers include the Song of Moses (Ex 15:1-18), the Song of Hannah (1 Sam 2:1-10).

[12] Moshe Greenberg, "On the Refinement of the Conception of Prayer in Hebrew Scriptures," *AJS Review* 1 (1976): 76-80.

[13] Greenberg, 80; Shaye J. D. Cohen, in *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987), 22, notes that for the pre-exilic Israelites, "prayer was not a standard part of worship, either in the temple or anywhere else." (22). However, Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism gradually developed a new way of worship: prayers and the study of Torah (218).

[14] David M. Goodblatt characterizes the forms and features of yeshivas of Tannaitic and Amoraic periods as "disciple circles" rather than "academies." See David M. Goodblatt, *Rabbinic instruction in Sasanian Babylonia* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 44-59, 267-72. Goodblatt (59) also points out that we "must approach the data available in Amoraic sources free from the preconceptions imposed by Geonic tradition." Jeffrey L. Rubenstein (58) also notes, "In many cases rabbinic sources project back upon earlier ages." As Rubenstein (62) describes, the form and scale of yeshivas appears as small groups of disciples who might have gathered around a rabbinic master in his home, e.g., "the study house of the family of the *nasi* (patriarch), the dynasty of Rabban Gamaliel." See Rubenstein, "Social and Institutional Settings of Rabbinic Literature," in *The Cambridge Companion to Rabbinic Literature*, eds. Charlotte Fonrobert and Martin Jaffee (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 58-74. Cohen notes that the synagogues were neither a uniquely rabbinic invention nor a rabbinic institution. The yeshivas, in contrast, had more spiritual and intellectual authority than any other institutions in Rabbinic Judaism. See Cohen, 223. For evidence that Torah study was as an activity in the synagogue, see Mt 4:5; 6:2-13; 9:35, Mk 3:1-6; Lk 6:6-11; Acts 13:14).

[15] Ibid, vol. 2, 199-200. This shows that there were primitive forms of the yeshivas, according to *Aggadah*, since the time of the biblical patriarchs and their descendants, and during the Egyptian bondage. Mordechai Yudelowitz, however, states that the academic institutions of the Second Temple and Amoraic periods did not

Temple Period, regarded the Great Sanhedrin, which had its seat in the Chamber of Hewn Stone, as a yeshiva (e.g., m. *Mid.* v, 4; b. *Sanḥ.* xi, 2; b. *Sanḥ* iv, 32b).[16] The Great Sanhedrin had functions, procedures and religious authority as a central institution at that time. Hillel the Elder (110 BCE - 10 CE) who was the greatest sage of the Second Temple period said: "The more Torah, the more life; the more yeshiva, the more wisdom" (m. *'Avot* ii, 7).[17] There is a well-known legend of the yeshivas indirectly reflecting the shifting process of Judaism from Temple-centered religion to Torah-centered religion. When Titus, the son of Nero surrounded Jerusalem in 69 C.E., the Tanna R. Johanan ben Zakkai (abbr. Ribaz, ריב"ז), moved to Yavne to revive the social, economic, and religious life of the Jewish people.[18] Ribaz believed that the Rabbis could achieve the goal of uniting the life and mind of Jewish people through Torah study, but not through a military victory in the war of Jewish independence against the Roman Empire.[19] As a result, the Pharisaic rabbis and leaders following Ribaz were successfully able to build a Jewish academic center, i.e., yeshiva for Torah study, and Jewish community in Yavne in place of Jerusalem and its Temple.[20]

Throughout the history of the yeshivas in the Rabbinic period, we can see how much Jews emphasized the mental, legal and spiritual importance of Torah study.[21] Torah study was a vital

---

have a special name, such as the *yeshivah*. Nonetheless, as he recognizes, this appears as a matter of the use of various names, such as *sidra*, *metivta*, and *beit ha-midrash*. Yudelowitz, *Yeshivat Pumbedita bi-Yemei ha-Amoraim* (Hebrew; Tel Aviv: Israel Art Printing, 1935), 8.

[16] Alexander Guttman, *Rabbinic Judaism in the Making: The Halakhah from Ezra to Judah I* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2018), 27.

[17] Ibid.

[18] See b. *Git.* 56a-b.

[19] Alon, *The Jews in Their Land in the Talmudic Age*, 308-10. However, this story only appears in the Babylonian Talmud. As Jeffrey L. Rubenstein notes, in a manner similar to this story, a metaphoric concept of the "war of Torah" in Babylonian rabbinic sources (e.g. b. *Meg.* 15b; b. *Sanḥ.* 42a) reflects a verbal "give-and-take" involved in debate in "a hostile and combative environment" rather than an actual fight. By contrast, a military metaphor and violent imagery, to a certain extent, more radically appears in Palestinian Talmud and rabbinic sources (e.g., y. *Shab.* 1:4). See Rubenstein, *The Culture of the Babylonian Talmud* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. 2003), 60-61.

[20] Ibid. They maintained a close relationship with the similar communities built in Palestine and Babylon. Their community produced excellent scholars, such as R. Akiba and Rabbi Ishmael. Jewish solidarity was maintained through the teachings of these Rabbis.

[21] Haim H. Ben-Sasson, *A History of the Jewish People*, vol.1 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univesity Press., 2002), 319.

institution for the ultimate survival of Judaism during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.[22] This corroborates that since the destruction of the Second Temple, the authority of priests, who had a critical role in the service of the Temple sacrifices, gradually waned, whereas rabbinic authority, including scribes and scholars, gradually increased.[23] The strength of the priesthood was transferred to that of the Rabbis through a complicated sequence of replacing and extending various components of the priesthood and the Temple sacrifices into Torah study. The Pharisaic rabbis worked particularly hard to formulate a new compilation of laws, and their efforts were regarded as the divine activities of interpreting a profound meaning of the two Torahs: the oral Torah and written Torah.[24] Through the study of Torah, they tried not only to make themselves interpreters of the Torah but also to extend the presence and influence of God on their life. The Rabbis compiled the Mishnah, in order to provide Jews with specific information and authentic interpretations regarding the Written Law of Moses from Mt. Sinai.[25] The exclusive Jewish interpretative traditions variously flourished through the development of the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds, the exegetical and homiletical Midrashim, and Jewish liturgical traditions throughout the history of Rabbinic Judaism.[26] Although the Mishnah and Talmud were authoritative texts, the authority of Torah ultimately played a key role, not only as a permanent legal statute and criterion for them but also as a unique motivation for Jews to keep their own identity through Jewish history.

---

[22] As A. Guttmann, in *Rabbinic Judaism in the Making,* 27-28, notes, the succeeding *beth din ha-gadol*, "Great Court," unlike the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, had to frequently move to several places (Yavne, Usha, and Shefar'am, etc.) During these transitional periods, the name of Sanhedrin gradually disappeared due to Roman persecution, and instead the role was conducted under the name *beit ha-midrash*. As Goodblatt (66) notes, the term *yeshivah* generally appears to refer to "courts" rather than to "schools" in Palestinian sources and it appear as a pure Hebrew, which is identical to the Greek loan word Sanhedrin. In all, this shows that various synonyms, such as *beit din*, *beit hamidrash*, and *metivta*, were actually a primary and typical model of the yeshiva. See also Goodblatt, 63-107. Since the Second Temple period, their roles became clear, and then they were established in more concretized forms such as schools and courts respectively, in accordance with their specific roles. The yeshiva was also utilized as a place where synagogue functions were carried out, and sometimes as a place of meeting to make important determinations for the Jewish communities. The fact that Torah was studied in both the synagogues and schools shows the importance of the study of Torah during this period. See Cohen, 223.

[23] Schiffman, 167-69.

[24] Ibid., 177-81. As Schiffman explains, "In the difficult years after the revolt, when the support of the people at large was so important, the rabbis, in order to guarantee the authority of their teachings, occasionally appealed to the divine origin and nature of the oral law." (181). The Rabbis, in this context, became honored as interpreters of the Law who increased the contents of the Torah.

[25] Ibid., 182-200, 220-34.

[26] Ibid., 234-39.

Historically, as seen, the significance of Torah might have increased in classical Rabbinic Judaism due to the shock of the destruction of the Second Temple.[27] On the one hand, the Rabbis of the Talmudic era assumed that the term Torah in biblical literature refers to the recording of Mosaic revelation.[28] The teaching (תורה, Torah) of YHWH in a rabbinic midrash (e.g., *Tanḥuma Re'eh* 1) refers to the Torah as the Laws of Moses.[29] On the other hand, numerous Rabbinic sources also assume that the Pentateuch is “only part of the Torah of Moses” while asserting the authority of “an Oral Torah, which is identical with rabbinic teaching.”[30] This implies that the biblical concept of Torah, in the classical rabbinic tradition, appears to have been developed in two different connotations. In *m. 'Avot* i, 1, ‘Be deliberate in judging, and raise up many disciples, and make a fence for the Torah,’ Torah signifies not only laws and practices but also teachers and judges of the Jewish people, and in *m. Sanḥ.* xi, 2, Torah signifies the teaching of precepts and *Halakhot* itself. Simon the Just declares in *m.* ’*Avot* i, 2, “Upon three things the world is based: upon the Torah, upon Temple service, and upon deeds of loving-kindness.”[31] This also implies not only that the term ‘Torah’ was not confined to use for the Torah of Moses, but also that the Torah had an expansive and symbolic meaning of teaching of the Torah.

We can also see significant Hellenistic influences in the way in which Jews understood the nature of Torah. Since the beginning of the Hellenistic Age (approx. 332 - 63 B.C.E) after the invasion of Alexander the Great, there were tremendous Greek influences on the Jewish religion, language, architecture, military, government, social forms and so forth.[32] Despite the political and religious successes of the Maccabean Revolt, Hellenistic influence continued to increase in the Jewish cultural and literary life. Lee I. Levine describes Hellenistic influences on Jewish life and creativity.[33] Similarly, Martin Hengel describes the intellectual influence of Hellenism on Jewish literature by using the accounts of the anonymous Samaritan, the Jewish historian Eupolemus, and the Palestine-Jewish historical writings of Jason of Cyrene.[34] Since the period of the Roman Empire (31 B.C.E.), Greek language and culture was influential in the educational systems of the Pharisees and in their interpretative and hermeneutical methods of studying Torah.[35] In particular, it is notable that, as Hugo Mantel and Alon note, the Sanhedrin implies not only a religious and educational institution in Hebrew sources, but also a political, judicial, body, as well as a philosophical school in Greek sources.[36] This also implies that the Hellenistic influences appear to have significant relevance for the emergence and explosion of new varieties of Judaism, such as Essenes, Sadducees, and Pharisees, the

---

[27] It is conceivable that despite the harsh exilic experiences, they overcame the difficulties through the Jewish tradition that God and his Torah are always spiritually with them and protecting them. In a sense, they would have needed the glory and presence of God even outside of the Temple realm, i.e., in their practical life in the Diaspora.

[28] Levenson, “The Sources of Torah,” 559.

[29] *Tanḥuma Re'eh* 1: לְלַמֶּדְךָ, שֶׁכָּל מִי שֶׁמִּתְבַּטֵּל מִן הַתּוֹרָה, כְּאִלּוּ כּוֹפֵר בְּהַקָּדוֹשׁ בָּרוּךְ הוּא “This is to tell you that anyone despises (or abandons) the words of Torah, it is as though he denies (or does not believe) in the Holy One, blessed be He.” See Levenson, 559.

[30] Ibid., 560.

[31] Ibid. This also implies a profound relationship between the Temple service, and deeds of loving-kindness, and the study of Torah.

---

[32] Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* vols. 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 1:12-32.

[33] Lee I. Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence, Samuel and Althea Stroum Lectures in Jewish Studies* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998), 30-31. Levine analyzes three categories: 1) the city of Jerusalem in the late Second Temple period; 2) the Pharisaic-rabbinic culture; 3) the ancient synagogue.

[34] Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:83-98. In addition, Alon (339-40, 346) provides a list of Jewish literature in Greek: the works of Philo of Alexandria, the books of the Apocrypha, the works of Josephus Flavius, and the History (now lost) by Justus of Tiberias, as well as the original of Second Maccabees, which was written by Jason of Cyrene.

[35] Saul Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1994), 1-3.

[36] As Hugo Mantel and Sydney B. Hoenig note, the Sanhedrin is synonymous with the Greek word *synedrion,* which means “assembly” or “governing body.” The Sanhedrin not only appears similar to the meanings and functions of *ekklesia* but is also identified as “the Great Court” of “seventy-one” members. As Hidary (7) and several scholars note, in reality, the Rabbis might have met in a form of “smaller courts,” rather than “a single centralized Sanhedrin” after 70 C.E. Hidary shows the descriptions of the Sanhedrin as a rabbinic idealization in rabbinic and Talmudic sources (e.g., m. *Sanḥ.* xi, 2-4; t. *Sanḥ.* iii, 4; vii, 1; xi, 7, xiv, 12). See Hidary, *Dispute for the Sake of Heaven: Legal Pluralism in the Talmud* (Providence, R.I: Brown Judaic Studies, 2010), 7, 301-2; Hugo Mantel, *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1961), xi, 55-92; Sidney B. Hoenig, *The Great Sanhedrin: A Study of the Origin, Development, Composition and Function of the Bet Din Ha-gadol during the Second Jewish Commonwealth* (Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1953), 10, 145-47, 157; Alexander Guttmann, *Rabbinic Judaism in the Making: A Chapter in the History of the Halakhah from Ezra to Judah I* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1970), 27-28. As noted earlier, the Tannaim in the Second Temple Period regarded the Sanhedrin as an educational body of yeshiva (e.g., b. *Sanḥ.* iv, 32b). Alon, in *The Jews in Their Lands in the Talmudic Age,* 43, notes that the Sanhedrin further convey a feature of Hellenistic philosophical school.

Qumran sect, as well as apocalyptic and Hasidic Judaism.[37]

Practically, we can find many parallels between Jewish and Greek civilizations and cultures at the time.[38] The Second-Temple period works of the Jewish historian Josephus demonstrate the Greek and Hellenistic influence on the culture and language of Jewish Palestine.[39] Josephus's synthesis of Torah and Greek culture can be seen in his rewritten works of biblical history and Hellenized narratives, which include language and ideas that would appeal to Greek-educated readers.[40] In addition, as Hengel notes, we can see that during the late Second Temple and Talmudic periods, the Rabbis and the Diaspora Jews, such as Philo, began to compose didactic, historical and apocalyptic writings, which combine the interpretations of Scripture and Hellenistic literature.[41] A significant marker of Hellenistic Jewish literature was the Septuagint, which contributed to the development of Christianity by making an authoritative Greek text of the Jewish Scripture.[42] Interestingly, Hengel emphasizes the "encounter between Jewish and Hellenistic thought" seen in Jewish wisdom and rabbinic speculations about the nexus of personified Wisdom and Torah in the creation context, which appears in the Greek translations of Prov 8:22-31, and *Sirach.*[43] The substantial interactions between Hellenistic influences and rabbinic exegetical and hermeneutic rules can be gleaned from the midrashic methods which are employed in the Wisdom literature, including the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and Qumran scrolls, as well as Philo's works, which I will examine later in this study.[44] Even though the Rabbis fundamentally followed the traditional Jewish positions in their Hebrew or Aramaic works, they remained receptive to the scientific and moral concepts of Greek philosophy and theology. This is reflected in the terminology and logical methodology, as well as in the more systematic or metaphysical structures of their expositions of Judaism.[45] The Greek philosophical influences on early Jewish sources can be seen in linguistic features of Jewish texts, such as the Greek and Latin loanwords in Rabbinic literature, including the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds.[46]

---

[37] Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity*, 110-12.

[38] It appears clear that Greek was widely spoken and used in business and governmental contacts in the Land of Israel. However, this does not tell us much about the influence of Greek literature, religion, and philosophy.

[39] Louis H. Feldman, "Torah and Greek Culture in Josephus," *The Torah U-Madda Journal* 7 (1997): 64-73. In Josephus' works, we can get considerable information about both his Jewish and Greek background. We are, therefore, able to draw reasonably secure conclusions concerning his methodology of synthesizing the Jewish and Greek sources and what the reactions of his contemporaries were to his works.

[40] Ibid, 70. It is evident that Josephus was influenced by Greek tragedy, as can be seen, for example, in the following citation: "As if they were stage masks (*Ant.* 6.264)." Feldman (70) mentions, knowing "his Greek readers would appreciate motifs familiar from Greek tragedy, he rewrites the biblical narrative of the Flood by stressing that mankind was full of overweening pride" (hubris, a key word in Greek tragedy) (*Ant.* 1.73, 100)."

[41] Hengel, 1:83; Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1974), 47-82; Alan Mendelson, *Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1982). Mendelson theorizes that Philo was intimately acquainted with the techniques of the Greek rhetoric that were used in the epics and dramatic poetry.

[42] Schiffman, 91-92; Feldman, *Torah and Greek Culture in Josephus*, 42. It is evident that the translators who produced the Septuagint had not only a good knowledge of the Hebrew of the Pentateuch, as well as of the tradition of the Oral Torah but also of the Hellenistic Greek language of the third century B.C.E. For instance, the use of the singular form of Torah, the avoidance of using the Greek terms used in pagan worship and so forth.

[43] Hengel, 1:109-10; 153-69. As Hengel (109-10) notes, the Greek influences on the translations from Hebrew into Greek emerge even in the canonizing process of a diverse collection of the Jewish writings in Second Temple literature.

As Saul Lieberman notes, despite the real conflicts between the Rabbis and Greek culture and influence, the Rabbis also encouraged the learning of the Hellenistic traditions for the practical purposes, such as the Jewish settlement plans and social and cultural assimilations in Jewish Palestine and in the Diaspora.[47] Against this background, we can infer that the Hellenistic influences on the Jewish scholarly realm were more extensive, i.e., not only on the method by which the Talmud and other Rabbinic literature was composed, collected, and redacted, but also on the rabbinic methodology of studying Torah.[48] Specifically, Greek philosophical dialectics and intellectual dynamics are analogous to the dialectical characteristics of the Mishnah and both Talmuds.[49]

---

[44] Shiffman, 120-37. These sources may be influenced by Greek philosophy and Greek Wisdom tradition.

[45] Hermann L. Strack, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash,* ed. G. Stemberger, trans. Markus Bockmuehl (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991), 116-17; Shaye J. D. Cohen, "The Destruction: From Scripture to Midrash," *Prooftexts* (1982): 39-41.

[46] Daniel Sperber, *Essays on Greek and Latin in the Mishna, Talmud and Midrashic Literature* (Jerusalem: Makor Pub, 1982), 82-87.

[47] Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine,* 153-63. Lieberman notes that the interactions between sacrificial rites and heathen customs in Greek culture prevailed "in the Mediterranean world during the first century B.C.E. and C.E." (163) In this context, a small number of the Rabbis might have dealt with the Greek language and philosophy in Rabbinic literature. The Talmudic passage (b. *Sotah* 49b, b. *B. Qam.* 82b) notes that the patriarch Rabban Gamaliel II who lived in the latter part of the first century and was a contemporary of Josephus, had "a thousand students, five hundred of whom studied Torah and five hundred of whom studied Greek wisdom." (Feldman, *Torah and Greek Culture in Josephus*, 74).

[48] Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine,* 153-63.

[49] Jacob Neusner, *The Reader's Guide to the Talmud* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 200-11. For instance, *m. B. Mes.* 1:1-2: the rule of the Mishnah, which is cited at the head of the sustained discussion, deals with the dialectical features of the case of two persons who find a garment.

Importantly, in the Midrashim, such as *Genesis Rabbah* (*Gen. Rab.*) and *Leviticus Rabbah* (*Lev. Rab.*), there are the explicit Greek and Latin loanwords.[50] Burton L. Visotzky points out that *Lev. Rab.* can be regarded not only as “one of the great works of the Western canon in its broadest sense,” but also “a kind of Hellenistic provincial literature” since “reflexes of Hellenism may be found in the attitudes of *Lev. Rab.* toward Temple and sacrifice, towards the sages, in its use of interpretative hermeneutics, [the dualistic understanding of] the relationship of body and soul, even in attitudes toward women.”[51] *Lev. Rab.* appears to utilize the syllogistic reasoning of the Hellenistic philosophy in citing, compositing, and exegeting the verses of Scripture.[52] These features provide explicit evidence of the concurrence between Greek and Jewish linguistic and hermeneutical principles.

However, Lieberman and David Daube disagree about the characteristics of the hermeneutical methodologies associated with these Greek terms.[53] Lieberman points out that even if the terminology itself was borrowed from the Greeks, the hermeneutical rules appearing in Jewish and Hellenistic traditions, respectively, are not identical.[54] In his view, it is difficult to discover direct evidence in the early Jewish sources of exegetical practices reflecting the Hellenistic linguistic and hermeneutical rules. By contrast, Daube asserts that it was a Greek hermeneutical model that leads to these rules being introduced into the rabbinic circles.[55] He notes that this model not only covers the domain of rabbinic rhetorics and interpretations but also the domain of Talmudic jurisprudence.[56] This corroborates that despite the insufficiency of explicit quotations and cross-references in the Greek sources and Talmudic literature, the influence of Hellenistic rhetorics, whether in merely terminological applications or in hermeneutical rules, appears within the Pharisaic circles before the first century B.C.E.[57] This also substantiates, whether we are dealing with a lesser or greater receptivity, that Hellenistic influences are found within "several primary areas of rabbinic intellectual literary activity likewise genres, ideas, and motifs."[58]

---

[50] Neusner, 313-16; Sperber, 67-81.

[51] Burton L. Visotzky, *Golden Bells and Pomegranates: Studies in Midrash Leviticus Rabbah Texte Und Studien Zum Antiken Judentum; 94* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 179-80.

[52] Jacob Neusner, *Judaism and Scripture: The Evidence of Leviticus Rabbah, Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 8-9; 33-35. The Mishnah adopts the rhetoric of word-for-word or phrase-by phrase exegesis. *Lev. Rab.* attempts an exegetical and hermeneutical metamorphosis of Leviticus from a Biblical, Mishnaic, and Midrashic from into a philosophical one.

[53] Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, 1-2. Liberman notes that “The Jewish leaders felt that not only is “Greek Wisdom” indispensable for proper relations with the Roman government but that Greek philosophy is a useful instrument in religious discussions, especially with the Gentile Christians who became more and more influential. Yet it is obvious that Greek philosophy was the appanage of only very few outstanding Rabbis” (1). David Daube, “Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric,” *HUCA* 22 (1949): 239-64.

[54] Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine,* 47-82. Interestingly, Liberman introduces some critical hermeneutic rules “used by the Rabbis to interpret the narrative parts of the Bible,” such as *mashal* (i.e., “parable or allegory or symbol”), *paranomasia* (i.e., “playing with homonymous roots)”, and *gematria* (i.e., “computation of the numeric value of letters”) and so forth (esp. 68-72).

[55] Daube, 239-64. Daube shows that Hillel rendered the Greek terms into Hebrew terms that had already been in use for generations among the Greeks.

Representatively, we can see the methodology of the rabbinic rhetorics of Hillel the Elder, which effectively combines the Hellenistic influences and Hebraic traditions. Hillel believed that Scripture itself not only includes "the tradition of the father" but also needs "a series of rational norms of exegesis making possible a sober clarification and extension of legal provisions."[59] In so doing, he appropriated Greek terminological, rhetorical, and hermeneutical rules while combining them with the Hebraic values and traditions. As Levine has argued, the hermeneutical methods of the Rabbis were "thoroughly Hebraized in spirit as well as form," supporting the natural progress of Jewish laws.[60] Hillel's approach shows that he tried to solve the fundamental antithesis between law relying on respect for the authority of tradition and law resting on rational considerations, through the help of certain Hellenistic modes of reasoning or rhetorical theory.[61]

At the same time, it is evident that the Hebraic values in the works of the Rabbis were not compromised, even if the midrashic interpretation of Scripture was profoundly related to the Greek hermeneutic rules and Hellenistic influences, which were operative in the rabbinic practices of formulating the Talmudic laws. In this context, Richard Hidary analyzes the idiosyncratic features of the rhetorics of rabbinic authority. As noted earlier, the Rabbis contended that rabbinic scholars became more important than priests as a result of their effective legislation and various rhetorics.[62] In this manner Torah study of the Rabbis was made analogous to the Temple sacrifices of the priests. Accordingly, they appropriated other means, such as Torah study and prayers, for achieving the effects of the Temple sacrifice. As Hidary analyzes, they mainly did so by using four rhetorics (comparison, legal fiction, replacement, and appreciation).[63]

---

[56] Ibid., 240, 251-53, 261-63. Daube emphasizes a widespread Hellenistic influence on the rabbinic rhetorics. He notes that the influence of Hellenistic philosophy was neither confined to "the period of Hillel" (261), nor to "the domain of interpretation" (262). However, his analysis concludes that this is not one-side Hellenistic influence on the Jewish system but reflects a profound interaction between them.
[57] Daube, 261-64.
[58] Levine, 131. Liberman shows "how well they were versed in the Greek language and literature" and "the general acquaintance of the Rabbis with Hellenistic culture" (15). For instance, he examines "the house of the patriarch and the house of the head of the academy in Caesarea," which proves the "inherent factors favoring the spread of Greek culture among the Jewish masses" (27). See Lieberman, *Greek in JewishPalestine,* 15-28.
[59] Daube, 245.
[60] Ibid., 240.
[61] Ibid., 246-47.

The rhetoric of comparison is a typical method in Greco-Roman narrative, which also appears in late Biblical texts and Talmudic texts.[64] This rhetoric conveys an analogical and metaphoric method of comparing and analyzing the different values.[65] As Hidary also analyzes, in the rhetoric of legal fiction, "the realms of Torah and Temple are brought into closer relationship by defining the value of the former in terms of the value of the latter."[66] This shows that Torah and prayer are metaphorically considered like sacrifices.[67] This also corroborates that the Rabbis achieved the same goals, which can be achieved by the sacrifices, through the rhetoric of legal fiction based on an allegorical approach to the Torah and its study. The rhetoric of substitution implies that one thing can substitute for the other, i.e., the Temple, to some extent, is replaceable with the synagogue, and Rabbis and Halakah can replace priests and Temple rites.[68] This rhetoric also offers a hermeneutic (analogical and allegorical) apparatus not only for achieving religious values and truths (e.g., holiness, atonement, and communion with God) even without the Temple but also for shifting the judicial authority from the priests to the Rabbis.[69] Furthermore, the rhetoric of appropriation extends the priesthood and the Temple sacrifices to the requirement of laypeople.[70] This shows that the Rabbis appropriate the acts and meanings of the Temple rites to the Rabbinic Halakah by viewing Temple sacrifices symbolically.[71] The four rhetorical categories, which cover various hermeneutical traditions from the Tannaim and Amoraim, helps us understand the shifting process in which Torah study of the Rabbis was centralized instead of the Temple sacrifices of the priests.[72] The four rabbinic rhetorics, which coincided and mutually reinforced each other in subtle ways, give a critical insight not only into the relationship between Torah study of the Rabbis and the Temple sacrifices of the priests but also into how the Rabbis utilized various rhetorical and hermeneutical strategies for understanding the reality of sacrifices in Torah and prayer, and for creating their new meanings in the Diaspora and supporting their own system and authority.

---

[62] Richard Hidary, "The Rhetoric of Rabbinic Authority: Making the Transition from Priest to Sage," in *Jewish Rhetorics: History, Theory, Practice,* eds. Michael B. Donals and Janice W. Fernheimer (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2014), 20.

[63] Ibid. Hidary highlights the work of Kenneth Burke and that of Sabine Maasen and Peter Weingart. See Burke "Four Master Tropes," *The Kenyon Review* 3, no. 4 (1941): 421-38 and Maasen and Weingart, *Metaphors and the Dynamics of Knowledge* (London; New York: Routledge, 2000), 35. As Hidary notes, Burke's four master tropes (metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony) correspond with his four categories of rhetoric, which I will discuss later in this study.

[64] Hidary, "Rhetorics of Rabbinic Authority," 20-21. Hidary notes, "The exercise in comparison (*synkrisis*) was one of the stages in the *progymmasmata* in which the student would evaluate the relative worth of two people or things." Consider the following examples: *m. 'Avot* vi, 5, "Torah is greater than priesthood and kingship," and in b. *Ber.* 32b, "Prayer is greater than sacrifices"; Prov 21:3: "To do what is right and just is more desired by the Lord than sacrifice." These passages show a priority of righteousness and justice over the sacrifices through this rhetoric.

[65] Ibid. By this logic, the Rabbis in Tannaitic and Amoraic sources argued that the authority of the Torah is more significant than the authority that priests exercised over the sacrifices in the Temple. After the destruction of the Second Temple, in terms of a hierarchical priority, the Rabbis taught that the study of the laws of the Torah instead of the Temple sacrifices would lead to the fulfillment of the critical commandment of the Torah to love God. See Baruch M. Bokser, "Rabbinic Responses to Catastrophe: From Continuity to Discontinuity," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 50 (1983): 47-50.

[66] Hidary, 22, 34. A legal fiction implies "one thing as if it were the same as another," even if that is not actually the case. The rhetoric of legal fiction was "common to both Roman and Rabbinic jurisprudence.

---

[67] Ibid., 22. In these texts, the Rabbis take over the role of the priests and various halakhic rituals are analogized to Temple rites and can therefore replace them. As Hidary notes, this rhetoric appears as "a persuasive rhetorical device" required in the legal system. Cf. b. *Menah.* 110a: "When Scholars study Torah in any place, I consider it as if (*keillu*) they have burned incense to Me…" In a manner different from the rhetoric of comparison, this rhetoric also leads to the conclusion that the Rabbis and Halakah are "functionally equivalent" to priests and Temple sacrifices instead of reducing the significance of priests. Acts of loving-kindness (Hos 6:6) are an example that conveys both legal fiction and comparison, insofar as they are equivalent to the sacrifices in the Temple for the atonement of sins. See *ʾAbot R. Nat.* A 4, B 8; b. *Ber.* 17a.

[68] Hidary, 25-28. For instance, Dt 17:8-9, 31:9 and m. *ʾAvot* i, 1 mention the succession of transmission of the Torah that was handed to the priests and the elders (sages) from Moses. In m. *Meg.* 3:3, the sanctity of synagogue is substituted for that of the Temple. It is mentioned in m. *ʾAvot* iii, 3 that "the food at one's table is substituted for a sacrifice."

[69] Martha Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*: *Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism*, *Jewish Culture and Contexts* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 170-73. In the architecture of the synagogue, there are dedicatory inscriptions, which appear to be modeled after the Temple. The rabbinic rhetoric in *m. Hor.* 3:8 utilizes the biblical descriptions of the Tabernacle in order to explain its relationship with the Temple. Steven Fine, in "From Meeting House to Sacred Realm*: Holiness and the Ancient Synagogue*" in *Sacred Realm: The Emergence of the Synagogue in the Ancient World*, eds. Steven Fine and Yeshiva University Museum (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 27, also notes, "For the early Rabbinic Sages, synagogues were the institutional focal point for the reconstruction of Judaism." He explains that synagogue is an institution infused with Temple qualities, while calling attention to the similarity between synagogue and Temple in *t. Sukk.* 4:6 and in Tannaitic descriptions of the Temple. The Sukkah is similarly considered a miniature of the Temple. This implies the synagogue instead of the Templee became the place of the presence of God. Interestingly, the activities in the synagogue appears to be identified with the activities in the Temple. It should also be added that after the destruction of Temple, the table at one's home, i.e., an alternative sacrificial object and place can be substituted for the Temple altar to attain atonement. Cf. *y. Sukk.* 2:7 (52a).

[70] Hidary, 28-29. Hidary notes that the most explicit example of this rhetoric of appropriation can be gleaned from the enactment of *shofer* and *lulav* in the Sukkot, which are extended into outside the Temple. This shows how the Rabbis compared taking the four species in the Sukkot, something which is applicable into the rabbinic system, to offering a sacrifice.

On the one hand, these rabbinic rhetorics demonstrate some critical reasons and implications of why Rabbinic Judaism emphasized and concentrated on the concept of Torah and its study instead of the Temple sacrifices despite the huge Greek philosophical influences, which were inevitable on the life of Jewish people and the Jewish concepts of Torah and God. On the other hand, despite the Rabbis' emphasis on the rabbinic conception of Torah as "divine law", which, as Christine Hayes discussed, conveys the human elements (i.e., the intrinsic rationality of Torah and its contents and the fluidity of Talmud), a theological and philosophical conceptualization of Torah, which was mainly influenced by the Hellenistic (Stoic and Neoplatonic) and Greco-Roman thought and culture, explicitly appears in Rabbinic sources, which I will examine in detail in the study.[73] This corroborates that while emphasizing the importance of Torah study and its halakhic matters and replacing the critical meanings of the Temple sacrifices during the transitional periods, the Rabbis implicitly have attempted, in earnest, to create a new theological and philosophical concept of God and Torah, as I will argue, through the utilization of the Hellenistic philosophies and ideas. In particular, the conceptual (theological and philosophical) change of Torah implicitly can be gleaned from the rabbinic concepts of Torah in the hypostatic notions, such as *memra* and *shekhinah*, which were manifest in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods which I will examine in greater detail in the study. This study eventually will substantiate not only a synthesis of the rabbinic rhetorics and Hellenistic influences on the development of the concepts of God and Torah but also a dramatically shifting process from the biblical concept of Torah to a conceptually combined form of the rabbinic, philosophical, and mystical notions of Torah, thereby dynamically formulating the hypostatic notions of Torah and their images, which I will discuss, in turn, in the study.

---

[71] Hidary, 27-33. The strictness of the rabbinic purity laws can be gleaned from the Pharisees' complaints about Jesus's disciples eating with unwashed hands in Mk 7:1-4. Cf. b. *Ber.* 53b; Lev 20:7. However, *m. Ḥul.* 2:5 implies that the purity laws were no longer the domain of the priests but became a domain of the Rabbis. This shows that the Rabbis appropriated various aspects of priestly purity laws including the eating of foods in a state of purity. In this sense, regarding the Passover sacrifice, the Mishnah appropriates the eating of unleavened bread on the first night even in the Diaspora without the Temple. This means that the Temple ritual is extended to a new and substitutive ritual. The Rabbis, furthermore, extended purity laws to unrelated areas, while utilizing them to support their own system and authority. As Hidary explains, they eventually became the specialists in the priestly system of purity, helping their followers survive in the traumatic transition periods. Through the rhetoric of appropriation, the rabbinic authority appropriates priestly rites in relation to purity laws for their own halakhic ends through the extension of the sanctity of sacrificial rites beyond the Temple's boundaries.

[72] Ibid., 33-34.

[73] As Christine Hayes notes, the Rabbis primarily valued a "positive-human law" which was critical in the Greco-Roman legal tradition, in the conceptualization of Torah. The Rabbis had more focus on the development of the rabbinic concept of "divine law," which conveys the human elements (i.e., the intrinsic rationality of Torah and its contents and the fluidity of Talmud), than on a divine-natural law which was influenced by the

On the basis of this historical and conceptual backdrop of Torah in the Second Temple period, prior to diving into the examination of the hypostatic notions of Torah, it is briefly worth noting that the concepts of Wisdom and Logos, are crucial for understanding the developmental process of the philosophical and mystical concepts of Torah, and the dynamic formulation of the images of Torah. Philo's Logos demonstrates a Hellenistic philosophical influence on the Jewish wisdom traditions. Philo's Logos primarily appears as a conceptually synthesized form of the hypostatic notions of Torah, i.e., one that combines between the biblical concepts of Torah (or Word of God) of Moses and the Greek philosophical concept of λόγος or the Stoic concept of νόμος.[74] The concept of Torah in

---

Hellenistic (Stoic and Neoplatonic) and Greco-Roman thought and culture. See Hayes, *What's Divine about Divine Law?: Early Perspectives* (Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press, 2015), 166-195, 272-328. As Hayes also notes, this shows that the Rabbis weighed the halakhic (formal and performative) elements of divine law (i.e., Torah-low of the Talmud) rather than a philosophical concept of Torah, i.e., "ontological or mind-independent reality" of Torah (196), which is theologically hypostatized and personified in relation to the concepts of Wisdom and Logos. Nonetheless, as Hayes recognizes, the Rabbis did not ignore the significance of a conceptual change of Torah while implicitly promoting the development of its theological, philosophical, and mystical implications which I will examine, in turn, in this study.

[74] The Torah of Moses in Septuagint is "almost always translated, as νόμος (*nomos*) but in a sense distinctive from "the Nomos of Solon which is the traditional law of Athens." Generally, νόμος signifies a natural law in

Hellenistic Judaism appears as interchangeable with these philosophical and stoic concepts as a result of the terminological similarities between Torah and the Word (λόγος) of God or the Law (νόμος). These terms occasionally appear in Greek-speaking Jewish sources in Aramaic or Hebrew and which are used as translations or synonyms of Torah.[75] In this context, Philo's concept of Torah shows a synthesis between the Torah of Moses and the Stoic concept of νόμος, which signifies a natural law in the cosmos given by the divine creator.[76] This shows a dramatic change of the biblical concept of Torah, in that it is not limited to the corpus of the Law of Moses.

Philo's Logos also has a critical implication for discovering a missing and profound link, i.e., a unique Jewish exegetical practice which combines the concept of the Logos in relation to Torah with the concept of Wisdom in a Hellenistic Jewish tradition. The relationship in Philo's thought between Logos and personified Wisdom is explicit evidence of the derivation of a hypostatic notion of Torah from Wisdom literature.[77] The relationship between Philo's Logos and personified Wisdom is also profoundly related to the later Johannine Logos of early Christian tradition. Additionally, the relationship between Philo's Logos and personified Wisdom reverberates in other hypostatic notions of Torah, which reflect rabbinic and Jewish mystical concepts, such as *memra* and *shekhinah*, which are found in Rabbinic, Targumic, and late antique Jewish mystical literature, which I will examine later in this study. This eventually leads to a uniquely shifting process, placing the Hebraic values, from the biblical concept of Torah, first over the Hellenistic influences, even as a theologically and philosophically combined form of the hypostatic notions of Torah emerges. On the basis of this observation and examination, I will delve into the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified

---

the cosmos given by the divine creator. See Hindy Najman, "Torah and Tradition," in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; 2010), 1316.

[75] Najman, "Torah and Tradition," 1316. Cf. Boaz Cohen, *Jewish and Roman Law: A Comparative Study*, 2 vols. (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1966), 1:28-29.

[76] Najman, 1316.

[77] Harry A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 1:5-9, 48, 254-55. Wolfson (254-55) mentions, in reference to *Leg. All*. I. xix, 65 that "it was quite natural for Philo to use also the term Wisdom as the equivalent of Logos." This implies that the Jewish hypostatic notions were condensed and consolidated in Philo's Logos.

Wisdom, Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah*, which were mentioned above, and their relationships and interactions as they are manifest in the early Jewish and Christian sources during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.

Various Derivative Forms of Hypostatic Notions of Torah

Personified Wisdom in Proverbs

To begin with**,** I examine personified Wisdom in the book of Proverbs of the Hebrew Bible. Personified Wisdom is understood as the oldest form of the hypostatic notions of Torah. According to the descriptions of the collections of Proverbs themselves (Prov 1:1, 10:1; 25:1), the primary author of the Book of Proverbs is King Solomon (mid tenth century B.C.E.).[78] Yet, as Richard J. Clifford explains, "Proverbs is an anthology of collections and appendixes, which were composed and collected from the earliest days of the monarchy (ca. 1000 B.C.E.) to the end of the sixth century B.C.E., or to the Babylonian Exile and thereafter in the opinions of many scholars."[79] James L. Crenshaw specifically classifies "the actual dates of the various literary complexes that make up the wisdom corpus in the Proverbs" as follows: some canonical proverbs, which may have preceded the monarchy; others, which flourished during the exilic period; and Prov 1-9 as the latest collection, which was composed in the post exilic period.[80] Indeed, the majority of scholars insist that the bulk of the sayings of Proverbs were composed in the pre-exilic or exilic period, while most of the instructions and speeches in Prov 1-9, as well as the final editing were composed in the post-exilic period.[81] However, it is difficult to determine the date of the book of Proverbs by only the literary criteria, since this book also contains different linguistic characteristics, such as Aramaisms.[82] Michael V. Fox cautions, “The simplistic periodization is contradicted at every step by the complaints of the pre-exilic prophetic and Deuteronomic authors.”[83] In this sense, Crenshaw suggests that “the book of Proverbs may not have been complete until Hellenistic times (339-198), although containing

---

[78] Richard J. Clifford, *The Wisdom Literature* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1998), 1. Crenshaw notes that Proverbs, in large part Ecclesiastes, and Wisdom of Solomon are attributed to King Solomon. The author of Proverbs (e.g., Prov 25:1) alludes to chronological evidence of the collection of the men of King Hezekiah. See James L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), 5.

[79] Clifford, *The Wisdom Literature*, 42.

[80] James L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*, 3rd ed. (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), 52.

[81] Clifford, *Proverbs: A Commentary,* 1st ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), 4, 28. Clifford explains, "The original Hebrew manuscripts of Proverbs have not survived, but we have two fragments

---

from Cave Four at Qumran: 4QProv^{a} (=4Q102) written in an early Herodian formal script (ca. 30- 1 B.C.E), contains 1:27-2:1; 4QProv^{b} (=4Q103), written in a late Herodian formal script (ca. 50 C.E.), preserves vestiges of two columns: 13:6-9; 14:5-10, 12-13; 14:31-15:8; 15:20-31.” (28) “A different Hebrew recension of Proverbs was evidently the basis for the Greek translation of the second century B.C.E., which is known as the Septuagint. (29). As Clifford also notes, the translations of Proverbs include Syriac, Targum, and Latin (28-30).

[82] As Clifford, in *Proverbs*, 4, notes, “Proverbs has some Aramaisms but these in themselves are no argument for a late date, for they are also found sporadically in preexilic texts. A large number in a book, however, would suggest a postexilic date when Aramaic became the language of commerce and government.” In this vein, some scholars, such as Harold C. Washington and Roger N. Whybray, date Prov 1-9 to the Persian period. See Washington, *Wealth and Poverty in the Instruction of Amenemope and the Hebrew Proverbs*, *SBL* 142 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1994), 118-22; Whybray, *Wisdom in Proverbs: The Concept of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9* (London: SCM Press, 1965), 106. By contrast, some scholars, such as Georg Fohrer, Al Wolters, and Hengel, argue that in Proverbs there are some terms, such as אֵטוּן (7:16) and צוֹפִיָּה (31:27), which have been considered Greek loanwords. See Georg Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, trans. David E. Green (New York: Abingdon, 1968), 319. Al Wolters notes that the allusion to Greek *sophia* in צוֹפִיָּה can be regarded as “a cleverly veiled barb in a religious polemic,” and shows a poetic strategy to present a Hebraic wisdom, as opposed to a Hellenistic wisdom. See Wolters, “Ṣôpiyyâ (Prov 31:27) as Hymnic Participle and Play on Sophia,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104, no. 4 (1985): 577-87. However, Washington (121-22) notes that “the author knows enough about Hellenistic wisdom to engage in name-calling, but clearly does not operate, even as a resister, in a Hellenized intellectual environment.” He (119) also points out that “Hebrew אֵטוּן is now recognized to be a loan word in Semitic from Egyptian *ydmy*.” In this vein, he casts doubt on the influence of Greek thought on the book of Proverbs by noting that “the language of Proverbs suggests that the composition of the book was essentially finished during the Persian era.” Christine R. Yoder (34), by analyzing these terms, also asserts that “there are neither Greek loanwords nor expressions necessarily derived from Greek thought in Proverbs 1-9 and 31:1-31.” See Yoder, *Wisdom as a Woman of Substance: A Socioeconomic Reading of Proverbs 1-9 and 31:10-31* (Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2014), 32-34. In this vein, Clifford (5) also concludes that “there are no Grecisms in the book, which suggests a pre-Hellenistic date (before 333 B.C.E). In sum, the book cannot be dated with certainty from its language.” Nonetheless, as Washington (120) recognizes, “The penetration of Hellenistic culture deep into northern Palestine before Alexander’s arrival,” appears in other evidence, such as the spread of Greek names and the Samaritan papyri at Wadi Daliyeh in pre-Hellenistic Palestine. Hengel (1:61) notes that the use of Greek names was widespread among the Semitic populations of pre-Hellenistic Palestine, and it reflects the advance of the Greek language in Palestine in the early Hellenistic period. Despite the uncertainty of Greek loanwords in the book of Proverbs, Hengel (1:155-57) tries to show linguistic evidence of Hellenistic influences on the book by tracing the evidence of an encounter of Jewish wisdom with Hellenistic wisdom which appears in the texts (e.g., Prov 8 and 9). In this sense, Hengel (1:153-54) assumes that “the independent wisdom hymn Prov 8:22-31, which was probably worked in at a relatively late stage” (154), i.e., around the early Hellenistic period, at the latest, by “the middle of the third century B.C.E.” See also Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:61-65. In addition, Michael E. Stone (28) notes, “What is evident already, from the Wadi Daliyeh texts and even more from the Zenon papyri, is that the process of Hellenization was well under way at the end of the fourth and early in the third centuries B.C.E., and started to some extent, even before Alexander the Great.” See Stone, *Scriptures, Sects, and Visions, A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 27-28.

[83] Michael V. Fox, *Proverbs 1-9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st ed. (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 343.

much older literature."[84] Hengel and Alice M. Sinnott also assume that the book of Proverbs might have been formulated from the beginning of the exilic period until the post-exilic period and possibly even the early Hellenistic period.[85] These scholarly opinions suggest that the composition of Proverbs had a long developmental process that occurred over the course of both the pre-exilic and post-exilic period, and that the influence of Jewish wisdom speculation was widespread until the early Hellenistic period.[86] It is crucial to note that the wisdom of Proverbs is of two distinctive kinds: one may be characterized as didactic or practical wisdom, and the other as speculative or personified Wisdom.[87] The religious and moral instructions in Proverbs in accord with the purpose of Proverbs, which is directly explained in Prov 1:2-4, represent wisdom not only as an important compositional and theological source but also as a hypostatic notion, which is substantially identified with God.[88] The elements of practical wisdom are found throughout all the chapters of Proverbs. Yet the representations of wisdom in Prov 1-9 appear to be different from Prov 10-31. As most scholars analyzed, the final editor(s) of the book of Proverbs introduced the basic premises in Prov 1-9 to the earlier wisdom instructions in Prov 10-31. It also appears evident that, as Clifford argues, the editor(s) implicitly intended to connect the "father-son" instructions to the speeches of personified Wisdom (Prov 1:20; 8:1-36) to Prov 1-9 through a literal, metaphorical or allegorical approach.[89] The "father-son" instructions, which focus on the practical wisdom in Prov 1-9, appear analogous to the instructions (wisdom and authority) of personified Wisdom to the audiences.[90] Even within Prov 1-9, as most scholars agree, the personification of wisdom in Prov 1, 8-9 appears to be different from the practical wisdom in Prov 2-7.[91] The wisdom in Prov 5 and 7 seems as a general literary expression without a mythological background in contrast to Woman Wisdom in Prov 8-9. The change of the concept of Wisdom that can be detected within Prov 1-9, involves a shift from a motif of practical wisdom to a symbolic motif of personified Wisdom.[92]

---

[84] Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*, 5.

[85] See Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:153-7; Alice M. Sinnott, *The Personification of Wisdom* (England: Ashgate Pub., 2005), 6-7. As noted earlier, despite the lack of linguistic evidence, when considering various (historical and ideological) contexts (e.g., dynamic interactions between Hellenistic and Jewish cultures in pre-Hellenistic Palestine), the possibility of the date of its final editing in the early Hellenistic period cannot be ignored. In this sense, it appears to be reasonable to accept that there were several authors who wrote and finally edited the collections of Proverbs in the early Second Temple period, which includes, at the latest, the early Hellenistic period, i.e., the fourth century B.C.E.

[86] Samuel L. Adams, *Proverbs, Book of*, in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; 2010), 1103; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:151-7; Clifford, *Proverbs*, 1, 5-6, 31. Clifford suggests that "The book of Proverbs consists of several collections of instructions, speeches, and two-line sayings" (1). As Clifford notes, Proverbs also seems to have influenced "the rabbinic sources, such as *Pirqe. Abot*, *the Saying of the Father's*, a collection of sayings such as "*the men of the Great Assembly* between fifth to the third century B.C.E.," and "the commentary in *Abot de Rabbi Nathan* in the Mishnah, and the descendants of Rabbi Judah the Prince in the third century C.E." (31).

[87] Daniel J. Harrington, in *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (London: Routledge, 1996), 8, argues that Proverbs provides significant understandings and vocabularies to other wisdom literature, such as Qumran texts, Qoheleth, and *Sirach*, as well as the *Wisdom of Solomon*.

[88] Prov 1:2-4: "(2) That men may appreciate wisdom and discipline, may understand words of intelligence (3) May receive training in wise conduct, in what is right, just and honest (4) That resourcefulness may be imparted to the simple, to the young man knowledge and discretion." (NAB). On the meaning of hypostasis, see the discussions in Pauliina Remes, "Neoplatonism," 48-49; John P. Anton, "Some Logical Aspects of the Concept of Hypostasis in Plotinus," *The Review of Metaphysics* 31 (2) (1977): 258-71. As noted earlier, in Plotinus's metaphysic system, these are higher spiritual principles, i.e., hypostases such as the Soul and the Intellect which emanate from the One. In Christian theology, a hypostasis represents one of the three distinct substances or persons in the essence and unity of God. In other words, the term hypostasis is used for representing a person of "three *hypostases*, Father, Son, and Spirit" in relation to the conception of "one *ousia*" in the Trinity. See Erwin Fahlbusch and G. W. Bromiley, *The Encyclopedia of Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 542-3. I will discuss in turn and in detail the aspects of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Wisdom, Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah*, later in this study.

It is also notable that there is a profound nexus between the concepts of wisdom and Torah in the book of Proverbs. The primary concept of Torah in the book of Proverbs appears to have a didactic meaning, such as "instruction" or "teaching," in accordance with the lexical meaning of the Hebrew word "Torah," which was used in a wide variety of contexts and has "a rich set of connotations in early Jewish texts."[93] This is seen in examples, such as the following: תּוֹרַת אִמֶּךָ (Prov 1:8), בְּנִי, תּוֹרָתִי (Prov 3:1), תּוֹרַת אִמֶּךָ (Prov 6:20), וְתוֹרָה אוֹר (Prov 6:23), and וְתוֹרָתִי (Prov 7:2). As Levenson notes, the meaning of Torah is not limited to the Mosaic Torah (i.e., the Pentateuch), but refers to "a broader tradition of extrabiblical law and narrative, authoritative interpretation, and cosmic wisdom" throughout the Second Temple period.[94] This implies that the concept of Torah in Proverbs, rather than the juridical and ritual laws of Moses, appears to be related to the concept of wisdom, which is derived from the revelation of God.[95]

---

[89] Clifford, "Proverbs 1-9 as Instruction for a Young Man and for 'Everyman'" in *When the Morning Stars Sang*, eds., Scott C. Jones, Christine R. Yoder, and Choon L. Seow (Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2018), 129-35; Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 319-59; idem, *Proverbs 10-31*, 902-17; Ronald E. Murphy, *Proverbs*, Word Biblical Commentary 22 (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1998); Tava Forti, "The *Isa Zara* in Proverbs 1-9: Allegory and Allegorization," *Hebrew Studies* 48 (2007): 89-100. These scholars analyzed a metaphorical, allegorical or analogical relationship between parents' instructions and those of personified Wisdom.

[90] Clifford, "Proverbs 1-9 as Instruction," 135-41.

[91] Michael V. Fox, *Proverbs 1-9,* 343; Clifford, *Proverbs,* 5-6. As noted earlier, the dating of Prov 1, 8-9 which describes the personification of wisdom, is a controversial issue as some scholars, such as Hengel, Sinnot, extend its dates to the early Hellenistic period. See Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:153-57; Sinnott, *The Personification of Wisdom*, 3-7, 171-2. In my view, it is reasonable to assume that Prov 2-7 is dated to the exilic or early post-exilic period, especially around the Persian period, while Prov 8-9 is from the Persian period (the sixth and fifth century B.C.E.), at the latest, to early Hellenistic period (the fourth century B.C.E.).

[92] Bernd U. Schipper, "When Wisdom Is Not Enough! The Discourse on Wisdom and Torah and the Composition of the Book of Proverbs," in *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*, eds. Bernd U. Schipper and David A. Teeter (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 75-76.

In this context, Michael A. Fishbane and Hindy Najman also argue that this feature alludes to not only a conceptual development of Torah by Deuteronomic reworkings of earlier wisdom traditions in the Second Temple period but also a theological change regarding Wisdom in relation to the Torah.[96] It is notable that Torah appears to be profoundly related to or even identical with Wisdom (e.g., Ps 119; Prov 1, 3 and 8; Sir 24;Wis 7 and 8) in early Jewish texts.[97] This concept of Torah in relation to Wisdom alludes to a sapiential sense of "the counsel of a sage" derived from the wisdom and revelation of God, rather than the juridical and ritual laws of Moses.[98] This alludes to a Jewish wisdom speculation, which combines the sapiential and covenantal theologies with the Mosaic (or Deuteronomistic) concept of Torah.[99] This substantiates not only remarkable evidence of a Torah-centered tradition influenced by Deuteronomistic Laws in respect to didactic wisdom but also a conceptual development of Torah through the dynamic interactions with the concept of Hellenistic wisdom in the Second Temple period.

---

[93] Najman, "Torah and Tradition," 1316. Before the canonization of the Hebrew Bible, these texts may have been called as the Torah. Levenson, in "The Sources of Torah," 570, notes three sources of Torah from Ps 119: 1) "received tradition, passed on most explicitly by teachers" (vv. 99-100); 2) "cosmic or natural law" (vv. 89-91); 3) unmediated divine teaching" (e.g., vv. 26-29).

[94] Levenson, "The Sources of Torah," 566-67. Clifford, in *Proverbs*, 5, points out that the meaning of Torah, including "Law" and "command," in Proverbs does not appear to be directly related to "the Torah of Moses which would presuppose the missions of Ezra and Nehemiah in the fifth century B.C.E."

[95] Clifford (5) notes that the primary meaning of Torah reflects "prudent advice (which is nonetheless considered inspired and from God)." Clifford (49-53, 82-90) further explains that it reflects "teachings" as part of a teacher-disciple or father-son relationship in Ancient Near Eastern culture. Washington implies that the meaning of Torah in Proverbs appears to be related to the laws and post-exilic prohibitions against marriages with foreign women in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, which appear in manner similar to the polemic against the strange woman in the book of Proverbs. See also Washington, "The Strange Woman (אשה זרה/ נכריה) of Proverbs 1-9 and Post-Exilic Judean Society," in *Second Temple Studies Vol. 2: Temple Community in the Persian Period*, eds. Tamara C. Eskenazi and Kent H. Richards (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 233-37. These implications of Torah appear to be compatible with the meanings of "teachings" and "instructions."

[96] Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 213-16; Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 20-31. Fishbane and Najman show the evidence of Deuteronomic reworkings in the various examples of rewritten Bible and pseudepigrapha, which proliferated in the Second Temple period.

[97] Najman, "Torah and Tradition," 1317; Matthew J. Goff, "Wisdom Literature," in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 1341.

[98] Levenson, "The Sources of Torah," 566-7.

In this vein, Bernd U. Schipper also notes that, in the book of Proverbs, there appears to be a profound nexus between the didactic Torah and personified Wisdom based on an intertextual comparison between Prov 3, 6 and Prov 7, 8.[100] Indeed, the degree of the distinction between the didactic Torah and wisdom (or personified Wisdom) in Prov 3, 6, 7 appears to be gradually attenuated in Prov 8.[101] In addition, we can see the changing meanings and uses of בִּינָה (*binah*) and חָכְמָה (*ḥokhmah*) between Prov 3, 6, and Prov 7, 8. Specifically, a conceptual change in the meaning of *ḥokhmah* in Prov 7:4 (a verse which refers to בִּינָה and חָכְמָה) and the usages of Wisdom and Torah of Prov 3 and 6, show explicit evidence of a shifting process from the practical motif of wisdom, which is related to didactic Torah, to the symbolic motif of Wisdom. In this vein, Schipper suggests the dynamic interactions (i.e., a theological conflict, or debate) between the Deuteronomic Torah and the concept of Wisdom in the process of the final editing and composition of the book of Proverbs.[102] On the basis of this examination, I will discuss in greater detail the intertextual, exegetical, and theological relationships of personified Wisdom to Torah in this study.

---

[99] Ibid., 566-71; M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 244-319. This alludes to not only a possibility of divine inspiration, even after the canonical prophets but also a witness to the rabbinic concept of non-Pentateuchal Torah.

[100] Schipper, “When Wisdom Is Not Enough!” 75-6. Schipper argues that the main strategy of the author of Prov 31, which is generally considered to be the final redactor’s chapter, is to intentionally reduce the theological position of wisdom from the heavenly level (i.e., personified Wisdom) to the earthly level (i.e., practical wisdom). This is indicative of the author’s theological intention, which appears in scribal and exegetical practices regarding personified Wisdom.

[101] See Schipper, in “Wisdom is not enough!” 63, notes the conceptual changes and relationships of Torah and personified Wisdom in Prov 6, 7, and 8. In particular, personified Wisdom in Prov 7 seems to play a critical role in introducing her in Prov 8, 9. See also Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 343.

[102] Ibid.; Schipper, 75-6. Schipper asserts that on the basis of a reception of Deuteronomy in Prov 1-9, the concept of wisdom appears to serve as a hermeneutic tool for a didactic concept of Torah.

It is notable that Clifford summarizes the scholarly research on personified Wisdom as divided into four theories all of which concern the processes of adoptation of ancient Near Eastern literature: “1) Wisdom is a hypostasis of Yahweh; 2) Wisdom as a Syro-Palestinian or Egyptian goddess such as the Goddess Ma'at, Isis and Canaanite Goddess and so on;[103] 3) Wisdom as the Mesopotamian divine or semi-divine *ummānu* in terms of a mythology; 4) Wisdom as a pure literary personification.”[104] Clifford assesses the formative and developmental process of personified Wisdom in Proverbs in conjunction with Wisdom literature in the ancient Near East by summarizing various scholarly theories of personified Wisdom, which were formulated against the backdrop of the processes of adoptation of ancient Near Eastern literature.[105] Specifically, by analyzing these literary and textual features, Clifford connects the identity of personified Wisdom to the term אָמוֹן in Prov 8:22, as an ongoing polemical issue. He states that אָמוֹן, derives its meanings from the Akaddian *ummānu*, which means "sage," a term which is close in meaning to "teacher."[106] Clifford further investigates the relationship of אָמוֹן (which signifies or is identical with personified Wisdom) and the post-Flood *ummānu* as a sage or master, which is derived from the Akkadian *apkallu*, who was the god of wisdom in the Mesopotamian mythology.[107] Indeed, the Mesopotamian *apkallu-ummānu* traditions etymologically and philologically appear as the origin of the personification of wisdom in the book of Proverbs in light of the Mesopotamian tradition.[108] By this logic, Clifford identifies אָמוֹן with personified Wisdom as a sage-like or mature heavenly figure.[109] Clifford's argument shows that the images of the personified (Woman) Wisdom figure in Prov 8 and 9 appear to be derived from the genre of ancient epics of Mesopotamian mythology.[110] Like Clifford, several scholars, such as Jonas C. Greenfield, Henri Cazelles, and Alan Lenzi also discussed the provenance of אָמוֹן in Prov 8:30 through its linguistic nexus with the Akkadian *ummānu*.[111] This examination demonstrates that the images and roles of personified Wisdom appear close to the roles and images of a sage with authority and wisdom or a mature heavenly figure which is closer to a symbolic mediator, and which connects the human audiences and God.

---

[103] Fox, *Proverbs 1-9,* 331. As an example of an extended allegorical personification of an abstract virtue, Fox notes the Late Egyptian tale, in which truth and falsehood are meant as “Two Brothers in Egyptian literature (Pap. Chester Beatty II; AEL 2.211-14).” The allegorical personification also does not indicate hypostatization in itself. In this sense, Fox notes that the literary, mythological, and real-life background images entered into the portrayal of Woman Wisdom needs not amount to a personification of Wisdom. In addition to these hypothetical models of personified Wisdom, I also found, in my study of the history of the gods of ancient Egypt, that there is a strong (i.e., etymological and mythological) relationship between personified Wisdom (אָמוֹן) and *Amun*, as a divine figure, who is personified as the king of the gods in Egyptian sources. See E. A. Wallis. Budge, *The Gods of the Egyptians: Or, Studies in Egyptian Mythology* (Chicago: Open Court Pub., 1904), 137-45; Richard Wilkinson, *The Complete Gods and Goddesses of Ancient Egypt* (New York: Thames, 2003), 92-7; *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, ed., James B. Pritchard (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1950), 368. *Amun* first was stationed in Thebes in the twelfth dynasty and antedates the Amarna Revolution. In particular, *Amun,* which means “hidden” or “concealed,” appears as a symbol of Egyptian polytheism (especially triad gods) at the pinnacle of Egyptian civilization during the New Kingdom period. *Amun,* who was primarily considered a god of war in the beginning of the New Kingdom and was successively identified with all other Egyptian deities. *Amun* became the king of the gods by the 18th Dynasty. In the creation hymns regarding *Amun*, such as *A Hymn to Amun-Re* and *Amun (Amon) as the Sole God*, *Amun* appears not only as a creator god or solar god in a monotheistic manner but also as a symbolized and personified being (e.g., a warrior or king) from the divine. In addition, *Amun* appears as a personified god or king of gods. This conveys a monotheistic feature in a manner similar to Aten who was prominent in the Amarna Revolution. In spite of a lack of intertextual research, there is a possibility of an etymological and mythological relationship between personified Wisdom (אָמוֹן) and *Amun* and even the Mesopotamian *ummānu* .I hope to examine this question in greater detail in a separate study.

[104] Clifford, *Proverbs*, 23.

[105] Ibid., 23-28. Clifford summarizes the research, since Gunkel viewed “the Bible against its ancient Near East literary background.” Cf. Ronald E. Murphy, “The Personification of Wisdom,” in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel: Essays in Honour of J. A. Emerton*, eds. John Day, et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 222-33.

---

[106] Ibid., 99-101. As Clifford explains, Akaddian *ummānu* refers t wisdom, understood as having a pedagogical dimension, which is taught by the institutions of king, the scribe, and the family (father and mother) in the ancient Near Eastern culture.

[107] Ibid., 26-27. The epithet *apkallu* given to Marduk means the sage of the gods, and the epithet *ummānu* designates their human, post-flood counterparts. This shows a process of transmission of heavenly wisdom to the human beings.

[108] Ibid., 24-28. The *Babyloniaca* of Berossus and the van Dijk list of kings and their sages (which is dated to 164 B.C.E.) attest to the mythology of the *apkallu* and *ummanu.* These translations are available in Stanley M. Burstein, *The Babyloniaca of Berossus*, Sources and Monographs. Sources from the Ancient Near East 1:05 (Malibu, CA: Undena, 1978) and the van Dijk list of kings and their sages in R. Caplice, *Background of Old Testament History: Mesopotamian Texts* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1982), 35-36.

[109] Clifford, *Proverbs*, 99-101.

[110] Clifford, et. al., "Woman wisdom in the book of Proverbs," in eds. Georg Braulik, Walter Gross, and Sean McEvenue, *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel*: *Für Norbert Lohfink SJ* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 61-72. As Clifford analyzes, Proverbs appears to have transposed the epic type-scenes, such as the "life or death scenario," and the encounter of the goddess and the youth.

[111] Jonas C. Greenfield, "Apkallu," in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, eds. Kevin van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst, 2nd extensively rev. ed (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999), 72-74; Lenzi, "The Uruk List of Kings and Sages and Late Mesopotamian Scholarship," *JANER* 8 (2008):137-69. Clifford, Greenfield, and Lenzi argue for its explicit linguistic nexus with Akkadian *ummānu,* which appears in the Uruk lists of kings and sages in the ancient Near Eastern sources. See Clifford, "Proverbs 8:22-31," 694-95. Lenzi also tries to connect the Akkadian *ummānu* to the Hebrew term אמן (instead of אמון) as a designation of Wisdom, which attests to the Greek term τεχνῖτις "craftsman, artisan," playing as an agent in the creation context. See also Henri Cazelles, "Ahiqar, 'Umman,' and 'Amun, and Biblical Wisdom Texts," in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield,* eds. Ziony Zevit, Seymour Gitin, and Michael Sokoloff (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 45-55; Cleon L. Rogers III, "The Meaning and Significance of the Hebrew Word אמון in Proverbs 8, 30," *ZAW* 109 (1997): 208-21; Alan Lenzi, "Proverbs 8:22-31: Three Perspectives on Its Composition," *JBL* 125, no. 4 (2006): 700-3. As Lenzi analyzes, נסכתי, in Prov 8:23, appears to be very similar to *nassiki,* a common epithet for Ea that is attested to in the Akkadian texts. In light of the Akkadian and Mesopotamian tradition, Lenzi also argues that the particular

However, in contrast to Clifford and Lenzi, who emphasize its images of a sage or a teacher, Fox interprets אָמוֹן as a "nursling" or "child (or son)," in the sense of a hypostasis of Yahweh, and later refines the view by translating it as "growing up"—grammatically, in an "infinitive absolute functioning as an adverbial complement."[112] According to Fox, the compositional, exegetical, and intertextual features in the book of Proverbs strongly support a literary and exegetical development (i.e., from an inchoate stage to full-fledged stage) in the personification of wisdom and the features of the personified Wisdom figure in relation to the concept of Torah.[113] In a manner similar to Fox, Sinnott suggests that the concept of personified Wisdom was developed in a gradual process through various ideological and theological responses to a critical event and dramatic change, such as the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, the Babylonian Exile, and even the invasion of Alexander the Great in the early Hellenistic period.[114] Schipper also tries to see the personified Wisdom figure as a literary and exegetical feature of a certain prophetic group during the exilic or post-exilic period, whose theological intention was to establish the authority of the Deuteronomic written Torah.[115]

---

usages and images of "water words" such as נסכתי and תהום in Prov 8:22-31 and Gen 1:7, and 8 appear similar to the "water and birth" images of Ea in the Mesopotamian tradition (e.g., *Enumah Elish* I. 79-108; IV). Cf. Stephanie Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 235-36.

[112] Fox, "'Amon Again," *JBL* 115, no. 4 (1996): 699-702; idem, *Proverbs 1-9*, 285-87. Following the later view, Fox translates it as "I was near him, growing up." (Prov 8:30, 285), and explicates various interpretations, such as in *Gen. Rab.* i. (286-87). In this vein, Fox eventually appears to reject a divine origin of Woman Wisdom.

[113] Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 331-32. Fox notes, "The literary development of the figure, such as the trope of personification is frequent and significant in the Hebrew Bible (Ps 85:11, Isa 59:14)."

[114] Sinnott, *The Personification of Wisdom*, 3-7, 171-2. Her argument is based on the mythological, and even Greek depictions of personified Wisdom as a feminine form in Prov 1, 7, 8, and 9. Regarding the features of personified Wisdom, Sinnott also refers to a significant theological and socio-political nexus between *Sirach* and *The Wisdom of Solomon*.

[115] Bernd U. Schipper, "When Wisdom Is Not Enough," 75-76. Schipper concludes, "the shift is related to a theological discourse on the status of Torah in post-exilic times and to the question whether the Deuteronomistic concept of Torah as a kind of sapiential instruction can lead to a life according to the will of God" (76). He also observes that there is "a reception of Deuteronomy in Proverbs 1-9," which alludes to "a didactic concept where wisdom can serve as a hermeneutic of Torah, transmitting the divine word from one generation to the other" (75). This implies that in the process of the final composition and editing of the book of

On this controversial issue regarding the provenance and development of the personified Wisdom figure, I am primarily in agreement with the Mesopotamian origin of personified Wisdom, which Clifford, Greenfield, and Lenzi proved to be philologically and intertextually based on the Mesopotamian mythology and its traditions. On the other hand, partially keeping with Fox's explanation of its literary development, the explicit Mesopotamian influences on it appears to fit in its inchoate stage of its literary development. However, the Hellenistic influences on it also appear in a full-fledged stage, which combines Hellenistic ideas and the idiosyncratic idea(s) of the author(s) of Prov 8:22-31. In this sense, it is reasonable to assume that the images and meanings of personified Wisdom, through the works of the later authors, gradually changed and transformed throughout the Persian and Hellenistic periods. Later in the phenomenological analysis, I will examine and reevaluate in great detail various images and connotations of personified Wisdom (אָמוֹן) in Prov 8:22-31, which were dynamically formulated by its transformative process.

Personified Wisdom in Sirach, The Wisdom of Solomon, and Qumran Texts

In order to trace the development of the concepts of Torah and various derivative forms of the images of personified Wisdom in relation to Torah I will delve into the related usages of personified Wisdom in other Jewish wisdom literature, such as deuterocanonical books, *Wisdom of Ben Sira* (=*Sirach*), *Wisdom of Solomon*, and the Qumran wisdom texts. As Richard M. Frank argues, the intertextual evidence of personified Wisdom in relation to Torah in the Hebrew Bible (especially the book of Proverbs) provides not only a critical understanding of her pre-existence and relationship with God in creation but also a way of approaching her relationships with the personified Wisdom figures in the deutero-canonical texts, such as Sir 24 and Wis 7.[116]

Proverbs, the concept of wisdom was reduced, whereas the level of the Deuteronomic and written Torah was increased.

[116] Frank, *The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach* (*Sinai Ar. 155. IXth-Xth Cent.*) (Louvain: CorpusSCO, 1974), 33-34.

Sirach dates approximately to the second century B.C.E in the late Hellenistic period.[117] The personified Wisdom figure in *Sirach* reflects a particular socio-historical situation in the early second century Jerusalem under Hellenistic influences.[118] In Sir 24, there appears a close relationship between the Temple (v.10), Jerusalem (Zion) (v.11), Israel (v.8), personified Wisdom (v.1), and the Torah (v.23), as is reflected in the Table. 1.[119]

Table 1. The relationship between Wisdom, and Torah in relation to Zion

Sir 24:1-2	א	החכמה תהלל נפשה ובקרב עם אלהים תתפאר
	ב	בעדת אל תפתח פיה ובתוך עמו תתהדר
8-11	ח	אז פקד עלי יוצר כל ואל עשני אמר ל
		ביעקב תשכון ובישראל תשתר
	ט	מראש קדמי תבל נבראתי ולעלמי עד לא יסוף זכרי
	י	במשכן קדשו לפניו עבדתי ושם בצין אתו קמתי
	יא	בקריה אהובה נחתי וירושלים עיר ממשלתי
23	כג	תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת יעקב
33	לג	עוד כנבואת יי אטיף מלתי ולקחי אקים לדור אחרו

In Sir 24:1, חכמה is personified in a feminine form, which is translated as Ἡ σοφία in the LXX.[120] The personified Wisdom figure introduces and sings her own praises to her own people “in the assembly of the Most High (בתוך עמו)” (v.2). In particular, in Sir 24:8-11, Ben Sira seems to evoke the presence of personified Wisdom in the beginning of creation in God's beloved city of Jerusalem, by connecting it to personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31.[121] Wisdom is obviously depicted as dwelling at the Temple of Jerusalem in Israel in Sir 24:8-11. Ben Sira's expressions in Sir 24:23, 33 remind us of the profound relationship between personified Wisdom and Torah and their roles in Zion. Specifically, in Sir 24:33, Ben Sira implies that the Torah appears to be equated with Wisdom as an expositor of the Torah, who "again will pour out teaching like prophecy" (עוד כנבואתיי אטיף מלתי).[122] This corroborates a prophetic and salvific role and image of personified Wisdom for Zion and the people of Israel.[123]

---

[117] Benjamin G. Wright III, “Ben Sira, Book of,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; 2010), 437. In *Sirach*, the differences between the Hebrew original and its Greek translation illustrate a developmental process of Jewish sapiential tradition in broader Hellenistic contexts. The purpose of *Sirach* appears to be identical with the theme of the book of Proverbs: discipline through the teaching of Wisdom.

[118] Ibid. For instance, Ben Sira seems to use the tradition of personified Woman Wisdom for the emphasis of the authority of the Torah. The image of personified Wisdom as a sage or teacher appears to be related to the woman's roles in a literary and socio-historical context. This text tries to change the authoritative image of Woman Wisdom in Proverbs into the practical values in her life (Sir 25:8; 26:1-16; 28:15; 36:24-27; 40:23) in a manner reminiscent of the woman of strength in Prov 31. However, in the Jewish life of Jerusalem during the shifting period of authority from the Ptolemaic to Seleucid period around 200 B.C.E, the idealized female Wisdom figure did not lead to the social equality of women, but appears as a manifestation of a conservative Jewish perspective about women, which overtly resisted the pressures of Hellenization.

[119] Patrick W. Skehan, “Structures in Poems on Wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24,” *CBQ* 41, no. 3 (1979): 374. This text is a sort of modern reconstruction since Sir 24 is not extant in Hebrew. Here is the translation provided by Skehan: “(1) Wisdom shall praise herself, and shall glory in the midst of her people (2) In the congregation of the most High shall she open her mouth, and triumph before his power… (8) then, the Creator of all gave me his command, and my Creator chose the spot for my tent. He said, ‘In Jacob make your dwelling, in Israel your inheritance.’ (9) Before all ages, from the beginning, he created me, and through all ages I shall not cease to be. (10) In the holy tent I ministered before him, and so I was established in Zion. (11) In the city he loves as he loves me, he gave me rest; in Jerusalem, my domain.”

[120] Frank, *The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach*, 33. Wisdom is *ḥokhmah* (חכמה) in Hebrew and Sophia (Σοφία) in Greek.

Based on these relationships, Friedrich V. Reiterer explains the nexus between Wisdom and Torah in *Sirach*: as gifts of God for Israel, the Torah becomes "the law of life (Sir 17:11), and the fulfillment of the law (Sir 34:8)" through Wisdom.[124] Andrew T. Glicksman also explains that the image of personified Wisdom in Sir 24 has a liturgical role as a mediator between God and human beings.[125] In particular, we can see the intertextual and compositional similarities between Sir 24:9 and Prov 8:23, as well as Gen 1:1-2.[126]

---

[121] Andrew T. Glicksman, *Wisdom of Solomon 10: A Jewish Hellenistic Reinterpretation of Early Israelite History through Sapiential Lenses* (Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2011), 122-23. Glicksman (164) also observes that the author seems to place Wisdom in the heavenly court and the Temple in Jerusalem. This also alludes to a profound relationship between Torah and Zion.

[122] I translated this verse following NABRE. See also Harrington, in *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (London: Routledge, 1996), 8.

[123] Sinnott, 137. This these can also be found elsewhere. Mic 4:2 is a representative verse: "For from Zion will come the Torah and from the Jerusalem the Word of YHWH."

[124] Friedrich 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. Passaro, Angelo and Giuseppe Bellia, *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature* 1 (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 224-8. Reiterer offers a summary of the attributes and activities of God, such as wisdom, creation, and law for human beings, by connecting them to the theological, soteriological, and practical functions of the Torah.

[125] Glicksman, 12-23. Interestingly, Ben Sira, in a sense, seems to describe himself as personified Wisdom as a resident in Jerusalem. Glicksman mentions that the liturgical purpose is focused on the relationship between the heavenly God and the people of Israel.

[126] Ibid.; Reinhard Adler, *Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft*, http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/online-bibeln/ueber-die-online-bibeln/ (accessed by Oct. 2020). I translated these texts by referring various translations such as NIV. Glicksman supports his assertions by quoting the earlier Biblical texts as well as their reinterpretations.

Translations of Table 2. Gen 1:1-2 and Prov 8: 22-24, 27, 30

Gen 1:1-2	1 In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. 2 The earth was without form and void, and darkness was over the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters.

Table 2. The Intertextual Allusions between Sirach, Genesis, and Proverbs

Sir 24:9	מראש קדמי תבל נבראתי ולעלמי עד לא יסוף זכרי
Gen 1:1-2	א בְּרֵאשִׁית, בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים, אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם, וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ ב וְהָאָרֶץ, הָיְתָה תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ, וְחֹשֶׁךְ, עַל-פְּנֵי תְהוֹם; וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים, מְרַחֶפֶת עַל-פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם
Prov 8:22	כב יְהוָה--קָנָנִי, רֵאשִׁית דַּרְכּוֹ: קֶדֶם מִפְעָלָיו מֵאָז.
23	כג מֵעוֹלָם, נִסַּכְתִּי מֵרֹאשׁ-- מִקַּדְמֵי-אָרֶץ.
24	כד בְּאֵין-תְּהֹמוֹת חוֹלָלְתִּי; בְּאֵין מַעְיָנוֹת, נִכְבַּדֵּי-מָיִם.
27	כז בַּהֲכִינוֹ שָׁמַיִם, שָׁם אָנִי; בְּחֻקוֹ חוּג, עַל-פְּנֵי תְהוֹם
30	ל וָאֶהְיֶה אֶצְלוֹ, אָמוֹן: וָאֶהְיֶה שַׁעֲשׁוּעִים, יוֹם יוֹם

Sir 24:9, “He created me from the beginning before the world, and I shall not fail forever,” explicitly alludes to the first moment of Gen 1:1, as well as to the personification of Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31. These three texts particularly show terminological similarities, such as בְּרֵאשִׁית and עַל-פְּנֵי תְהוֹם, and a substitutability, such as אֱלֹהִים and בָּרָא in place of יְהוָה and קָנָנִי.[127] Gen 1:1 provides a critical foundation for a close association of personified Wisdom with God in the creation account of Prov 8:22-31.[128] Glicksman also explains that the motive for personifying Wisdom, which is profoundly related to a liturgical purpose in Sir 24:10, is that it serves the role of Wisdom connecting God and the people of Israel.[129]

Prov 8:22-24, 27, 30	22 The Lord possessed me at the beginning of his work, the first of his acts of old. 23 Ages ago I was set up, at the first, before the beginning of the earth. 24 When there were no depths I was brought forth, when there were no springs abounding with water. 27 When he established the heavens, I was there; when he drew a circle on the face of the deep, 30 Then I was by him, as *amun** brought up with him: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him

[127] Ibid. According to the Documentary Hypothesis, it could be hypothetically said that אֱלֹהִים and בָּרָא in Genesis, belongs to an Elohist source (E) written around 850 B.C.E., and יְהוָה and קָנָנִי in Proverbs, belongs to a Yahwist sources (J) written around 950 B.C.E. Cf. Sir 24:9. However, this does not seem to be a proper chronological calculation. Based on biblical criticism, it is not easy to delineate the chronological order between Genesis and Proverbs on the basis of literary, exegetic, and compositional dimensions. Nonetheless, this strongly implies that Prov 8:22-31 was written with Gen 1 in the background, because the author’s intention of Prov 8:22-31 seems to emphasize the superiority of Wisdom by employing קָנָנִי instead of בָּרָא in Genesis. See Lenzi, “Proverbs 8:22-31,” 694-95, 700-3. As noted earlier, the similarities between the “water words” such as תהום in Gen 1, 7, and 8, and Prov 8:22-31 which reflects a Mesopotamian tradition enhances intertextual and compositional similarities with Sir 24:9.

[128] The remainder of Prov 8 also supports the fact of Wisdom's presence with God during the creation.

[129] Glicksman, *Wisdom of Solomon 10*, 122-23. Sir 24:10 reads, במשכן קדשו לפניו עבדתי ושם בצין אתו קמתי, “In the holy tent I ministered before him, and so I was established in Zion.”

It is notable that Ben Sira, in Sir 24:23, connects and identifies the Torah in the center of the Temple of Jerusalem with the critical role of personified Wisdom in Prov 8.[130] As for Ben Sira's particular preference for Deuteronomy when it comes to the identification of the Wisdom and Torah, we can see a profound nexus between personified Wisdom in Prov 8 and the tradition, which increasingly came to associate personified Wisdom with the Law [Torah] in Sir 24. In this sense, Brooke emphasizes "the richness of the traditions which increasingly come to associate wisdom personified with the Law [Torah] as in the approximately contemporary Ben Sira 24." [131]

Table 3. Evidence of Quotation of Sir 24:23 from Dt 33:4

Sir 24:23	כג כל אלה בספר ברית יי כתובים תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת יעקב
𝕲	23 ταῦτα πάντα βίβλος διαθήκης Θεοῦ ῾Υ ψίστου, νόμον ὃν ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν Μωυσῆς κληρονομίαν συναγωγαῖς ᾿ Ιακώβ.
Dt 33:4	ד תּוֹרָה צִוָּה-לָנוּ, מֹשֶׁה: מוֹרָשָׁה, קְהִלַּת יַעֲקֹב

Indeed, we can see that the nexus between Wisdom and Torah, in addition to a clear inspiration from Prov 8:23 and Gen 1:1-2, is strengthened by the fact that Ben Sira interpolates Dt 33:4 into the verse in Sir 24:23. Sinnott notes that Ben Sira's theological perspective for the identification of Wisdom with the Torah appears to have originally derived from the Hebrew Bible texts, such as Dt 4:5-8, which allude to "a similar notion with the portrayal of Wisdom as Torah in Sir 24:23."[132]

Table 4. Preexistent Evidence of the Relationship between Wisdom and Torah

Dt 4:5-8[133]	ה רְאֵה לִמַּדְתִּי אֶתְכֶם, חֻקִּים וּמִשְׁפָּטִים, כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוַּנִי, יְהוָה אֱלֹהָי: לַעֲשׂוֹת כֵּן--בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ, אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם בָּאִים שָׁמָּה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ ו וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם, וַעֲשִׂיתֶם--כִּי הִוא חָכְמַתְכֶם וּבִינַתְכֶם, לְעֵינֵי הָעַמִּים: אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁמְעוּן, אֵת כָּל-הַחֻקִּים הָאֵלֶּה, וְאָמְרוּ רַק עַם-חָכָם וְנָבוֹן, הַגּוֹי הַגָּדוֹל הַזֶּה ז כִּי מִי-גוֹי גָּדוֹל, אֲשֶׁר-לוֹ אֱלֹהִים קְרֹבִים אֵלָיו, כַּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, בְּכָל-קָרְאֵנוּ אֵלָיו. ח וּמִי גּוֹי גָּדוֹל, אֲשֶׁר-לוֹ חֻקִּים וּמִשְׁפָּטִים צַדִּיקִם, כְּכֹל הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת

---

[130] Sinnott, 110. Regarding this, Sinnott explains that personified Wisdom is utilized in portrayals of the Torah, and that the identification of the Wisdom with the Torah is developed by the personification of Wisdom within "a heritage for the community of Jacob."

[131] George J. Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran," in *The Wisdom texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, Uitgeverij Peeters, 2002), 219.

[132] Sinnott, 137-8. It is meaningful to note that Dt 4:5-8 and Ps 1; 19:8; 119:97-98 show a close intertextual relationship with Wisdom of Ben Sira. In addition, in Sir 24:23, there is a special notion of the relevance of the book of the covenant of God in the history of Israel. This is comparable to texts, such as Ex 24:7, 2 Kgs 23:2, 21:2, Chr 34:31, and 1 Macc 1:57.

[133] (5) "… I have taught you statutes and judgments… (6) Observe them and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the people (8) And what great nation is there, that has statutes and judgments…." I translated these verses by referring to the NIV and KJV translations.

This intertextual connection made through quoting and reinterpreting earlier or older biblical texts, such as Dt 33:4, guarantees more of a profound relationship between Torah and personified Wisdom.[134] This demonstrates that the sources Ben Sira had in his mind also include Deuteronomy, Genesis, and Proverbs. It is possible that Ben Sira aimed at emphasizing the superiority of the Torah and Israelite Wisdom as a response to Hellenistic wisdom, i.e., as a theological response to a historical and ideological circumstance dominant in the Hellenistic period. This also shows not only explicit evidence of a profound nexus between personified Wisdom and Torah but also the manner in which their identification emerged from his practices of rewriting earlier and older scriptural passages, which reflect their relationships.

In a related manner, we can also see another piece of evidence of personified Wisdom in relation to Torah in the *Wisdom of Solomon,* which was composed in Greek in approximately the first century B.C.E.[135] Glicksman notes, “the function and role of Wisdom is connected with the purpose of the book as a whole, [as] in Solomon's prayer for wisdom (Wis 9:1-7).” In a manner similar to *Sirach,* the author of the *Wisdom of Solomon* primarily appears to intend to teach Jewish audiences to seek the way of salvation and safety from the Hellenistic world through the teaching of personified Wisdom in Wis 9:18, and Wis 10.4, and so forth.[136]

Table 5. Evidence of Personified Wisdom in Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon

Wis 9:18	καὶ τῇ σοφίᾳ ἐσώθησαν
Eng.	“were saved by wisdom”
Wis 10:4	δι᾽ ὃν κατακλυζομένην γῆν πάλιν διέσωσε σοφία
Eng.	“wisdom saved again for being drawn with flood”
Sir 24:1	Ἡ σοφία αἰνέσει ψυχὴν αὐτῆς
Eng.	“Wisdom sings her own praises”

---

[134] Ibid., 110.

[135] As David Winston (20) notes, “No consensus has thus far emerged regarding the date of Wisd, and various schoalars have placed it anywhere between 220 B.C.E. and 50 C.E.” Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979), 20-25. See also Randall D. Chesnutt, “Solomon, Wisdom of,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; 2010), 1243. The audience of this book seems to be Jews who lived in Alexandria, a Hellenistic city at that time.

[136] Glicksman, 160-2. In Wis 10:1-21, the author seems to emphasize that God and Wisdom have an identical reality insofar as Wisdom, like God, is involved in salvation. Glicksman’s conclusion is that the author attempts to portray Wisdom as a guide and savior, while recalling the salvific works of God, such as the Exodus.

In the *Wisdom of Solomon*, the combination between personified Wisdom of Proverbs and philosophical ideas, such as the Stoic Logos and “spirit” (πνεῦμα), reveals a considerable influence from Platonic and Hellenistic thought.[137] It is also worth paying attention to some different cultural influences on the *Wisdom of Solomon*, such as those of the Egyptian and Mesopotamian cultures and ideologies.[138] Unlike personified Wisdom in *Sirach*, she appears as a divine being with a God-like image who takes part in creation in Wis 7:25-8:1.[139] In this regard, David Winston notes that this is “the earliest attestation of its explicit application to the Logos or Sophia (i.e., Wisdom) as an emanation from God.”[140] The philosophical nexus between the ideas of Logos and Torah, found in the depiction of personified Wisdom, appear to have been influenced by Platonic and Hellenistic thought.[141] Indeed, a conceptual and intertextual nexus between personified Wisdom and Torah appears in the *Wisdom of Solomon*. The terms λόγος and νομός are translated as the Word of God or the Law of Moses in the following phrases, such as “your word” λόγῳ σου (Wis 9:1), “law” νόμον (Wis 6:4), which can be equivalent with חוק, and "instruction" παιδείας (Wis 6:17) with מוסר.

Table 6. Intertextual Nexus between Personified Wisdom and Torah in *Wisdom of Solomon*

Wis 9:1	ΘΕΕ πατέρων καὶ Κύριε τοῦ ἐλέους ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ σου
Eng.	O God of fathers, Lord of mercy, who has created all things in your word
Wis 6:4	οὐδὲ ἐφυλάξατε νόμον, οὐδὲ κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπορεύθητε.
Eng.	you did not keep the law, and did not follow the counsel of God
Wis6:17(18)	ἀρχὴ γὰρ αὐτῆς ἡ ἀληθεστάτη παιδείας ἐπιθυμία, φροντὶς δὲ παιδείας ἀγάπη,
Eng.	For the beginning of wisdom is to love true discipline; the results of discipline is love

The terms νομός and λόγος in *Wisdom of Solomon*, which appear to be semantically identified with Torah, have an implicit correlation with Wisdom in a manner similar to the identification between personified Wisdom and Torah in *Sirach*. However, in contrast to *Sirach*, the *Wisdom of Solomon* does not appear to attempt to directly connect personified Wisdom to Torah, but instead emphasizes the images and roles of personified Wisdom in relation to a philosophical Logos or God Himself.

---

[137] Ibid.

[138] Ibid., 165-70. For instance, there are mythological texts that describe the Egyptian goddess Isis.

[139] Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, 184-90.

[140] Ibid., 185.

[141] Martin J. Scott C., *Sophia and the Johannine Jesus* (Sheffield: *JSOT* Press, 1992), 89.

Furthermore, the images of personified Wisdom are depicted as a "guide" in διέσωσε ἔσωσεν σοφία in Wis 10:4 and as a "savior" in σοφίᾳ ἐσώθησαν in Wis 9:18.[142] The self-narrative of personified Wisdom leads to the inference that God speaks through the prophets for the salvific revelations. This shows that the image of personified Wisdom symbolically appears as a salvific and God-like figure in an intimate relationship with God.

More interestingly, personified Wisdom also appears in the sapiential texts from Qumran, which were most likely composed from around the early second century B.C.E to the late first century C.E. The character of wisdom in the Qumran texts alludes to an eschatological aspect of personified Wisdom, which is also asserted in *Sirach*.[143] In the Qumran Wisdom texts, there are a few passages that relate to personified Wisdom, such as 4Q184, 4Q185, 4Q525, "Sir 51:13-30" (11QPs^{a}=11Q5 21:11-17, 22:1), "David's Composition" (11QPs^{a} 27:2-11), and Ps 154 (=SyrPs II in 11QPs^{a} 18, 89).[144] In "Wiles of the Wicked Woman" (4Q184), the author uses literary personification in order to "transform the image of Strange Women into a mythological figure of evil."[145] A strange woman (אישה זרה) in Prov 1-9 appears very similar to Woman Folly in 4Q184, who leads men to sin and death.[146] Likewise, the Wicked Woman depicted in 4Q184 *Frg.*1:6-7 indicates a personification of foolishness.[147] The vivid depictions of Woman Folly appear to allude to the street prostitute described in Prov 5:3-14, 7:5-23, and 9:14-17.[148] In Sir 51:13-19, 30 (11QPs^a 21:11-17, 22:1), which is a version of *Sirach* from Qumran, personified Woman Wisdom is described in a narrative of an anonymous young man's search for personified Wisdom as a woman.[149] This shows a similarity with Prov 8-9, Sir 15:1-8 and Wis 8:2-21, as well as with the Canticles, insofar as this description alludes to a sexual component.[150] This diametric contrast between Woman Wisdom and Woman Folly in the Qumran texts also appears to reflect "a dualistic setting" illustrated in Proverbs, and in the Qumran sectarian writings such as the *Community Rule* in 1QS 3:13-4:26 and 4Q473.[151] Specifically, 4Q185 describes the search for wisdom, encouraging one to observe "the words of the Lord (דברי יהוה)" (4Q185 Col. II. 3).[152] This Qumran text employs interchangeable vocabularies, which are equivalent to the Torah, such as "the words of God" (דבר יהוה), "law" (חוק), "teaching" (הורה), and "instruction" (מוסר). This shows that the substitution of these words as a compositional and exegetic strategy was significant for the author in describing his theological and religious intention and its expressions.

---

[142] Sinnott, 161-2. In addition, the image of personified Wisdom as a "guide" appears in οδηγος in Wis 7:15, and ὡδήγησεν in Wis 10:10.

[143] Crenshaw, 197.

[144] As Teeter notes, a clear association between personified Wisdom and Torah appears in Ps 154 (= SyrPs II) in 11QPs^{a} 18, 89, lines 10-13: "From the gates of the righteous is Wisdom's voice heard, from the assembly of the pious (10), her song. When they eat to satiety she is cited, when they drink, bound together (11) as one: their conversation is on the Law of the Most High, their words but declaring His might" (12). See the English translation in Teeter, "Wisdom and Torah," 261. Cf. Dieter Lührmann, "Ein Weisheitspsalm aus Qumran (11 QPsa XVIII)," *ZAW* 80 (1968): 87-98. The case of Wisdom in 4Q525 (=4QBeat) is not exactly personified. However, it appears to be a speaker calling out in a manner similar to personified Wisdom in Prov 8. The main message of Wisdom in 4Q525 is that to achieve wisdom, happiness, and successful life, the fulfillment of Torah is required.

[145] Matthew J. Goff, "Wisdom Literature at Qumran," in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 1343.

[146] Harrington, in *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 32-5, notes, "The poem about Lady Folly in 4Q184 is manifestly based upon the "Folly" passages scattered throughout Proverbs 1–9." (34) In addition, the "harshly negative portrait" in the poem about Woman Folly intends "to warn the readers" against her enticements. (35).

[147] Donald W. Parry, and Emanuel Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), 284-5.

In addition, Brooke agrees that Torah is represented as personified Wisdom in the Qumran texts as it was in *Sirach*.[153] In addition, "David's Compositions" (11QPs^a 27:2-11) is closely related to Sir 24, which combines the significant concepts of biblical and prophetic Jewish traditions: Wisdom, Torah, and Temple in Zion.[154] This text shows a strong Torah-centered Davidic tradition, and has a literary

---

4Q184 *Frg.*1. 6-7,ערשיה יצועיה יצועי שחת[מעמקי בור מלונותיה משכבי חושד ובאישני ליל[ה ממ]שלותיה "Her beds are couches of corruption, [...] Her lodgings are beds of darkness and in the depths of the nigh[t] are her [do]minions" (Harrington, 32). In reference to Woman Folly in 4Q184 we read of the "Wiles of the Wicked Women" (Allegro, 1964:32-35) and the "Seductress" (Vermes, 1995:273). 4Q184 clearly shows evidence of reusing and rewriting the language of Prov 1-9. See also Washington, "The Strange Woman (נכריההה/ זרה אשה) of Proverbs 1-9," 217-42.

[148] Harrington, 34.

[149] Ibid., 35. 4Q184 seems to reuse the language of Prov 1-9, in order to warn the readers against Woman Folly. Prov 1-9 focuses more on Woman Wisdom who gives the instructions to his young male students against the attractions of Woman Folly.

[150] Ibid., 29.

[151] Ibid.

[152] Parry, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, 274-77.

[153] Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation," 219.

[154] David A. Teeter, "Torah, Wisdom, and the Composition of Rewritten Scripture: Jubilees and 11QPsa in Comparative Perspective" in W*isdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period,* eds. Bernd U. Schipper and David A. Teeter (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 263.

structure similar to 1 Kgs 5:9-14. Importantly, we can also find the evidence of personified Wisdom in 11QPs^a 18 (=Ps 154:3, 10-13) from Qumran, where it appears in relation to the concept of Torah. This text shows not only the apparent nexus between Wisdom and Torah but also how the critical aspects of personified Wisdom encompass an explicit connection with and equation to the Torah. In all, these examinations regarding the features of personified Wisdom in Wisdom literature strengthen the intertextual and theological nexus between personified Wisdom and Torah.

Table 7. Evidence of Personified Wisdom in relation to Torah in Qumran Texts

11QPs^a 18 (=Ps154:3,10-13)[155]	ג לכול פותאים כי להודיע כבוד יהוה נתנה חוכמה ולספל י צדיקים מפתחי צדיקים נשמע קולה ומקהל חסידים יא זמרתה על אוכלםה בשבע נאמרה ועל שתותמה בחבר יב יחדיו שיחתם בתורת עליון אמריהמה להודיע עוזו יג כמה רחקה מרשעים אמרה מכול זדים לדעתה הנה

Above all, theses demonstrates that the images of personified Wisdom in relation to Torah appear not only as a heavenly figure with various symbolic images (son-like or father-like or sage), who is a mediator which connects human beings and God, but also as a hypostatic notion which is in an intimate relationship with God or even identical to God. They also show the authors' compositional and exegetical practices for the personification and hypostatization of wisdom, which involved various intersections between scriptural sources and early Jewish wisdom traditions in accord with their socio-historical backgrounds. This authenticates that the personification and hypostatization of wisdom reflect the authors' theological intentions and philosophical backgrounds, which they convey through on a literary and hermeneutic strategy that describe Torah in poetic, symbolic, and prophetic ways. This analysis ultimately provides evidence of a Wisdom-centered hypostatic understanding of Torah (i.e., personified Wisdom) as well as, more broadly, a Wisdom-centered tradition, which is manifest during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. As will be seen, this Wisdom-centered tradition will continue to reverberate in the history of later Jewish thought.

---

[155] James H. Charlesworth, and Frank M. Cross et. al., (trans. and eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994-2011), 4A:170-73; Ps 154:3, 10-13 (=11QPs^a 18): "(3) To all the simple ones. For to make known the glory of Yahweh is Wisdom given, and to correct. (10) the righteous ones. From the openings of the righteous ones is heard her voice, and from the assembly of the pious ones. (11) Her praise-song. When they eat with satiety she is cited, and when they drink in fellowship. (12) Together, their mediation is on the Torah of the Most High, their words are to make known his might. (13) How far from the wicked ones (is) her word, from all the haughty ones to know her. Behold."

Philo's Logos

On the basis of the previous examinations of the relationship between personified Wisdom and Torah, I now examine Philo's Logos as one of the hypostatic notions as a derivative form of Torah. I will methodically investigate the intertextual and theological relationships between Personified Wisdom and Philo's Logos, which is a synthesis between Jewish Wisdom and Greek Logos. It is first notable that Jewish Palestinian culture was gradually integrated into, and deeply influenced by the Hellenistic ways of life, thought, and expressions since the first three centuries C.E.[156] Philo was clearly writing for an audience of Jews devoted to the interpretations of the Hebrew Bible, which were based on the key middle-Platonic theological notions. As Wolfson notes, Philo's biblical exegesis in Greek reflects a creative combination of Jewish wisdom traditions and Greek philosophy.[157] The ultimate concern of Philo was to fully authorize the concept and uniqueness of Torah through authoritative interpretations which reflect the Hellenistic context.[158] Philo thereby investigates the detailed descriptions of Moses' cosmology of divine creation with regard to the existence of the world, divine attributes, creation, and providence in the Hebrew Bible.[159]

The idea of Logos as a unique way of thinking about God, was a virtual commonplace in Alexandrian Jewish thought.[160] Philo's Logos shows a creative synthesis of the concepts of Torah and philosophical works on the Greek Logos. In this context, Philo adopts a theological notion of the Logos as a divine mediator under the influence of middle-Platonism while investigating the various exegetical and philosophical traditions of other Jewish texts in the contemporary period. Specifically, in his explanations of Logos in the treatise, *De Opificio Mundi* (*=Opif.*)*: On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses,* Philo crafts his conception of using his own exegetical methodology, which employs both Hellenistic philosophy and Jewish biblical traditions from Genesis.[161] Philo, in *Opif.*, xxv, 77, primarily elaborates on the Image of God in Gen 1:26-27 and Gen 2:7. Philo, in *Opif.* xxiii, 69-73, distinguishes the meaning of κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ “in the Image of God” in Gen 1:26-27 from καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν, which means “just as his likeness or resemblance, i.e., as an image of the Image of God,” which is supposed to be a human being.[162]

---

[156] Gregory E. Sterling, "Different Traditions or Emphases? The Image of God in Philo's *De Opficio Mundi*," in *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated literature,* eds. Gary A. Anderson, et. al. (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013), 42.
[157] Wolfson, *Philo,* 1:255.
[158] Ibid. Middle-Platonic readings of Plato's *Timaeus* emphasizes an intermediary role of the "image" as a second principle, which is called "the Idea," "the heavenly Mind," "the demiurge God," and "the Logos." This shows the critical influence of middle-Platonism on Philo's Logos as divine mediator. I will discuss this later in this study.
[159] Sterling, "Different Traditions or Emphases?" 43-44.
[160] Boyarin, "The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John," *HTR* 94, no.3 (2001): 249.

Table 8. Gen 1:26-27, 2:7 in the LXX

Gen 1:26	τὸν ἄνθρωπόν φησι γεγενῆσθαι κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν. וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמו כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ
1:27	καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ, בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ
Gen 2:7	καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν. וַיִּיצֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאָדָם, עָפָר מִן-הָאֲדָמָה, וַיִּפַּח בְּאַפָּיו, נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים; וַיְהִי הָאָדָם, לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה

By this logic, Philo also articulates the meaings of יִבְרָא (γεγενῆσθαι, “came into existence”) in Gen 1:26-27 and יִיצֶר (ἔπλασεν, “formed” or “fashioned”) in Gen 2:7.[163] According to David T. Runia,

---

[161] Sterling, “When the Beginning Is the End: The Place of Genesis in the Commentaries of Philo,” in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception and Interpretation*, eds. C. Evans, J. Lohr & D.L. Petersen (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 428-38. Philo’s works comprise three independent sets of commentaries on the Pentateuch, and extensive treatment of Genesis. Three sets are as follows: *The Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus, The Allegorical Commentary, Exposition of the Law.* Cf. Philo of Alexandria, *Opif. (=On the Creation),* in *Philo* (10 vols), trans. and eds. Ralph Marcus, and F. H. Colson, and G. H. Whitaker (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), xlvi-xlvii, 134-36.

[162] Sterling, “Different Traditions or Emphases?” 44-47; Thomas H. Tobin, *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*, *CBQMS 14* (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983), 36–37. Cf. William F. Arndt, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. eds. Walter Bauer and Frederick W Danker (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 487.

[163] Philo, *Opif.* xxiii, 69-71: “Moses tells us that man was created after the image of God and after His likeness (Gen. i. 26) Let no one represent the likeness as one to a bodily form; for neither is God in human form, nor is the human body God-like.” (69); “And, since images do not always correspond to their archetype and pattern, but are in many instances unlike it, the writer further brought out his meaning by adding “after the likeness” to the words “after the image,” thus showing that an accurate cast, bearing a clear impression, was intended. (71)

Philo, in *Opif.* xlvi, 134-135 and *Leg.* I. xi, 31-32, assumes that the human being of Gen 1:26-27 is intelligible, incorporeal, and immortal, while the human being of Gen 2:7 is composed of body and soul, and mortal.[164] This implies that the human being was created to convey not only an earthly image, but also a heavenly image very similar to the Image of God and His likeness.[165] Interestingly, Philo, in *Opif.* xxxi, 95-96, translates בְּצֶלֶם (Βεσελεῆλ in Greek) in Gen 1:27 as "in the shadow of God." He thereby exemplifies the heavenly image of human beings by highlighting the image of the chief craftsperson of the Tabernacle as an individual who was endowed with various gifts by God.[166] This implies that Philo appears to understand the Image of God in Gen 1:27 as an intermediary by associating it with the second principle of a middle-Platonic concept in Plato's *Timaeus*.[167] In this sense, Philo, in *Opif.* xxv, 77 and *Leg.* I. xxiii, 69-73, explicitly connects the Image of God with the Logos as a mediator between God and human beings.[168]

In the larger system of his thought, Philo further explains how the entire sense-perceptible cosmos-—a copy of a divine Image and "intelligible cosmos"—is connected to the Logos as the model (or the archetypal seal) of the human beings.[169] Philo thereby explicates that the divine Logos serves as the representative of God, i.e., "the intelligible cosmos," which is positioned between God and human beings, including the perceptible cosmos.[170] The active cause of an incorporeal intellect (i.e., invisible Reason) is not only the intellect of the universe but is also superior to all the men and all rational natures, and is eventually identified with the divine Logos, i.e., Word of God (ὁ θεοῦ λόγos).[171] By this logic, Philo develops not only a thematic link between the image of invisible Reason and the "first man" but also an intimate relationship between God and the divine Logos.[172]

---

[164] David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, Vol. 44 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1986), 556-58; idem, *Philo of Alexandria, On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 321-11. In addition, Sterling, in "Different Traditions or Emphases?" 45, 48, 50-52, explains that just as God is the model for the Image which has been called a shadow, the Image is the model for other things. This shows that God made the human being to represent the Image. Thomas H. Tobin deals with a controversial issue regarding two different versions (i.e., a single and double creation) of the creation of human beings in relation to the Image of God in Genesis 1-2. The single creation perspective means a Platonizing interpretation that includes the Logos as the Image of God in Gen 1:26-27 due to anti-anthropomorphic tendencies, whereas the double creation perspective implies a Stoicizing interpretation, which focuses on the *pneuma* in Gen 2:7. See also Tobin, *The Creation of Man,* 558-60. Runia harmonizes this double creation perspective in the two Genesis stories.

[165] See Philo, *Leg.* I. xi, 31: "There are two types of men; the one a heavenly man, the other an earthly. The heavenly man, being made after the image of God, is altogether without part or lot in corruptible and terrestrial substance; but the earthly one was compacted out of the matter scattered here and there, which Moses calls 'clay'." See also Philo, *Opif.* xlvi, 134-135. Through the philosophical interpretation of Scripture, Philo explains the threefold scope of the ontological and hierarchic order: God, the Logos, and humanity.

[166] Philo, in *Leg.* II. xxiv, 96, notes that *Bezalel* [in Ex 31:2-3] means "in the shadow of God," which is identified with "his Logos" that God used like "an instrument to create the cosmos." Philo also uses the etymology of *Bezalel* to establish a thematic link between and the metaphor of Plato's cave in *Republic* VII. 514a-520a.

[167] See Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato,* 38-41. Runia (200-8) also discusses not only the relationship between Plato's cosmic soul (e.g., *Timaeus* 34b-36b) and the Philonic Logos (e.g., *Somn.* ii, 2. *Prov*. i, 33. *Leg.* I. xxix, 91), but also the relationship between Plato's demiurge (e.g., *Timaeu*s 41 a-b) and the Philonic Logos (e.g., *Migr*. xxxii, 181, and so forth) See Runia, 232-49.

[168] See also Philo, *Leg.* I. lvi-xlvii, 134-36; *Leg.* II. 96; *Her.* 231.

On the basis of this theory, Philo associates the Image of God, in Gen 1:26-27 and Gen 2:7, with the Logos of God (ὁ θεοῦ λόγos), and further associates the human being with an image of the Image of God.[173] Philo thereby claims that human beings were created according to the Image of God which is identified with the Logos. More importantly, this reasoning enables Philo to both offer a conception of the Logos as a metaphysical intermediate being and also to see it as a "second God."[174] The Logos of God, under his semi-Jewish philosophy, signifies not only a part and separate being of God but also a second God and a being that is with God.[175] This indicates that Philo's Logos offers a significant possibility that the divine Logos can be both the first human being and a second God.

For Philo, God created the world by the Logos, which serves as an agent, and revealed Himself to the prophets by means of His Word or Logos.[176] This suggests that Philo equates the Logos not only with the inner essence (of principles) of the Torah (i.e., the Laws of Moses) but also with Torah as a hypostatic notion created by God before the creation of the world, as well as a "blueprint" functionally designed for the divine work of creation."[177] By utilizing the conceptions of the Logos, Philo shows an innovative way of elucidating the relationship between Torah (Word of God) and personified Wisdom (in Prov 8:22-31) in the creation context.[178] Philo's Logos contains the conceptions and epithets of Torah, which combines the Greek Logos with the biblical concepts of Torah. Specifically, Helmer Ringgren also explains that Philo's exegetical use of Logos reinforces the Jewish exegetical practices for the personification of Wisdom.[179] This shows that the Logos is not only the Word that God created in the beginning that it also plays a mediatorial role as a divine agent for the creation of the world.

---

[169] Sterling, "Different Traditions or Emphases?" 55. On the basis of this logic, Philo notes that the cosmos is a copy of the intelligible cosmos and of God.
[170] Ibid.
[171] Ibid. By this logic, Philo explains the incorporeal and corporeal substances, while basing his philosophical foundations on this presupposition, i.e., the Reason of God as an incorporeal intellect.
[172] Runia, *On the Creation*, 111, 139-141, 337, 344-45; Charles D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 5; Wolfson, *Philo*, 1:5-9, 48. Philo actually appears to hesitate about whether the Logos exists separately or is totally incorporated with the godhead.
[173] Sterling, 44.
[174] Runia, *On the Creation*, 111, 139-141, 337, 344-45.
[175] Ibid., 23; Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, 2004), 114.
[176] Ibid. Philo's Logos is not the same as the Stoic or Platonic Logos. It is also not identical with the several usages of "Word" in the Hebrew Bible. For Philo, the Word is associated with the "mind of God" which contains the forms or the plan of all that is created. This seems to provide an opening to use the concept for the incarnation of the Word in Christian theology.

In all, this examination demonstrates not only how Philo's Logos points to a theological and philosophical synthesis between the concepts of Torah and God through Jewish exegetical practices but also how Philo's Logos played a critical role in providing a theological route and a philosophical mediator for the centralization of Torah and the formulation of the images of Torah. It also corroborates that Philo's work, which combines Hellenistic philosophy and biblical (and Second Temple) traditions, appears to participate in the conceptual development of Torah in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.[180]

As many scholars, such as William F. Albright, have noted, Philo's Logos primarily might have derived from the combination of Torah and personified Wisdom, which existed in Jewish wisdom traditions even before Hellenization.[181] As Ringgren notes, the profound relationship between Philo's

---

[177] Wolfson, *Philo,* 1:258-61. Philo's Logos appears to be identified not only with the preexistent Law (or Torah) but also with personified Wisdom in creation.

[178] Wolfson, *Philo,* 1:254-55. Wolfson notes, "It was quite natural for Philo to use also the term Wisdom as the equivalent of Logos" (254-55) in reference to *Leg. All.* I, 19, 65. Interestingly, the Jewish hypostatic notions are condensed and consolidated in Philo's Logos.

[179] Helmer Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East* (Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Boktrycker, 1947), 123.

[180] Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 107, 116. Najman argues that Philo elaborated and reworked the Mosaic and Deuteronomic discourses.

[181] William F. Albright, "The Supposed Babylonian Derivation of the Logos," *JBL* 39 (1920):143-51. He also asserts that personified Wisdom is not essentially related to Hellenistic origin but more significantly originates

Logos and personified Wisdom corroborates that Philo’s Logos also shows a possibility of connecting the Greek Logos to Jewish hypostatic notions, such as Torah and personified Wisdom, by combining and harmonizing Hellenistic philosophy and Jewish biblical traditions.[182] Indeed, Philo’s exegetical use of Logos, which is based on a synthesis of early Jewish exegetical practices and the Hellenistic influences, explicitly reflect a similarity to or close relationship with personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31.[183] In this sense, Craig S. Keener confirms that Philo’s Logos appears to logically combine universal Law [or Torah] and divine Wisdom.[184] This concretizes explicit evidence of the harmonization of the Greek Logos of Hellenistic philosophical traditions with Jewish Wisdom of Palestinian Jewish traditions. Along similar lines, Thomas H. Tobin also concludes that Philo’s Logos is explicit evidence reflecting a “Hellenistic Jewish biblical interpretation and speculation,” i.e., creative hermeneutics and expressions regarding the concept of God and Torah, encompassing and harmonizing the features of the multi-faceted (Palestinian, Hellenistic, and Rabbinic) Judaism.[185] This substantiates that Philo’s Logos explicitly shows a profound relationship with personified Wisdom in the creation context, As I will show later in this study, these themes repeat in the biblical and rabbinic concepts of Torah (Word of God or *memra*), which I will, in turn, examine in this study.

Above all, these findings demonstrate that Philo’s Logos, in relation to Torah and personified Wisdom, appears not only as an angelic agent, who functions as a human-like image as a philosophical mediator which connects human beings and God but also as a Logos-centered hypostatic notion, which is in a proximity with God. Like the personification and hypostatization of

---

in Canaanite-Aramean paganism. Nevertheless, as examined earlier, it becomes evident that Greek influences strengthened the developmental process of personified Wisdom in the Jewish wisdom traditions.

[182] Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom,* 123.

[183] Sterling, Different Traditions or Emphases?” 43-4. The closeness of Philo’s Logos to Torah and Jewish homiletic and midrashic practices appears in his descriptions of the cosmology in the opening verses of Genesis.

[184] Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 1:345. R. D. Middleton argues that the shift from Philo’s Logos to Torah is consistent with the overall rabbinic insistence that personified Wisdom in Prov 8 is Torah. He insists that there is a significant role played by Philo's Logos in connecting between Greek Philosophy and rabbinic traditions. See R. D. Middleton, “Logos and Shekinah in the Fourth Gospel,” *JQR* 29, no. 2 (1938): 101-3.

[185] Thomas H. Tobin, “The Prologue of John and Hellenistic Jewish Speculation,” *CBQ* 52, no. 2 (04/01, 1990): 268.

wisdom, this authenticates Philo’s theological intentions and philosophical backgrounds based on a literary, exegetic, and hermeneutic strategy, which hypostatizes and personifies the Logos and Torah in the combination between Greek philosophy and the Jewish wisdom traditions.

This eventually substantiates, unlike the hypostatic notions (i.e., personified Wisdom) in the Wisdom-centered tradition, the evidence of a Logos-centered hypostatic notion (i.e., Philo’s Logos), as a primitive form derived from Torah in a supposed Logos-centered tradition, which is manifest during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. In this context, I will further examine, in turn, the similar hypostatic notions of Torah, which appear close to personified Wisdom and Philo’s Logos, such as the Johannine Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah* in order to prove the existence of the two traditions and the explicit evidence of the emergence and development of the two different kinds of the hypostatic notions of Torah throughout the history of Jewish thought. Consequently, Philo’s Logos provides broader critical implications for the development of Jewish hypostatic notions of Torah, which are especially relevant to the Johannine Logos in early Christian tradition, to which I will presently turn.

The Johannine Logos

On the basis of the previous examinations of Philo’s Logos and personified Wisdom, I now delve into the Johannine Logos. I will also show that Philo’s logos is a missing and profound link between early Jewish thought and Christian thought. In so doing, I will place a special focus on Johannine Logos’s relationship to Philo’s Logos and personified Wisdom by analyzing the intertextual nexuses between the Gospel of John and other early Christian, early Jewish, and later Rabbinic sources. I first examine the backgrounds of the Johannine Logos, i.e., the provenance of the Gospel of John, the profound relationship between early Christianity and Hellenistic philosophies, and the relations and interactions between the Jewish communities in the Diaspora and the increased influences of Christianity during the late Second Temple period and Rabbinic periods.

Most scholars place the origin of the Gospel of John between 90 and 110 C.E. Rudolf Bultmann also presumes the origin of the Johannine Prologue to be after the first century C.E.[186] Yet there are debates regarding the provenance of an "original hymn" of the Prologue and especially, the origin of the Johannine Logos which features prominently in the Prologue.[187] Raymond E. Brown suggests three main sources that can be considered as the origins of the Johannine Prologue: Gnosticism, Palestinian Judaism, and Hellenism.[188] Bultmann attempts to discover the early impact of eastern gnostic speculations upon early Christianity and especially on the Johannine Prologue.[189] He particularly reconstructs the origin of the Johannine Logos from the Gnostic "redeemer myth," while emphasizing the strong influence of mythological Gnosticism had on it.[190] He emphasizes that it is a revised Logos hymnic or mythic form that derived from the Gnostic mythology.[191] By contrast, James A. T. Robinson notes that the Prologue reflects a close relationship with first-century Palestinian *realia*, i.e., Palestinian Judaism, which was in a deep interaction with Hellenistic influences and had a central impact on the formation of Rabbinic Judaism.[192] In this vein, several scholars, such as James D. G. Dunn, Francis J. Moloney, and James H. Charlesworth, traced linguistic and theological parallels between the Qumran texts, other Christian sources, such as the Johannine Prologue on the one hand, and Epistles of Paul, the Synoptic Gospels, and patristic period theology on the other.[193] After the recovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Charlesworth particularly tried to discover linguistic and theological parallels between the Gospel of John and the Qumran texts as part of an effort to understand the influences of Palestinian Judaism on the Johannine Logos.[194] In addition, they investigated, in the Prologue, a strong influence of Greek and Hellenistic philosophies, such as Aristotelianism, middle-Platonism and Stoicism, as well as dualistic features, such as light and darkness.[195] Furthermore, Dunn examined the Jewish and Hellenistic backgrounds of the Johannine

---

[186] Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1971), 12. Bultmann notes, "We should define the period for the composition and redactional edition of the Gospel as about 80-120 A.D." Raymond E. Brown, in *The Gospel According to John* I-XII (Anchor Bible; Garden City, NY: Doubleday &, 1966), lxxx-lxxxiii, analyzes the dates of its composition and final editing in five stages by classifying the final redaction of the Gospel as the stage 5. He notes, "If the historical (earlier) tradition underlying the Gospel goes back to 40-60, and the first edition of the Gospel is dated somewhere between 70 and 85 (a dating which is very much a guess), then the five stages we have posited in the composition of the Gospel would cover over forty years of preaching and writing," while considering the discovery of "several early 2nd-century papyri texts of John" (lxxxii). However, Brown emphasizes "at its outermost limits, A.D .75 to 110, but the convergence of probabilities points strongly to a date between 90-110" (lxxxvi). He pinpoints that the positive arguments seem to point to "100-110 as the latest plausible date for the writing of the Gospel with strong probability favoring the earlier limit of 100" (lxxxiii).

[187] Bultmann, in *The Gospel of John*, 13-29, insists that the Prologue is a revised Logos hymn in a mythic form that derived from the Gnostic community. However, Brown (lix-lxiv) says that the Prologue has considerable evidence to be a unique exegetic production within the Johannine community influenced by multi-faceted (Palestinian, Hellenistic, and Rabbinic) Judaism. In addition, he discusses the relationships of Johannine thought to ancient Jewish thought in Philo's works, Biblical and Rabbinic sources, and the Qumran texts. In particular, he (524) notes that "the Prologue's description of the Word is far closer to biblical and Jewish strains of thought that it is to anything purely Hellenistic." The Johannine prose of the discourses of Jesus is different from the other chapters with their narratives and theological reflections in the form of drama-rhetoric oriented approaches in the Gospel of John. This prose contains a quasi-poetic feature, such as "parallelism" and "rhythm" (cxxxii-cxxxvi). This shows that the Prologue contains both two kinds of genres: a poetic or hymnic form and a rhetoric prosaic form. Interestingly, this feature appears very similar to the form of Prov 8:22-31.

[188] Brown, liii-lxv. Cf. John Ashton, *Understanding the fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 22-23, 61,115.

[189] Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 13-29.

[190] Bultmann, (9) also insists that "John is directly dependent on Gnostic traditions, and he uses these traditions in far greater measure than Philo and the other late Jewish writers." Bultmann (7-9) also notes the possible evidence of the sources of the Johannine discourses outside of Judaism, such as the pre-Christian Gnosticism found in *the Odes of Solomon* and particularly in the writings of Mandeans. Brown (liv) also notes that Christian Gnostic works, such as *the Gospel of Truth* (*Gos. Tr.*), and *the Gospel of Thomas* (*Gos. Thom.*), which are based on ontological dualism, seem to be comparable to the Gospel of John. However, neither of these Gnostic works provides explicit evidence for a "source" of John's Gospel. In fact, their allusions to ontological dualism, such as light/darkness division, are quite distinct from John.

---

[191] Bultmann, in *The Gospel of John*, 22-25, insists that the concept of Johannine Logos does not directly have its origin in the “Judaic Wisdom myth” (22) and the “Stoic Logos.” (24-25). He (24) notes that “It is enough to recognize that the mythological figure of the Logos has its home in a particular understanding of the world, namely, the Gnostic.”

[192] James A. T. Robinson, “The Relationship of the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John,” *NTS* 9 (1962): 128.

[193] James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1996), 214-50; Francis J. Moloney presumes that the narrative and theological messages of the Prologue itself should be considered as a mirror or window introducing Jesus as Incarnate Logos. See Moloney, *The Gospel of John: Text and Context* (Boston: Brill, 2005), 9-22. Herman N. Ridderbos asserts that the intention of the Prologue is “to describe the background against which Jesus’s historical self-disclosure must be understood.” See Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), 17. Andrew T. Lincoln, in *The Gospel According to Saint John* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers; London; New York: Continuum, 2005), 109, comments, “The prologue’s profound theological implications emerge from a radical reshaping of Israel’s story. Israel’s God, its Scriptures and its symbols are now reconfigured around the one who is the subject of the Gospel’s own story. Genesis 1, Torah, Moses, Exodus 33 and 34, Wisdom, God’s Word, glory, the identity of the people of God, covenantal grace and truth, all help to interpret the distinctive significance of Jesus, but in the process are themselves reinterpreted in the light of what is believed to be the decisive revelation that has taken place in him.” Finally, Dwight M. Smith notes, “In discussing the background of the theology of the Gospel of John, it has seemed appropriate to refer to Paul and the Synoptic Gospels.” See Smith, *The Theology of the Gospel of John* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 56.

[194] James H. Charlesworth, “The Fourth Evangelist and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Assessing Trends over Nearly Sixty Years,” in *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sixty Years of Discovery and Debate*, ed. Tom Thatcher (Atlanta: *SBL*, 2011), 161-63.

[195] Dunn, in *Christology in the Making*, 231-40, The Hellenistic influences on the Johannine vocabularies mainly are Greek philosophy, Stoic thought, Philo, and the *Hermetica*, which are Egyptian-Greek wisdom texts

Prologue by analyzing the theological nexuses and hermeneutical (i.e., allegorical) similarities between the Johannine Logos and the other hypostatic notions, such as Wisdom, Torah (i.e., the Word of God), and Philo's Logos.[196]

In this context, some scholars, such as Burton L. Mack, place the theological and philosophical interactions between the Johannine community and Palestinian Judaism as instrumental in the ideological development of the Johannine Logos.[197] Jo-Ann Brent also emphasizes, "there is a growing consensus that the Prologue must be read within the context of a Jewish speculative theology."[198] By contrast, John Ashton and Brown intriguingly assert that the origin of the Johannine Prologue—even if it was influenced to some extent by multi-faceted (Palestinian, Hellenistic, and Rabbinic) Judaism—appears to be a direct and idiosyncratic composition by the Evangelist in the Johannine community.[199] In this regard, Ashton elaborates a hypothetical reconstruction, which supports the view of a singular theology of the Johannine community, while excluding the view that the provenance and composition of the Gospel of John can be reconstructed simply from the Gnostic mythology and Hellenistic and Rabbinic Judaism.[200] This upshot is a Johannine theological

---

from second century C.E. These philosophical nexuses also seem to appear in deuterocanonical books like *Sirach* and *Wisdom of Solomon*. By contrast, Boyarin insists that the background of the Johannine Logos is a homiletic midrash in the rabbinic tradition, as well as Jewish Logos/*memra* theology, which was later developed to Logos Christology. See Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 129. Several scholars are still skeptical of Boyarin's theory due to the lack of clarity in the nature and even existence of synagogical schools in either Palestine or Alexandria. Moreover, it does not appear to fit the anti-Jewish character of the Evangelist in Jn 9:22, 12:42 and 16:2.

[196] Dunn, 220-30, also examines the various influences of the pre-NT materials, discusses the significance of Philo's allegorical interpretation of the Logos on the Johannine Logos as a hypostatic entity.

[197] Burton L. Mack, "Wisdom Makes a Difference: Alternatives to 'Messianic' Configurations," in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 44-47. Mark explains the shifting and integrating process from the Johannine Logos into an incarnate Logos.

[198] Jo-Ann A. Brant, *John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011), 26.

[199] Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 36-43, 160-98. Brown, lix-lxi, also notes that the Evangelist in a Jewish-Christian community wrote this hymn as a result of a conflict with Jewish authorities. The hymn is not an immediate result of the conflict, but a consequence of the debates surrounding the incarnation and the separation of the "grace and truth" of Jesus from the Torah of Moses. Peder Borgen shows that similarities with Philo's exegeses and with *Gen. Rab.* reflect that the Evangelist attended a synagogical school with a curriculum of exegetical questions and answers. See Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria as Exegete," in *The Ancient Period: A History of Biblical Interpretation* eds. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 126-29. According to Moloney, the Prologue seems to have been composed as a final section, after the Gospel of John had undertaken a compositional development within the Johannine community. See also Moloney, *The Gospel of John,* 52.

[200] Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 15-35, 160-198.

development of an idiosyncratic Christology.[201] This theory shows that the origin of the Johannine Logos should not be just restricted by external influences, including the Hebrew Bible, Hellenism, and Hellenistic and Rabbinic Judaism. Rather, the unique characteristics of Johannine Logos itself need to be considered in understanding its formative process.

However, these preceding views still do not seem to elucidate entirely the backgrounds of the Johannine Logos. In this context, I will reexamine its compositional and exegetical intentions, as well as the theological and philosophical backgrounds of the author of the Prologue in the Johannine community. Let us first offer an exegetical overview of the Johannine Prologue, highlighting its chiastic structure.[202]

Table 9. Chiastic Structure of the Johannine Prologue

A The Origin and emergence of Logos in relation to God (1:1-5)
B Witness of John the Baptist about the light (1:6-8)
C Emergence of the light (1:9-11)
D The purpose of emergence of the light: transition from the light to Logos (1:12-13)
C’ Incarnation of the Logos (1:14)
B’ Witness of John the Baptist about Jesus Christ (1:15)
A’ The Origin of Incarnate Logos/Jesus Christ in relation to Moses and God (1:16-18a)

The descriptions of A’, B’, C’, supplement the descriptions of A, B, C in a more articulated form. A’ makes the origin and its meanings of Logos in A clear by connecting directly to the origin of Jesus. In B, John the Baptist witnesses the light whereas in B’, John explicitly witnesses Jesus. C alludes to the emergence of the light in relation to the Logos, while C’ directly alludes to the emergence of the

---

[201] Ibid., 36-43. It is conceivable that the formation of an idiosyncratic Christology eventually leads to a high Christology, which identifies Jesus with God and thereby caused the expulsion from the synagogues within Palestinian Judaism.

[202] Ibid., 23-27. Brant mentions that we should be careful to reconstruct the Prologue in a rigid chiastic structure. I represent the appropriate chiastic juxtaposition, while referring to other analytic structures of the Johannine Prologue. In fact, there are various structures suggested, which are “discerned from the way in which the major editions of the Greek NT divide it.” See John F. McHugh, *John 1-4 (ICC): A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (London; New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 78-79. McHugh mentions, “By far the most popular description (and in the present writer’s view, rightly so) is that which sees vv.1-5 as speaking of the primordial existence of the Logos, and of is role in creation and history, of vv. 6-13 as outlining the historical advent of the Logos into the world, and of vv.14-18 as celebrating the Incarnation of the Logos.” I follow Brown’s classification of the four strophes in the Prologue. See Brown, (1-2) asserts, that there is an “original hymn,” first (1-2) strophe, second (3-5) strophe, insertion (6-8), insertion (9-10), third strophe (10-12b) fourth strophe (14,16), explanatory expansions (17-18), including additional materials pertaining to John the Baptist (vss. 6-9, vss. 15 R).

Logos in relation to Jesus. D has a significant role in bridging between A, B, C and A’, B’, C’, the paralleled statements in this chiastic structure.[203]

Interestingly, we can also discover that a poetic structure and metaphorical language is used through a “step parallelism” in the structure of vv.1-5.

Table 10. “Step Parallelism” in Jn 1:1-5[204]

1 Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.	1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was by (in company with)[205] God, and God was the Word.
2 Οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.	2 He (the Word) was by (in company with) God in the beginning.
3 πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν.	3 all came into being through him; without him nothing came into being
4 ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων.	4 In him was life, and that life was the light of men.
5 καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.	5 The light shines in the darkness, but the darkness has not understood it.

The first strophe (vv.1-2), ἐν ἀρχῇ in the opening phrase of the Prologue, seems to have a sense analogous to the translation of בְּרֵאשִׁית in Gen 1:1 and Prov 8.[206] In particular, ἐν ἀρχῇ is paralleled in v.1 and v.2. The role of ἦν is to confirm that the Logos existed before the existence of the physical world.[207] John F. McHugh classifies the term λόγος as having possible five basic meanings: 1) a self-subsistent Form or idea in the Platonist sense; 2) internal concept or the external expression in the Stoic sense; 3) Mind (Νοῦς) for Plotinus and the Neoplatonists; 4) the Word of God in the Hebrew Bible; 5) the Aramaic term *memra* in the Targums, “meaning literally the *utterance* or the Word of God.”[208] As Mchugh first says, “The sense of Jn 1:1a is therefore: ‘In the beginning, before the material world was created, there existed the Word of God, the Compassionate, the All-merciful.’”[209]

---

[203] Through the abrupt transition from the light to Logos in D, the purpose of emergence of the light, i.e., Incarnate Logos, seems to be dramatically emphasized in the middle of the Prologue.
[204] Brant, *John*, 28.
[205] William F. Arndt, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 875.
[206] Even if it cannot be guaranteed that the Evangelist directly exegetes the Genesis texts, there is an allusion to them and an intention to at least echo part of Gen 1 in the opening of the Prologue.
[207] McHugh, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1-4,* 6.
[208] Ibid., 8.
[209] Ibid. McHugh mentions, “The Logos, the *Memra*, is ‘He Who is There’.” He does not reject the possibility of the classical interpretation that the Evangelist intended to include in his usage whatever the OT meant by the

Specifically, πρὸς τὸν θεόν may be appropriately translated as "near God, or by God, or in company with God," according to the lexicological usages.[210] In this sense, the Logos, interestingly, appears to be portrayed as "a companion of God."[211] Regardless of many terminological interpretations and theological speculations about it, the Logos has an exalted and hypostatic status in relation to God.

The most striking and debatable sentence in the first strophe is θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, "The Word too was God."[212] As James F. Mcgrath states, this expression is exegetically connected to a theological intention of dignifying the "exalted status" of Jesus through the association of the image of Logos with personified Wisdom.[213] McHugh also notes that the Word of God in the Hebrew Bible can be identified with "divine Wisdom."[214] As Dunn asserts, a Greek and Hellenistic influence on the Johannine Prologue enhances the critical nexus of the Johannine Logos with the status and features of personified Wisdom.[215] Indeed, the status of the Johannine Logos in the Prologue shows a significant nexus to the status and role of personified Wisdom in relation to God in the context of creation in Prov 8:22-31.[216] This implies that the Evangelist elaborated the idea of personified Wisdom in the creation context while trying to motivate the audiences to understand his theological intentions in terms of the incarnation of the Logos. It is also conceivable that Philo's Logos played a critical role in understanding the Johannine Logos and the theology of its Incarnation of the divine Logos**.** As noted earlier, the concept of Philo's Logos, which can be "a second God" who is simultaneously a part of and separate from God, reflects the conception of the Johannine Logos as the Only Begotten Son.

---

term Logos, and the Logos-*memra* interpretation, which refers to the Deity revealed in the phrase 'I AM WHAT I AM' in Ex 3:14.

[210] Arndt, *A Greek-English Lexicon,* 875.

[211] Brown, 21.

[212] The absence of article before Θεὸς implies that ὁ λόγος is the "subject," and θεὸς is the "predicate." See Nigel Turner, and James H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906), 183.

[213] James F. McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology: Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology* (Cambridge, U.K.; New York; Cambridge University Press, 2001), 137-142. See also Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 17.

[214] McHugh, *John 1-4,* 6-9. Through various interpretations, McHugh alludes to the relationship between Torah (Word) and Wisdom, which is in a proximity to God.

[215] Dunn, *Christology in the Making,* 213-50.

[216] I will conduct a detailed intertextual analysis in the next chapters.

These relationships of other hypostatic notions with the Johannine Logos, as Brown expounded, explain the images and activities of Incarnate Jesus, which I will examine later in this study.[217]

Interestingly, the dualistic contrast between φῶς "light" and σκοτίᾳ "darkness" (vv. 4-5) shows explicitly the Hellenistic influences on the Johannine Prologue.[218] The terms of light and darkness in the Prologue also allude to a significant connection with creation. In verse 3, there appears to be an emphatic poetic antithesis between πάντα "all" and οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν "nothing that has come into being," and between δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο "through him" and χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο "without him." In vv. 6-9, an insertion, which seems to be not part of the original hymn, the witness of John the Baptist is mentioned.[219] The testimony of John the Baptist in vv. 6-8, 15, which are insertions, provides an authenticity to the Johannine narrative and messages, when considering the existence of considerable followers and comprehensive acknowledgement of John the Baptist around the age of Jesus. This insertion of the testimony of John the Baptist leads the readers to move from the "pre-creation, Genesis" mode to the quasi-narrative mode, which orients them to the Johannine narrative and sends the message that Jesus is not only Incarnate Logos but also the Son of God, as well as the Messiah.[220]

In the Johannine Prologue, we can also see the Hellenistic influences, which contain a blend of similar theological and philosophical languages, such as λόγος "word", φως "light" and σκότος "darkness," as well as αλήθεια "truth" and so forth.[221] The use of these terms is implicitly intended for the expression of salvation of Jewish people and humankind. The term “light” in vv. 9-12, alludes to a similar notion of separating sons of light and sons of darkness, or the Jewish sectarians at Qumran from the main Jewish community.[222] Through the antithesis, the Evangelist asserts the purposeful emergence of the light towards the significance of ζωὴ “life,” in vv.10-13, by emphasizing the role of Logos as a life-giver and life-sustainer. In this sense, ὁ κόσμος in v.10 appears not to be merely the physical Universe, whereas δι’ αὐτοῦ, “the world,” in which people lived with sin in Jn 1:19, had come into being through the Logos.[223] The purpose of the emergence of the light, i.e., Logos, is to give ἐξουσίαν “the authority” to τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα “those who believe in his name” έκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι “to become the children of God.”[224] In this context, the Evangelist attempts the intersectional change between the light and the Logos (Word) through the parallel between vv. 4-5 and vv. 10-13, and the shift from the light to Jesus via the Logos.[225] In particular, verses 9-10 illustrate a process of transfer from cosmic Logos to Incarnate Logos. The move from the light to Jesus is a transitional point from Logos (Wisdom) to the incarnation of Logos. In the third strophe (vv. 11-13), the ultimate goal of the incarnation is to give the gift and power of being children of God to those who believe in Jesus.

---

[217] Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 29.

[218] D. M. Smith, *The Theology of the Gospel of John*, 16-17. Smith notes that in Qumran text, *Community Rule* (col.3 and 4), there are similar dualistic concepts and theological vocabularies to those found in Gnosticism and in the Gospel of John, such as world, life, the spirit of truth, falsehood, light, darkness, and unending light.

[219] Brown, *The Gospel of John*, 22.

[220] This implies that the Johannine Prologue is close to a rhetorical prose piece, which addresses an abstract entity, rather than a formal encomium.

[221] Even if philosophical languages and terms do not frequently appear in the Gospel of John, there are shared vocabularies between the Gospel of John and Philo's works, such as λόγος "word", φως "light", and σκότος "darkness." See Philo, *Opif.* viii, 31-33: τὸ δὲ ἀόρατον νοητὸν φῶς ἐκεῖνο θείου λόγου γέγονεν "Now that invisible light perceptible only by mind had come into being as an image of the Divine Word" (31).; μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ νοητοῦ φωτὸς ἀνάλαμψιν, ὃ πρὸ ἡλίου γέγονεν, ὑπεχώρει τὸ ἀντίπαλον σκότος "After the kindling of the intelligible light, which preceded the sun's creation, darkness its adversary withdraw."(33).; Philo, *Somn.* viii, 75: ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστι, "God is light." The Evangelist uses some philosophical language, but John's Greek actually seems to show the influence of non-professional Greek rhetorics and philosophies in contrast with Philo's more philosophic Greek.

Strikingly in the fourth strophe (vv.14-16), v.14a, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο “The Logos became flesh,” refers directly to the incarnation of Jesus. This verse 14a, and ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός “the only begotten [only one of his kind] Son, who is in the bosom of the Father,” provide a critical allusion to the theological relationships between the Johannine Logos and the other hypostatic notions, such as personified Wisdom and Philo’s Logos. In other words, the Johannine Logos appears to be similar to Philo’s Logos, which is an example of λόγος informed by personified

---

[222] Smith, *The Theology of the Gospel of John*, 16-17, 53-55.

[223] McHugh, *John 1-4*, 40-41.

[224] Cf. Philo, *Conf.* xxviii, 144-46. Philo explains the Logos (Word) as God’s First-born. Philo writes that “a Son of God is the Word,” and “those who live in the knowledge of the One are rightly called ‘Sons [or children] of God’ (Deut. xiv 1).”

[225] Interestingly, this “light-metaphor” of the Johannine Logos, appears in the symbolic motif of a “light-metaphor” of transcendent Wisdom in the thought of Philo, and later in that of the *ḥokhmah* in medieval kabbalistic traditions, which I will examine later in this study.

Wisdom as a heavenly agent or as a hypostasis of Yahweh.[226] The Evangelist's use of the Logos theologically plays as a communicative means between God and humankind, which reveals the secret and salvation of God through the incarnation of Jesus.[227] The term σαρξ "flesh," as a counterpart of Logos alludes to a theologically significant matter. In particular, the Evangelist appears to emphasize the incarnation of Logos into flesh and blood of Jesus as reflecting the revelation and salvation of God. Brown, furthermore, expounds upon a profound connection between Incarnate Logos and personified Wisdom while thereby emphasizing the divine origin of Jesus, which is derived from the identification of personified Wisdom with Philo's Logos and Johannine Logos, i.e., the culmination of a Jewish wisdom tradition running through early Wisdom literature.**[228]** Indeed, the images and activities of personified Wisdom appear to be compatible with the activities and images of Incarnate Logos (Word) and the ministry of Jesus, which reflect the revelatory performance of God in the world.[229] One of the interesting points is that in Jn 6:41-58, the Evangelist asserts that the "flesh" and blood of Jesus is the "true food" and drink.[230] More interestingly, Keener explains its similar symbolic analogy to "food and drink" in personified Wisdom's invitation in Prov 9.[231] Indeed, the rhetorical expression of "food and drink" in the account of personified Wisdom further offers a critical insight into that of "flesh and blood" in the account of Incarnate Logos, which I will examine in detail later in this study.[232] Furthermore, the narrative of "the origin of the Logos and its indwelling" in Jn 1:14b, appears analogous to portrayals of personified Wisdom in early Jewish sources, such as *Sirach* and *Wisdom of Solomon*.[233] Finally, the Evangelist contrasts, in v.17, ὁ νόμος, "Law" which is credited to Moses and ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια "grace and truth" which is credited to Jesus.[234]

---

[226] Brant, *John*, 26. In this sense, the Evangelist's theological use of Logos alludes to Philo's Logos in the creation context.

[227] Through John 1-6, the speeches of Jesus are deeply related to His passion, death, and resurrection. The rhetoric method of "flesh" seems to be directly related to the ultimate purpose of the revelation of God's salvation. In the "Bread of Life" discourse in Jn 6:41-58, the Evangelist asserts the flesh and blood of Jesus is the true, real food and drink, which assures union with the Son and Father as the source of eternal life in the Prologue.

[228] Brown, Appendix II: The "Word," 519-24.

[229] Brown (29) expounds not only the presence of the incarnate Word in the world but also the rejection by the world that does not recognize the Word (10c), despite the existence of Jesus who has come into the world (Jn 3:19, 7:46, 4:5).

[230] Interestingly, the rhetorical analogy between "food and drink" and "flesh and blood" already appears to in a terminological, phraseological, and theological sources of the Gospel of John, including early Jewish sources, such as Prov 9, Sir 1:1-4; 15:3; 24:8, 19-21; 32:1-13, as well as Wis 9:1-2, 4. These passages in *Sirach* and *Wisdom of Solomon* are related to a concept of eating and drinking in relation to personified Wisdom which provides the righteous with ἄρτον συνέσεως "bread of understanding" and ὕδωρ σοφίας "water of wisdom" in a banquet. In this sense, the character of the banquet is also linked to an imagery of eating and drinking. This imagery and the motif of eating and drinking of personified Wisdom appears similar to those in the activities and ministries of Jesus as Incarnate Logos in the Prologue.

[231] Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 1:682. Personified Wisdom in Prov 9 and Sir 4:19-21 alludes to repeated thirst, whereas Jesus promises "never thirst again."

Some scholars, such as Erwin R. Goodenough, are doubtful whether the Logos, Wisdom, and other variants were widespread images, and whether they were generally expressed as mediator figures in a theological and philosophical system of the first-century or even second-century Judaism.[235] However, through this examination of the exegetical and hermeneutical features of the Johannine Prologue, we have seen that the Johannine Logos appears as a derivative form of the hypostatic notions of Torah as a mediator, such as Philo's Logos and personified Wisdom. This examination shows the direct or indirect interactions within multi-faceted (Palestinian, Hellenized, and Rabbinic) Judaism and early Christianity. It corroborates that the Johannine Logos not only appears to be closer to Philo's work than to other early Jewish sources but also appears as a striking copy of Philo's Logos in its relation to personified Wisdom as can be seen from the depiction of the images and activities of the Logos as the creation and revelation of God.

---

[232] Clifford, *Proverbs*, 32. Clifford observes, "Jesus speaks in long discourses", "Jesus recruits disciples" and "gives the bread [and wine] of life" in a similar form with Woman Wisdom. See also Brown, 32.

[233] Brant, *John*, 26. Jn 1:14b, ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας, "The Word became flesh and made His dwelling among us. We have seen His glory, the glory of the [only Son] from the Father, full of grace and truth." The concept of "indwelling" is profoundly related to the rabbinic and Jewish mystical concept of *shekhinah,* which I will examine later in this study.

[234] McHugh, *John 1-4*, 67. In addition, we can see that "The essential nature of the Greek concept of νόμος has something in common with the Greek gods." See Gerhard Kittel, et el., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (vol. 4) (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964), 1033. In the LXX, תורה is the "vast majority of cases translated νόμος (some 200 times out of 220)" (Kittel, 1046). In Rabbinic Judaism, the Law is denoted by the term תורה (Kittel, 1082-83). In the Johannine Prologue, νόμος can usually be translated as תורה, which means the whole teachings in the Law, as it does in the Hebrew Bible. However, the point is that in the Johannine Prologue, νόμος in v.17, which primarily signifies the Deuteronomistic laws in the written Torah, has no "possibility for regulating human or even Christian action," and it is shown as the first instance of revelation, in the sense that "it is set in confrontation with Jesus."

[235] Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr: An Investigation into the Conceptions of Early Christian Literature and Its Hellenistic and Judaistic Influences* (Amsterdam: Philo, 1968), 140-41; Boyarin, "The Gospel of the Memra," 248. Some scholars, such as Boyarin, who attempt to interpret the meanings of the Logos within the context of Jewish Midrash, importantly consider the translations of either דבר (word) or חכמה (wisdom) in Jewish wisdom traditions into the Logos. They assume that the Prologue can be a kind of homily or midrash, which means a retelling of a biblical story through the exegetical Jewish wisdom tradition on a passage, such as Gen 1:1, as noted earlier.

Nonetheless, it appears that these external influences do not compromise the unique characteristics of the Johannine Prologue. The exegetical and rhetorical features in the images of the Johannine Logos corroborate not only an intertextual and theological relationship between the Johannine Logos and other hypostatic notions but also the unique idea of the Johannine Logos and the theology of its incarnation, which were essentially founded through creative complex operations fused with various interactive influences. This examination shows explicit evidence of a particular hermeneutic strategy based on John's theological intentions and philosophical backgrounds, which combines the concept of Greek Logos, as expressed Philo's Logos, with the concept of Jewish Wisdom, as expressed in a Hellenistic Jewish tradition, and thereby create the images of the Johannine Logos. In this sense, the images of the Logos in the Johannine Prologue validate an exegetical, philosophical, and theological nexus with the images of personified Wisdom and Philo's Logos. Specifically, the images of the Johannine Logos convey not only an image of the Son of God as an angelic mediator like Philo's Logos but also Incarnate Logos in a manner similar to the images of personified Wisdom, as well as an image of the Messiah. This demonstrates that both the features of the Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah explicitly appear in the images of the Johannine Logos, within the profound interactions of the Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered traditions, which were manifest during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. I will further discuss this subject later in this study in order to concretize the intertextual and theological relationships of the Johannine Logos to various hypostatic notions of Torah, and the formulation of the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, as well as the existence of the two supposed traditions through the history of Jewish thought.

Memra

As noted earlier, the concept of Torah appears to have been centralized within Palestinian Judaism, including in Rabbinic Judaism around the first century C.E. Boyarin notes that the Rabbis attempted to understand and represent God as a tangible and substantial God in their practical life, while simultaneously defending a monotheistic and transcendent understanding of God from the problematic theological issues (e.g., the Godhead or Trinity).[236] In this context, the Rabbis appear to focus on the term, concept, and image of Torah, itself, instead of using its hypostatic notions by idiosyncratically reformulating the concept of God and Torah through rabbinic exegetical and hermeneutical strategies.

In the classical Palestinian midrash *Ber. Rab.*, R. Hoshaya of Caesarea states that God examined the Torah as a blueprint in order to create the world.[237] The rabbinic thought in this midrash radically hypothesizes the existence of the Torah before the creation of the world, in spite of an inner conflict, i.e., the conflict between a preexistent Torah and the idea that the Torah was revealed at Sinai.[238] This midrash shows that the concept of Torah appears to have been changed into the hypostatic notion of Torah, which represents the presence and attributes of God. The critical change of the rabbinic concept of Torah can be seen in the hypostatic notion of *memra* (מֵימְרָא) in Aramaic. Interestingly, the term *memra*, which appears as one of the rabbinic concepts of Torah, is, from a semantic perspective, profoundly related to the philosophical concept of Logos in Greek. First, we can see that the *memra*, understood as a hypostatic notion in the Targums, is semantically used as a similar and interchangeable term with the Hebrew term Word, *davar* (דבר), which denotes "spoken words," or "word(s) of God," in ancient Near East tradition.[239] In addition, the *memra* has a textual nexus with the term “Word of God” in the Hebrew Bible texts, which is generally employed in biblical dialogues in which patriarch or prophet is addressed, such as Gen 15:1, Num 12:6, Sam 3:21, and so forth.[240] There are also some related passages, such as Ps 107:20, “He sent his word, and healed them,” and Ps. 33:6, “By the word of the Lord, were the heavens made.” Specifically, the *memra* in the Targums functions as God's messenger instead of God Himself.[241] Robert Hayward points out, “in Neofiti, the *Memra* indicates God's revelatory activity as 'HYH.[242] However, Hayward states that the usages of *memra* in the Targums are in line with a rabbinic exegetical and hermeneutical strategy to avoid

---

[236] Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 129. According to Boyarin, the Rabbis' subjective assurance of the presence of God overwhelmed the necessity of the doctrinal constitution of the concepts of God. This tendency was part of a normal spirituality rooted in everyday life. This also implies that God does not come forcibly to human beings. Rather, God comes in proportion to the human capacity of understanding and receiving God, as God is radically a subjective experience. Each person can experience God's presence in a variety of ways to meet the needs of their unique temperament.

[237] Ibid., 128. In this midrash, R. Eliezer b, R, Zadok and R. Akiva spoke of the Torah as an instrument in the creation of the world within the doctrine of revelation of Rabbinic Judaism. (reference to the midrash itself)

[238] Boyarin, "The Gospel of the Memra," 287.

[239] See Stephen A. Kaufman, "Dating the Language of the Palestinian Targums and Their Use in the Study of First Century Texts" in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context,* eds. Derek R. G. Beattie, and Martin J. McNamara (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 119-130. The date of Targums is a controversial issue. Qumranists, such as Frank M. Cross, date the Palestinian Targums texts composed around the "second, third, or even late fourth century B.C.E., however later the script of the copies of that document recovered from Qumran may be." (122). The relationship between the spoken Aramaic of first-century Palestine

---

and the Aramaic of the Palestinian Targum(s) cannot be ignored. Joseph A. Fitzmyer categorizes the chronological phases as follows: 1) Old Aramaic, until 700 B.C.E.; 2) Official (Imperial) Aramaic c. 700 to 200 B.C.E.; 3) Middle Aramaic 200 B.C.E. to 200 C.E. which shows local dialects, such as in Nabatean, Qumran, and so forth; 4) Late Aramaic roughly 200 to 700 CE. (esp. 72). See Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, c1979), 57-84. This shows that the first and final dating are still not fixed exactly, while most of Targums (“the primitive basic texts of both Targums Onqelos and Jonathan of the Prophets”) are dated after second centuries C.E. (Kaufman, 122). For this reason, it is not reasonable to exclude the study of *memra* in the Targums from the discussion of the Word of God and Torah, as well as from the discussion of Greek Logos.

[240] Lexicographers note different etymological origins of דבר, such as “to be behind,” and “word” or “to speak.” In the Hebrew Bible, דבר is a substantive, which means a Word, thing, or something. See Ernst Jenni, and Claus Westermann, *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* vols. 3 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 1:325. The Word of God appears approximately 240 times in the Hebrew Bible, mainly occurred in the Pentateuch. In addition, it is used as object and subject, such as “commandment,” especially in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic works. In the prophetic literature, דבר means a “self-revelation of God” (332) which alludes to a relationship between the word of God and the prophetic word. The important point is that the term דבר seems to be semantically identical with Torah in the Wisdom literature. However, דבר does not seem to be used as a personification, except for “Hu (‘utterance, saying’) which is found as In Ps 107:20, “To those to whom he sent his word to heal them” and 147:15 “Who sent his word to earth.” In these verses, we can see a divine attribute that is “separate from the deity, considered autonomous and understood as an independent entity or even as a special deity” (332). This also implies even a personification of the divine word.

[241] Ernest G. Clarke, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 23-24. Instead of “God,” “the voice of the Memra of the Lord” is used in the translation of Pseudo-Jonathan on Dt 4:33 and “the voice of his Memra” in the translations of *Tg. Neof.* of Dt 4:36.

[242] Robert Hayward, “The Memra of YHWH and the Development of Its Use in Targum Neofiti,” *JJS* 25 (1974): 417-8. The *memra,* in *Tg. Neof.* I, in relation to the term *ehyeh* as a self-designation of God, appears to be used as an apparatus for expressing the Divine Presence in God's speech, when God communicates with human beings. In this sense, the usages and meanings of *memra* in the Targumic traditions give a particular theological meaning to the Divine Name (YHWH; the Tetragrammaton, HE IS/WILL BE THERE). Hayward in *Divine Name and Presence: The Memra*, 1-53, notes that the *memra* just functions as a substitution for the divine name YHWH, and is neither a personification nor a hypostasis in the Targum texts (5-7). In particular, Hayward also notes a possibility of the identification of memra with God’s mercy in Rabbinic literature (53). Nahmanides disagrees with Maimonides, who sees the use of the targumic terms, such as *memra* and *shekhinah* as a means of avoiding anthropomorphic descriptions of God in order to defend a notion of incorporeality of God. Nahmanides, however, holds a mystical and symbolic meaning of these terms. See Nathaniel Deutsch, *Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 5-7; M. Kadushin, *The Rabbinic Mind,* 2nd ed. (Blaisdell, 1965), 325-36. The rabbinic and targumic ideas of *memra* and *shekhinah* were accepted by the consensus modern scholarship as a “buffer term to preserve the transcendence of God; it has no reality of its own” (Thomas H. Tobin, “Logos,” *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* 4 (1992): 352-3).

anthropomorphisms in speaking of God, and to preserve a symbolic notion of His in-corporeality.[243] In this similar vein, Brown also notes that the *memra* in *Tg. Onq.* does not appear to be related to a literary personification.[244] Mack assumes that the development of personification and hypostazation of the *memra* in the Targums might have been difficult within Rabbinic Judaism, which presupposes the divine transcendence.[245]

In this context, Martin J. McNamara further discusses that in the translation of *Tg. Neof.* to Dt 1:32, "You have not believed in the Lord" is translated as "You did not believe in the Name of the Memra of the Lord your God." [246] In the translation of *Tg. Onq.* to Num 27:14, "My Memra" is also meant as the manifestation or the agent of God.[247] This means that *memra* can refer to an angelic agent of the Deity who sustains the course of nature and personifies the Law (or the Torah).[248] This shows that the *memra* in these passages is also used to refer to the pre-existent Torah, which is an instrument of creation, which was examined earlier. In this vein, Craig S. Keener and George F. Moore delves into the possibility of the hypostatization and personification of *memra*.[249] As Ernest G. Clarke notes, the *memra* also sometimes refers to the appearance of the divine voice or power instead of God Himself.[250] In this vein, we can see that in the translation of *Tg. Ps.- J.* to Dt 4:33, "the voice of the Memra of the Lord" is used instead of "God," while "the voice of his Memra" is used in the translations of *Tg. Neof.* to Dt 4:36.[251] In this sense, Azzan Yaddin argues that the *memra* is profoundly connected to a hypostatic Voice (קול), i.e., the source of revelatory voices.[252] The concept of the hypostatic ‘Voice’ can be found in the passages, such as Ex 19:19, Num 7:89-8:1, in the Hebrew Bible itself, and are implicitly connected to the Revelation of Jn 1:10, 12, 15, 4:1 on the New Testament (NT).[253] Charlesworth suggests, convincingly, that “it is well known that both many Jews and many early Christians knew about a heavenly Voice; what is not clear is whether by circa A.D.100 there had developed a concept of a heavenly being, the Voice.”[254] This investigation demonstrates a profound relationship of the *memra* to other hypostatic notions, such as the Logos and Torah, as well as the hypostatic Voice.

---

[243] Hayward, *Divine Name and Presence: The Memra* (Totowa, NJ: Allanheld, Osmun, 1981), 3.
[244] Brown, 117.
[245] Burton L. Mack, *Logos und Sophia: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie im Hellenistischen Judentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 6.
[246] Martin J. McNamara, *Targum Neofiti 1: Deuteronomy* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997), 19.
[247] Alexander Sperber, Abraham Berliner, and Israel Drazin, *Targum Onkelos to Numbers: An English Translation of the Text with Analysis and Commentary* (based on the A. Sperber and A. Berliner edition) (Hoboken, N.J.: Ktav Pub. House, 1998), 270.
[248] Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 116; Marion J. Edwards, "Justin's Logos and the Word of God," *JECS*, no. 3 (1995): 263.
[249] Keener, 1:349; George F. Moore, "Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: Memra, Shekinah, Metatron," *HTR* 15, no.1 (1922): 54.
[250] Clarke, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, 23-24.
[251] Clarke, 23-24.
[252] Azzan Yadin, "קול as Hypostasis in the Hebrew Bible," *JBL* (2003): 616.

In addition, it is crucial to note that in a manner similar to Philo’s Logos, the *memra* appears to hypotatize the Law (ὁ νόμος) in the Targums and, in some cases, appears as a heavenly or angelic agent of God, who sustains the course of nature.[255] As John L. Ronning suggests, from a semantic perspective, the *memra* is conceivably related to the Greek Logos.[256] Several scholars, such as Boyarin, recognize that the use of *memra* in the Aramaic exegesis is a striking parallel to the Logos, insofar as both terms are related to the Torah (or Law) of God.[257] It is beneficial to note that the *memra* in connection to the Logos might have been suggested by early Christians writers, such as Justin Martyr.[258] In *the Dialogue with Trypho,* we find:

> An everlasting and final Law [Torah was] Christ himself, and a trustworthy covenant has been given to us, after which there shall be no law, or commandment, or precept. Then everyone can clearly see from these deeds and the accompanying powerful miracles that he isindeed the New Law, the new covenant, and the expectation of those who, from every nation, have awaited the blessings of God. (chapter 11: 2, 4)[259] .. because he sometimes appears in visions that cannot be contained; is called a *Man* and a *Human being*, because he appears arrayed in such forms as please the Father; and they call him Word [or Logos], because he reveals to men the discourses of the Father. (chapter 128:1)[260]

---

[253] Ibid.
[254] James H. Charlesworth, “The Jewish Roots of Christology: The Discovery of the Hypostatic Voice,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 39, no. 1 (1986): 23.
[255] Beattie, and McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible*, 12, 14, 122.
[256] John L. Ronning, *The Jewish Targums and John's Logos Theology* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 13. Ronning mentions that *memra,* which is derived from the Aramaic root אמר, may be used simply as a translation of a Hebrew word for “word.” He mentions that the word is related to the Logos when it is used as “a circumlocution for the divine name.”
[257] Boyarin, *Border lines*, 116.
[258] Boyarin, “The Gospel of the Memra,” 275-78.
[259] Saint Justin Martyr, and Michael Slusser. *Dialogue with Trypho*, Selections from the Fathers of the Church, Vol. 3 (Catholic University of America Press, 2003), 20-21.
[260] Ibid., 193.

Justin's several arguments in *the Dialogue with Trypho* allude to the fact that there were a certain number of people who were aware of a personified divine Logos (i.e., the Word of God), which is arguably identified with the *memra*, even before the Incarnation of Jesus.[261] This passage appears to be profoundly related to the story, as translated in Palestinian Targums to Gen 15:1-6 of Abraham who believed in the *memra* of God.[262] The theophany at *mamre* describes the appearance of *memra* to Abraham in Gen 15:1-6, "And it was after these things that the Word of God appeared to Abraham (v. 1)… Abraham believed in God and he reckoned it for him as righteousness" (v. 6).[263] We find here a Johannine idea of the Logos, as depicted in Jn 8:56-59. As explicit evidence of the relationship between *memra* and Incarnate Logos, Justin Martyr claims that the Logos has already have revealed himself to Abraham, who presumably rejoiced, and gladly received him before the incarnation of Jesus.[264] By this logic, Justin Martyr explicitly depicts Jesus as a human being who personifies the Law (Torah) and the Logos (Word). This shows the relationship of *memra* in the ancient Rabbinic and Targumic midrash to the Johannine Logos in the Prologue.

In this vein, several NT scholars also studied the influence and implication of the concept of the *memra* (or the Word of the Lord) in the Palestinian Targum as an acceptable Jewish exegetical source for the Johannine concept of the Logos reflected in the Prologue, as well as for other early Christian sources. However, they generally argue that the Johannine Prologue is not familiar with rabbinic sources, and the dating of most rabbinic sources is later than the date of the Johannine Prologue in the Gospel of John.[265] Nevertheless, it is still meaningful and necessary to examine a connection between the Gospel of John and rabbinic traditions in relation to the concept of Torah due to the agreed assumption of a later date of the final compositional editing of the Johannine Prologue in the Gospel of John, as well as the chronological diversity and ambiguousness of the time of the final editing of the Targums and the Rabbinic sources.

---

[261] Ibid., 71-73, 84-88, 264-66. See also Edwards, "Justin's Logos and the Word of God," 279.

[262] Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 275-76.

[263] Ronning, *The Jewish Targums*, 46-69. As noted earlier, Abraham's belief in the *memra* of God appears in the Palestinian Targum to Gen 15:6.

[264] Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 276. In this passage (vv. 57-58), Jews say, "You are not yet fifty years old, and have you seen Abraham?" (v.57). Jesus answers them, "Truly, truly I say to you, before Abraham was, I am" (v. 58). This passage implies that Abraham would be one of those "who received him," and became "one of the children of God."

[265] See Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 151-59.

In this context, Gary A. Anderson asserts that the profound relationships (e.g., "preexistence and superintendence") between the Johannine Logos and *memra* appear in the various interpretations of the term *bereshit "*in the beginning," in the creation context, and are intertwined by the inextricable (i.e., rabbinic, philosophical, and Jewish mystical) concepts in the Palestinian Targum, the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, and *Gen. Rab*. i, 1.[266] By analyzing the Johannine Prologue, McHugh also states that the Evangelist identified the *memra* (i.e. Torah or Word of God) with the Greek term Logos.[267] In particular, McNamara, Bruce Chilton, and Alejandro Díez Macho all investigate and prove the existence of *memra* in the Targums as the conceptual and theological backgrounds that stand behind the Johannine Logos.[268]

Clear evidence for the relationship between the *memra* and the Johannine Logos appears in a poetic homiletic text in the Targmuic midrash of the "four nights":

> Four nights are written in the Book of Memories: The first night: when the Lord was revealed above the world to create it. The world was unformed and void and darkness was spread over the surface of the deep; and through his *memra* there was light and illumination, and he called it the first night.[269]

---

[266] Gary A. Anderson, "The Interpretation of Gen 1:1 in the Targums," *CBQ* 52 (1990), 28.

[267] McHugh, *John 1-4*, 6. This implies that the Evangelist presented Jesus as the Savior "to all 'the Greeks' (cf. Jn 12:21) who sincerely sought the truth about God amid the perplexing world of Hellenistic religions."

[268] Martin J. McNamara, *Targum and Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 102-3; idem, "Logos of the Fourth Gospel and Memra of the Palestinian Targum (Ex 1242)," 115-7; Bruce Chilton, *Judaic Approaches to the Gospels* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 271-304; Alejandro Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1: Targum Palestinense ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana: edición príncipe, introducción general y versión castellana*, Vol. 4 (Spain: Editorial CSIC-CSIC Press, 1974); idem, "El Logos y el Espfritu Santo," *Atlantida 1* (1963): 381-96. These scholars all argued for the close connection between the *memra* in the Palestinian Targums and the Johannine Logos. There is a possibility, therefore, of the existence of a primitive conception of *memra* as a personified divine Logos, even before the incarnation of Jesus. See also Edwards, "Justin's Logos and the Word of God," 279.

[269] Michael L. Klein, ed. and trans., *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch according to Their Extant Sources* (2 vols.; AnBib; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980), 2:47; McNamara, "Logos of the Fourth Gospel and Memra of the Palestinian Targum (Ex 1242)," *The Expository Times* 79, no. 4 (1968): 115-7. As McNamara analyzes, the midrash of the "four nights" shows a closer connection between the Jewish religious tradition manifested in the Targums and the early Christian religious tradition as appeared in the Gospels in terms of the theological subjects, such as messianism.

As Martin J. McNamara notes, this text bears a striking terminological resemblance to the Johannine Prologue as is seen in its use of the words *memra* (Word or Logos), the Logos, and light.[270] It is notable that the type of prose which we find in the Targumic midrash appears to be similar to the genre of the Prologue to the Gospel of John as a kind of rhetorical prose, as noted earlier. In addition to the Targums, the explicit evidence of the personification and hypostatization of *memra* can be found in early Christian sources, such as Justin Martyr's work, *the Dialogue with Trypho*, as examined earlier.[271] The *memra* in affinity to Philo's Jewish conception of the Logos strengthens the possibility of incorporation and interaction of the *memra* in the Targums, and other rabbinic sources, with the Christian Johannine conception of Logos as well as with various other hypostatic notions of Torah, which were held by Jewish non-Christians in the first and second centuries C.E. As Marion J. Edwards states, the Johannine Logos can be referred to as *memra*, i.e., the Word of God or Torah, as well as personified Wisdom.[272] From a Christological perspective, the Johannine Logos can be identified with Philo's Logos, or with personified Wisdom in relation to Torah.

As Ringgren analyzes, the profound (intertextual and theological) relationships between Philo's Logos and personified Wisdom corroborate the personification and hypostatization of other hypostatic notions of Torah in the Wisdom literature (e.g., Sir 24:3, and Wis 9:1-2), Targumic and Rabbinic literature.[273] As it is articulated in Sir 24 and rabbinic midrash, the personification of Word

---

[270] McNamara, *Targum and Testament*, 102-3. McNamara notes that the Targumic text conveys an original midrashic exegesis rather than a later "Christianizing" interpolation. He also elaborates on its theological nexus with personified Wisdom and Philo's Logos.

[271] Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 22-24.

> And as an eternal and final Law [Torah] was Christ given to us… all can understand that He is the new Law, and the new Disposition, and the Expectation of those from among all the nations, who await the good things that come to them at the hands of God (xi. 2, 4)… He appears sometimes in an appearance that cannot be reckoned by space; and was called sometimes a man and a human being, since He makes His appearance in the fashion of such forms as the Father wills. And they called Him Word (Logos), since He also bears to men the discourses that come from the Father (cxxviii. 1).

In addition, there is a scholarly debate about whether Justin's works are depending on the Gospel of John. Nonetheless, this shows that the *memra* is a possible Jewish source for the Logos, which might have been regarded as a special case of contemporaneous Jewish hypostatic notions even within early Christian writings.

[272] Edwards, "Justin's Logos and the Word of God," 262.

[273] Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, 123, 163-64. Personified Wisdom in the Targums substantiates the existence and features of personified Wisdom in in Gen 1:1, Prov. 8, and Sir 24, which were examined earlier.

(or Torah) and Wisdom shows the concept and image of *memra* as a pre-existent agent or instrument of God's plan of creation.[274] In all, this substantiates not only that the *memra* has a semantic nexus with the Word and Torah, as an interchangeable term, but also that it is engendered out of the concatenation of the other hypostatic notions, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos.[275]

On the basis of these examinations, Alan Segal further observes that the concept of *memra* is closely related to the heretical idea of *Two powers in Heaven* in the Jewish Logos theology.[276] Several scholars, such as William D. Davies and Boyarin, also point out that the idea of *Two powers in Heaven*, in Jewish Midrash, along with the interpretations of the *memra* could have been part of an accepted Jewish Logos theology.[277] Indeed, this examination demonstrates that the Johannine Logos has a profound relationship to the notion of *memra* and the idea of *Two Powers in Heaven* in Jewish Midrash.[278] This substantiates that, in the shifting process from Wisdom and Logos to the concept of Torah in Rabbinic Judaism, the idea of Logos remained as an ancient Jewish heritage, which derived from the idea of *Two Powers in Heaven* in the Jewish *memra* theology, and which later transmuted into a Jewish Christian tradition.[279] Davies also agrees that the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, and *memra*, were sometimes even called a second God among Semitic speaking Jews.[280] This shows that the binitarian conception, such as the second and visible God (Wisdom, Logos, and *memra* as the Son of God), was originally derived from pre-Christian Jewish understanding and interpretations. This also implies that even though the binitarian worship or the belief in a second God does not appear as an acceptable belief in rabbinic traditions, it became more common to many Jews who followed other religious traditions throughout the Rabbinic periods.[281] As Hayward notes, even extant Rabbinic texts demonstrate that the Rabbis had a sufficient understanding for *memra* theology as an intermediary, even though they constructed their own orthodoxy without professing the Jewish Logos.[282]

---

[274] Frank, *The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach*, 33; Glicksman, *Wisdom of Solomon 10*, 122-23; Brant, *John*, 26.

[275] I will discuss in detail more evidence of their intertextual and theological nexuses and their distinctive usages later in this study.

[276] Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*, 5-6.

[277] William D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, 2nd ed. (1965; London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1995), 170-72. Cf. Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 128-31; Ronning, *The Jewish Targums*, 271, 275-78, 281.

[278] Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 131, 145-47; Azzan Yadin, "Shenei Ketuvim and Rabbinic Interpretation," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 33, no. 4 (2002): 386-410.

[279] Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 5-6; Boyarin, "The Gospel of the Memra," 275-78.

[280] Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 147-76.

It is also conceivable that in the formative period of Palestinian Targums, the Logos theology as expressed in the concept of *memra*, was deeply related to Jewish doctrine and its conception of *Two Powers in Heaven,* which was accepted by an active and particular current within non-Christian Judaic circles. As noted earlier, the interrelationship between the *memra* as a Jewish hypostatic notion and the Johannine Logos gives a critical insight into a deeper theological interaction between early Christianity and multifaceted (Palestinian, Hellenized, and Rabbinic) Judaism. Above all, this interrelationship substantiates an innovative way of thinking about the concepts of Torah: the *memra*, as the origin of Law or the Word of God as a source of being, in a common pattern of rabbinic thought, also including in Philo's Jewish conception of the Logos as "a second God," as well as in the Johannine Logos as a Christian conception of the Logos as "a second God" or as a Person of God, that is as Incarnate Logos. Taken together, this implies that the concept of *memra* has been utilized as an original form of Incarnate Logos in early Christianity before the Trinitarian doctrine of Christianity was institutionalized.

This examination shows that the concept of *memra* triggers a couple of theological and philosophical questions: is there an essential connection between *memra* and Logos in the Judaic and Hellenistic religious worlds in antiquity?; what is the role of the conception of the *memra* in the formative process of the theological doctrine of the Logos in early Christianity? In this context, the Rabbis later perceived the idea of *Two Powers in Heaven* as one of the earlier categories of heresy of a new phenomenon of Christianity.[283] Against this backdrop, Boyarin constructs a compelling theory:

---

[281] The trajectory of the evidence of binitarian worship conveys the belief in Incarnate Logos as an intermediary, i.e., a *deuteros theos* throughout the history of Jewish mysticism from the Rabbinic period to the early Kabbalistic period of the Middle Ages. I will discuss this point later in this study.

[282] Hayward, *Divine Name and Presence: The Memra*, 1-4.

[283] Ibid., 69.

they gradually repudiated the Logos theology itself due to the heretical elements of the idea of *Two Powers in Heaven* as a non-rabbinic religious expression, while making a differentiation between Rabbinic Judaism and its ideology and Christological doctrine.[284] The foregoing analysis also implies, according to Boyarin, that the Jewish idea of *Two Powers in Heaven* is based on the concept of *memra* and appears to be a critical theological concept in the development of Christology. In this context, the more Rabbinized Targums and Rabbinic literature itself conspicuously censored the Logos theology, which was based on the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos and Metatron. Afterward, rabbinic theology expelled the idea of *Two Powers in Heaven* as one of the categories of heresy from their orthodoxy, while trying to censor the traditional concepts of *memra* or Logos as divine intermediaries from the center of Rabbinic Judaism in opposition to earlier Hellenistic and Palestinian Jewish traditions.[285] In this vein, this rabbinic theological position with regard to the Logos theology characterizes the major difference between orthodox Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism. As Maren Niehoff notes, the comments of rabbinic scholars on the *minim*, which presumably and generally referred to Christians, reflect a clear difference between Rabbinic Judaism and the emerging context of early Christianity.[286] In fact, we can see that the binitarianism of a traditional Jewish Logos theology appears to be generally similar to the doctrine of Modalism, which was regarded as one of the Christian heresies.[287] However, unlike the Rabbis, Nicene orthodoxy, which emerged as Christian orthodoxy, accepted the Logos as a divine intermediary and Logos theology.[288] Strictly speaking, the idea of *Two Powers in Heaven*, which is similar to the concept of Incarnate Logos as a radical form of Christology, was eventually rejected by the theological debates even within early Christian orthodoxy. The critical point is that the Rabbis still remained active in the discourse of the Jewish *memra* or Logos theology, which demonstrates a profound theological dialogue with early Christian traditions.

---

[284] Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 131-32; Charles K. Barrett, "Jews and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius," in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity*, Essays in Honor of W. D. Davies (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 223; Interestingly, the critical shifts can be observed within Rabbinic texts dating between the earlier Palestinian and the later Babylonian Talmuds.

[285] James D. G. Dunn, *The Parting of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (London: SCM Press and Trinity Press International, 1991), 219. See also Alan Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 5-6.

[286] Maren R. Niehoff, "*Creatio ex Nihilo* Theology in Genesis Rabbah in light of Christian Exegesis," *HTR* (2006): 38-39. Niehoff points out that it is necessary to trace the followers of Jesus's origin in Jewish traditions, since the new movement involved them for its own purposes, which were deeply related to the subject of exemption from the law for the identity of Christianity mentioned in the writings of Paul. This context might have caused the emergence of orthodox Christian identity, and at the same time, intensified its position in response to Jews and Rabbinic Judaism. The parting of the main bodies of Christianity and Judaism appears to occur after the second revolt of Bar Kokhba 132-135 C.E. In this context, the centrality of Logos theology in Christianity is one of the clearest symbols of the theological separation between them. These different manners in which Early Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism understood the Logos led to the construction of borders between the two religions, which had not previously existed, but were now decisively constructed. Even though Judaism and Christianity were vague in defining the entities, we can infer, from the earliest stages of their parallel development on the subject of the Logos, that theological conflicts and respective developments on the subject of Logos had a great influence on the split-up between Christianity and Judaism. The collection of laws and narratives about *minut* in the discourse of heresiology of the Rabbis, which is related to the idea of *Two*

In all, the concept of *memra* hypostatized and personified in the Targumic and Rabbinic sources appears to be parallel to the conceptual changes of Torah, as a result of Hellenistic influences, into personified Wisdom, as well as to Philo's Logos and even the Johannine Logos. Specifically, it is notable that the images of *memra* appear closer to a Logos-centered hypostatic notion, such as Philo's Logos and Johannine Logos than a Wisdom-centered hypostatic notion (i.e., personified Wisdom). This corroborates the existence of the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, which were part of a broader Logos-centered tradition and Wisdom-centered tradition, respectively, in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. In this context, I will examine another example of the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions, i.e., *shekhinah,* in comparison to other hypostatic notions, which were previously examined, in order to concretize the existence of the two traditions—Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered—and the explicit evidence of the emergence and development of the two different kinds of the hypostatic notions of Torah throughout the history of Jewish thought.

Powers in Heaven, may be in part of a response to Christianity, rather than about Christianity. See Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 133-41, 167-71, 192-96, 200.

[287] Ibid.; Wolfson, "Judaism and Incarnation: The Imaginal Body of God," in *Christianity in Jewish Terms*, ed. Tikva Simone Frymer-Kensky (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2000), 241. Modalism understands Jesus as just an aspect of the one God, while attempting to hold the opinion that considers Incarnate Logos as Jesus and God as separate persons. Modalism, in this sense, generally appears in a rabbinic doctrine of God.

[288] Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 33-57.

Shekhinah

Even though the *shekhinah* (שכינה), which literally means "dwelling or presence of God," does not appear properly in the Hebrew Bible, it is apparently related to the rabbinic and Jewish mystical concepts of Torah**.** In the Hebrew Bible, there are conceptions and images related to the *shekhinah*: the glory of God who "dwells" in the mountain (Ps 68:16-18; Jl 3:17); the glory of God, which filled the tabernacle according to Ex 40:34; "the glory of God" dwelling in the Temple according to 2 Chr 7:1-16. In a manner similar to the image of *shekhinah*, there are also various depictions of the divine presence as a cloud (Ex 24:16-18; Ex 33:9; 1 Kgs 8:10-13), as a pillar of smoke and fire (Ex 13:21-22), and as fire and a burning bush (Zech 2:5; Ex 3:2).

It is notable that, in Rabbinic literature, the *shekhinah* is explicitly connected to the meanings of the cloud indicating the Divine Presence, as well as "the glory of God" in 1 Sam 4:22 as a symbol with the Divine Presence, and of the glory, i.e. *kavod* (כבוד) of God, in Ex 33:18. As R. D. Middleton notes, the conception of the *shekhinah* (which is written as *shekhinta* (שכינתא) in the Targums) is equivalent in meanings to "glory" of *yeqara* and *kavod* in the Targums.[289] As Anderson also notes, the terms *shekhinta* and *yeqara* and their usages interestingly appear similar to those of the targumic word *memra* as used in the creation context, which appears in the Targums.[290] Specifically, the term *shekhinah*, in the Talmudic and Tagrumic literature (e.g., *Tg. Onq.*), is generally used when the texts represent the anthropomorphic manifestation of the Lord and His closeness to human beings.[291] In various mentions of *shekhinah* in the sayings of the Amoraim, such as "They enjoy the splendor of the *shekhinah* (מִזִּיו הַשְּׁכִינָה)" in b. *Ber.* 17a and "The Holy One, blessed be He, sates them with the splendor of the *shekhinah*" in b. *B. Bat.* 10a, we can infer the omnipresence of God is described in relation to the image of *shekhinah*.[292] In the sayings of R. Nathan in the Halakhic Midrashim, the *shekhinah* even refers to God Himself as “the Holy One, blessed be He.”[293]

---

[289] Middleton, 120-30.

[290] Anderson, "The Interpretation of Gen 1:1 in the Targums," 28; Middleton, 125-30.

[291] See *Baraita*, b. *Sabb.* 12b; b. *Ned.* 40a; Urbach, *The Sages*, 42-45; J. Abelson, *The Immanence of God in Rabbinic Literature* (London: MacMillan, 1912), 83.

In a manner similar to the splendor of the *shekhinah*, the ‘light’ (אור) of God is also used for the *shekhinah* in some Rabbinic sources. The Sages, in *Num. Rab.* xv, 6 and *Lev. Rab.* xxxi, 8, connect the concept and image of the ‘light’ in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Prov 16:15) to ‘the light of the Holy One, blessed be He.’[294] The concept of the *shekhinah,* related to an invisible and hidden image of the ‘light’ of God, explicitly appears in relation to a divine-like image of Wisdom in *Wisdom of Solomon* (e.g., Wis 7:26).[295] Interestingly, the Jewish author also connects the ‘light’ image of the *shekhinah* to the intermediary image of personified Wisdom in a female form, which involves the doctrine of *pneuma* as the breath or spirit of the Creator (e.g., Wis 1:1-8; Wis 6:1-8; cf. Philo, *Opif.* xlvi, 135).[296] In all, this examination corroborates that this conception of *shekhinah* involves a poetic, mythic, and anthropomorphic understanding which is the result of exegetic and hermeneutic strategies, which symbolically formulates a divine-like image of *shekhinah*.

It is also crucial to note that, as Serge Ruzer notes, the *shekhinah* appears as a new mediating apparatus and “indwelling” locus for His people after the destruction of the Temple.[297] The *shekhinah* as a noun, or *shekinta* in the Targums, also represents the “indwelling of the Deity” or the Divine Presence, while avoiding an anthropomorphic and personal conception of the Deity.[298] The “indwelling” concept and image of *shekhinah* particularly appears in relation to the senses and images of a unique and selected place, such as the Tabernacle (מִשְׁכָּן, *mishkhan*), the Sanctuary, and the

---

[292] See Efraim E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), 45-6.
[293] Urbach, *The Sages*, 44.
[294] Ibid., 46.
[295] Wis 7:26: “For she is the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of his goodness.” (KJV).
[296] Max Pohlenz, *Die Stoa: Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung,* vol. 1 (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 368.
[297] Serge Ruzer, “From Man as Locus of God’s Indwelling to Death as Temple’s Destruction: Notes on the History of a Motif,” *Revue Biblique* 119 no. 3 (2012): 393-97. As Ruzer notes, in m. *Sotah* 9:15, t. *Sotah* 13:3, and b. *Sotah* 48b, we can also see that the *shekhin*ah appears, as a result of prophecy, instead of a heavenly echo or the Holy Spirit.
[298] Middleton, “Logos and Shekinah,” 120.

Chosen House in the Talmudic and Rabbinic literature.[299] As Alon notes, the concept and image of *shekhinah* is symbolically connected to the image of the Tabernacle during the wandering of the Israelites in the wilderness, and in the Exile, and in the Diaspora, but is also associated with a dwelling place for the Deity in the Temple of Jerusalem.[300]

Importantly, the s*hekhinah* in Tannaitic literature appears to be used not only for the manifestation of the Lord but also for the concept of angels as a means of expressing His closeness to his people, although it is a controversial issue.[301] One of the interesting characteristics of Tannaitic literature is the use of the image of *shekhinah* as a mediator to explain the concept of angels, such as “the angel of God, who went before the camp of Israel” in Ex 14:19.[302] This shows that the *shekhinah* appears as a mediator, which indicates the closeness of the Lord to His people and the Divine Presence among His people as a replacement of the indwelling of God in the Temple after its destruction.[303]

The motif and image of “dwelling” of the *shekhinah* as a mediator in an anthropomorphic and mythic form also can be gleaned from the Wisdom literature and early Christian writings. In particular, the “indwelling” image of *shekhinah* as a mediator appears in a profound relationship with a mythic and anthropomorphic image of personified Wisdom as a heavenly agent in *Sirach* and

---

[299] See m. *Ma'aser Sheni* v, 12; t. *Sanḥ.* iv, 5, b. *Menaḥ.* vii, 8; *t.* Kelim, *B. Qam.* i, 12; *Sifre Deuteronomy*, chs. 62, 70, 352 (e.g., Dt 14:23, 25). As Urbach (42) notes, the use of shekhinah is “prevalent in the Tesefta, and especially in the Halakhic Midrashim.”

[300] Alon, *The Jews in Their Land in the Talmudic Age*, 48. Alon explains, the concept of the Temple, which is “‘the Tabernacle of the Land,’ the dwelling-place of the *shekhinah* of the God of Israel,” further implies that the synagogue became an alternative place for *shekhinah*, and a place to worship God instead of the Jerusalem Temple.

[301] As can be seen in Ex 14:19, “And the angel of God, who went before the camp of Israel,” there is an implicit allusion to the image of angels, which expresses the presence of God, appear close to the image of *shekhinah*. Urbach, 63-67, notes that the *shekhinah* in the Talmudic, Targumic literature generally appears as a mere anthropomorphic expression through a mythic and mythological image of the *shekhinah*. However, as a rare case (e.g., *Midrash Proverbs* 22:29), the *shekhinah* appears as a separate created or angelic being. See *Midrash Proverbs* 22:29, “the *shekhinah* stood before the Holy One, blessed be He, and said unto Him: “Sovereign of the universe! Seest Thou a man diligent? - they wish to count him (King Solomon) with ‘mean men.’” This is the English translation of Urbach in *The Sages*, 63.

[302] Urbach, *The Sages*, 135-6; Isaac L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (Leiden: Brill, 1948), 62; Ἄγγελος appears as a human messenger like *malakh* in the Hebrew Bible. In addition, we can see a special connotation of mediums in *Gen. Rab.* x, 7.

[303] Urbach, 40.

Wisdom of Solomon.[304] The motif and image of Wisdom, which is "dwelling" at the Temple of Jerusalem, explicitly appears in *Sirach* (e.g., Sir 24:8-11), as noted earlier. As Charles F. Burney points out, the *shekhinah* has a profound nexus with *memra* and the Johannine Logos, and appears as an angelic being or a divine manifestation, including the Divine Name.[305] This shows that the motif and image of the *shekhinah* is profoundly related to the "dwelling" image of the Johannine Logos, Jesus in the world in Jn 1:14, and the people of God as a "dwelling" place (Rev 21:3). As I will examine later in this study, the concept of *shekhinah* can be gleaned from the images of various hypostatic notions of Torah, such as *memra*, the Logos, and Metatron, which is identified with the *merkavah* imagery, in Rabbinic and late antique Jewish mystical (e.g., Enochic and Hekhalot) literature.[306]

In all, as Efraim E. Urbach notes, we can observe the difference, regarding the concept and image of the *shekhinah*, between the way of understanding of the Talmudic and Midrashic sages and the way of the philosophical and Jewish Hellenistic thought.[307] In general, the concept of *shekhinah* appears to convey a divine-like image of the hidden presence and the omnipresence of God in the Talmuds and Midrashim. Nonetheless, as we can see in Rabbinic literature, the usages and meanings of *shekhinah* were gradually changed by the interactions with various theological and religious concepts of God and Torah. In other words, the *shekhinah* appears not only as a divine-like image in a mythic and anthropomorphic form that conveys the glory and the omnipresence of God but also as an angelic image of entity created by God. This demonstrates a dual conception of *shekhinah* as an angelic being and divine manifestation, which is related to the dual conception of Philo's Logos and personified Wisdom as both angelic and divine-like mediators, as noted earlier and I will further discuss later in this study.[308] Since these hypostatic notions of Torah are involved with an angelic and divine-like image in mystical and anthropomorphic descriptions of God, I will discuss, in detail later in this study, the features of the dual conception of the hypostatic notions in relation to Torah.

---

[304] Brant, *John*, 26.

[305] Charles F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1922), 39; See also Middleton, 130-32.

[306] See Hugo Odeberg, *3 Enoch: Or, The Hebrew Book of Enoch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928), xvii; xlv; Peter Schäfer, et. al., *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (סינופסיס לספרות ההיכלות) (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981), §§ 235-238. Michael D. Swartz (34) describes the phenomenological features of ancient Jewish mysticism as Merkavah mysticism, which "developed in Palestine and Babylonia between 3rd and 7th centuries," and "before the philosophical and spiritual concepts that shaped Kabbalah entered the mainstream of Jewish intellectual life." See Swartz, "Ancient Jewish Mysticism," in *Jewish Mysticism and Kabbalah: New Insights and Scholarship, Jewish Studies in the 21st Century*, ed. Frederick E. Greenspahn (New York: NYU Press, 2011), 33-4.

[307] Urbach, 65.

In summary, the investigation of the previously examined hypostatic notions of Torah (personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah*) provides critical insights into the conceptual development and historical backgrounds of Torah and the hypostatic notions of Torah from the Second Temple period to the later Rabbinic periods. It also implies their intertextual and theological relationships, which concretize explicit evidence of the emergence and development of the two types of the hypostatic notions of Torah—Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered—which were dynamically developed throughout the history of Jewish thought. It particularly shows the emergence of the dual conception of the hypostatic notions of Torah mainly emerges as the angelic and divine-like images through the complicated interactions and combinations between the various hypostatic notions of Torah. In addition, these images demonstrate not only a profound affinity between the various Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, and *memra,* but also a close relationship between the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom and *shekhinah*. It also authenticates the existence of the two supposed traditions: Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered, in accordance with the images and features of the Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, as well as their profound (intertextual and theological) relationships and interactions. Finally, it further substantiates that the characteristics of the hermeneutic strategies (i.e., allegory and symbolism), which formulated the concepts and images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, intertextually and theologically interacted with the rabbinic rhetorics and Hellenistic influences within the early Jewish and Christian sources.

---

[308] Ibid., 40.

Intertextual and Theological Nexuses between the Hypostatic Notions of Torah

On the basis of the previous examinations, I will turn now to study the intertextual and theological relationships between the various primitive forms of the hypostatic notions of Torah, as they are manifest in the creation context. This will allow me to describe their intertextual and theological relationships, and the primitive forms of the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, which were dynamically developed during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.[309]

Table 11. Intertextual Allusions to the Hypostatic Notions of Torah[310]

רֵאשִׁית, בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים, אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם, וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν.	Gen 1:1
בְּקַדְמִין בְּרָא יוי יָת שְׁמַיָּא וְיָת אַרְעָא	Gen1:1 *Tg. Onq.*
מן אוולא ברא אלקים ית שמייא וית ארעא	*Tg. Ps.-J.*
מלקדמין \בחכמה ברא דייי ״בחוכמתא ברא ייי#2#״ שכלל״ושכלל#2#״ ית שמיא	*Tg. Neof.*
בחכמה״מן לקדמין״ ברא וייי ושכליל ית שמיא וית ארע	*Frg.Tg.*
יְהוָה--קָנָנִי, רֵאשִׁית דַּרְכּוֹ: קֶדֶם מִפְעָלָיו מֵאָז כג מֵעוֹלָם, נִסַּכְתִּי מֵרֹאשׁ-- מִקַּדְמֵי-אָרֶץ..	Prov 8:22 23
וָאֶהְיֶה אֶצְלוֹ, אָמוֹן: וָאֶהְיֶה שַׁעֲשׁוּעִים, יוֹם יוֹם; מְשַׂחֶקֶת לְפָנָיו בְּכָל-עֵת 30 ἤμην παρ᾽ αὐτῷ ἁρμόζουσα. ἐγὼ ἤμην ᾗ προσέχαιρε, καθ᾽ ἡμέραν δὲ εὐφραινόμην ἐν προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ,	Prov 8: 30
וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ τὸν ἄνθρωπόν φησι γεγενῆσθαι κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν.	Gen 1:26
וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ, בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς	Gen 1:27[311]
וַיִּיצֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאָדָם, עָפָר מִן-הָאֲדָמָה, וַיִּפַּח בְּאַפָּיו, נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים; וַיְהִי הָאָדָם, לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν.	Gen 2:7[312]
1 Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. 2 Οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν 3 πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν.. 14 καὶ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. 18 Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε· ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.	Jn 1:1-3 14 18

---

[309] As examined earlier, the primitive forms of the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah appear in the Hebrew Bible, Wisdom literature, and Rabbinic literature, and Gen 1:1-2; Prov 8:1, 22-31; Num 11:12; Sir 24:1-10; Wis 7:1-2; 9:9-10; Ps 154 (11QPs^{a} 18); Gen.1:1 *Tg. Onq.*, *Tg. Ps.- J. Tg. Neof.*, *Frg. Tg.*, Philo's *On the Creation*, and even in the NT (e.g., Jn 1:1-18).

[310] I highlighted expressions, which show the intertextual relationships within these texts.

[311] Philo, *Philo: On the Creation,* 53-54.

[312] Ibid., 106-7, 133-36.

הֶאָנֹכִי הָרִיתִי, אֵת כָּל-הָעָם הַזֶּה--אִם-אָנֹכִי, יְלִדְתִּיהוּ: כִּי-תֹאמַר אֵלַי שָׂאֵהוּ בְחֵיקֶךָ, כַּאֲשֶׁר יִשָּׂא הָאֹמֵן אֶת-הַיֹּנֵק, עַל הָאֲדָמָה, אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתָּ לַאֲבֹתָיו	Num. 11:12[313]
א החכמה תהלל נפשה ובקרב עם אלהים תתפאר	Sir 24:1
ה בשמים יחדיו עמו הייתי ובמעמקי תהומות שם אני	5
ט מראש קדמי תבל נבראתי ולעלמי עד לא יסוף זכרי	9
י במשכן קדשו לפניו עבדתי ושם בצין אתו קמתי	10
1 ΘΕΕ πατέρων καὶ Κύριε τοῦ ἐλέους ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ σου 2 καὶ τῇ σοφίᾳ σου κατεσκεύσασας ἄνθρωπον, ἵνα δεσπόζῃ τῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ γενομένων κτισμάτω	Wis 7:1-2
9 μετὰ σοῦ ἡ σοφία ἡ εἰδυῖα τὰ ἔργα σου καὶ παροῦσα, ὅτε ἐποίεις τὸν κόσμον,	Wis 9:9

To begin, ἐν ἀρχῇ in the LXX seems to translate בְּרֵאשִׁית in Gen 1:1. Philo explicitly connects ἐν ἀρχῇ to λόγος.[314] In Sir 24:9, ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς "from the beginning" is used instead of ἐν ἀρχῇ. As Anderson observes, *Tg. Onq.* and *Tg. Ps.-J.*, exclude חכמה from Gen 1:1, and also exclude the term שכלל, while *Tg. Neof.* and *Frg. Tg.* include חכמה, also include שכליל.[315] The uses of חכמה in the Targums allude to a compositional and exegetic strategy, which reflects the intertextual intersection between these texts.[316] One interesting fact is that the midrashic interpretation in Gen 1:1 to 2:1, places Wisdom in the entire creative process, and inserts Wisdom into the beginning of creation.[317] According to *Gen. Rab.* i, 1, the word for "beginning" in Prov 8:22-31 refers to both the Torah and personified Wisdom in the creation context in Prov 8:22-31.[318] In a manner similar to the concept and images of personified Wisdom, the term שכלל (*skll*) in the interpretation of Gen 1:1 also signifies the preexistence of Torah (e.g., Wisdom or Intellect) in Targums, including the Targums (e.g., *Tg. Neof.* and the Fragmentary Targum). This explicitly corroborates a shifting process of the biblical and classical rabbinic concepts of Torah into a new hypostatic notion of Torah, and the profound relationships and interactions between the hypostatic notions of Torah**.** The association between the biblical and rabbinic concepts of the Torah and personified Wisdom in the creation context substantiates their profound relationships with Philo's Logos, which is associated with the Word of God, as noted earlier.

---

[313] Num 11:12 in the LXX, μὴ ἐγὼ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔλαβον πάντα τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον, ἢ ἐγὼ ἔτεκον αὐτούς, ὅτι λέγεις μοι, λάβε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν κόλπον σου, ὡσεὶ ἄραι τιθηνὸς τὸν θηλάζοντα, εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ὤμοσας τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν

[314] Philo, *Conf.* xxviii, 146. γὰρ ἀρχὴ καὶ ὄνομα θεοῦ καὶ λόγος καὶ ὁ κατ᾽ εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὁ ὁρῶν, Ἰσραήλ, προσαγορεύεται. "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."

[315] Anderson, "The Interpretation of Genesis 1:1 in the Targums," *CBQ* I 52 (1990), 24. As Anderson observes, in the Biblical texts, such as Jer 10:12; 51:15; Ps 104:24, we can see God's use of W/wisdom in creating the world. The observation is mentioned as part of argument of Anderson.

[316] McNamara, *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press, 1992), 52. The English translation of *Tg. Neof* of Gen 1:1 reads, "From the beginning 'with wisdom' the Memra of the Lord created and perfected the heavens and the earth. For creation of the world by/in wisdom." Cf. Prov 8:22, 3:19; Wis 9:9; Ps 104:24. In *Gen. Rab.* i, 4, the "beginning" is identified with the Torah. The creation and purpose of the world is "for the sake of the Torah alone," and for revealing the secrets of the Torah by the will of "the Lord your God" (Ex 20:2). In this sense, a hypostatic notion of Wisdom is identified with preexistent Torah. *Gen. Rab.* speaks of God creating the world by the Torah and Wisdom.

[317] Wisdom in the Targums particularly means "instrument" or "artisan," as well as "Torah" in keeping with rabbinic interpretation. There are allusions here allude to the similar roles of personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31. This is also corroborated by the interpretation of τεχνῖτις as "craftswoman" or "artisan" in Wis 7:21 and 8:6 and its use as a neologism in Wis 14:2. Cf. Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 286, 414; Lenzi, "Proverbs 8:22-31," 706-8; Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996), 2:474.

There is also a critical similarity to the activities and images of the personified Wisdom figure in Sir 24:9 and Wis 7:1-2; 9:9-10 in the creation context, as seen in the Table. 11. Wis 9:4, ἡν τῶν σῶν θρόνων πάρεδρον σοφίαν, "Wisdom, who sits by your throne," explicitly alludes to the status of אָמוֹן in Prov 8:30. The personified Wisdom figure in Sir 24:9-10, which describes the personified Wisdom figure, is not extant in Hebrew. Although, therefore, the term אָמוֹן is not mentioned, it is implicitly in the profound nexus between this text and personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31.

As examined earlier, there is controversy regarding the interpretations of אָמוֹן, but the variety of postions, in my view, offers a better understanding of the various images of personified Wisdom and its relationships with Incarnate Logos, Jesus. Along these lines, I will further discuss the interpretations of אָמוֹן, as a means of elucidating the various images of the hypostatic notions of Torah in the creation context. First, we can see that in a manner similar to the state of personified Wisdom in Wis 9:4, אָמוֹן is translated as ἁρμόζουσα in the LXX, which can be translated in English as "to join, to accommodate, bring into harmony," in a verbal adjective. In a similar sense, Bruce K. Waltke also prefers to translate אָמוֹן as "to be firm, faithful" in an infinitive absolute form, and also suggests a possible translation as “constantly,” in an adverbial form by considering the words יוֹם יוֹם, בְּכָל־עֵת, alluding to a temporal lapse moving from the past tense to the present tense in relation to the creation of Genesis.[319] It is evident that these interpretations of אָמוֹן appear to explain the roles and features of personified Wisdom as a preexistent and independent being in creation. However, the meaning of the term אָמוֹן, when holistically considering the literary, textual (terminological and grammatical), and contextual dimensions, appears to be incompatible with a verbal or adverbial (or adjective) form or an absolute infinite form. Rather, it is best seen as a noun representing the state of subject(s). In this context, it is worth noting that through a particular midrashic and encyclopedic method, *Gen. Rab.* i, 1 enumerates various interpretations of lexical items similar to אָמוֹן, which can be gleaned from other scriptural verses, such as “covered” or “hidden” (Lam 4:5)[320] or “brought up” (Est 2:7; 2:20b), and “great” (Nah 3:8), as well as “artisan” (2 Kgs 10:1).[321] In particular, Fox makes a connection with אֹמֵן (Esth 2:7) and בְּאָמְנָה (Esth 2:20b) meaning “bringing up” or “hidden or secretly” and אצל meaning “with” as a preposition of proximity.[322] By this logic, Fox grammatically also combines it with a *qal* passive participle meaning "being raised" or "growing up," as "an adverbial complement to the main verb."[323] Fox further makes a semantic combination between הָאֹמֵן (Num 11:12) as a noun meaning as a "child" or "nursling" and "sucking" or "growing up," which contains an adverbial or verbal meaning.[324] This reinforces the image of a child "sucking" or "nestling in and being embraced" or "fitting (or suiting) together with" in the arms of parents, which alludes to a "binding, or uniting" in God as His delight.[325] Importantly, the question of how to translate and grammatically interpret יֱהֹוָה קָנָנִי רֵאשִׁית in Prov 8:22—especially of whether קָנָנִי means "created" or as "possessed or [begotten or acquired]"—appears to be a critical issue in interpreting the identity and status of personified Wisdom in the creation context. The important point is that the interpretations of קָנָנִי convey a meaning of both "birth and pre-existence" rather than just "created."[326] This provides a critical insight into the author's theological intentions, exegetical practices and hermeneutic strategies regarding the hypostatic notions of Torah, which I will further discuss later in this study.

---

[318] Harry Freedman (trans.), *Midrash Rabbah,* eds. Maurice Simon, S. M. Lehrman, J. Israelstam, Judah J. Slotki, Joseph Rabinowitz, A. Cohen, and Louis I. Rabinowitz (London: Soncino Press, 1961), i, 1: "Thus God consulted the Torah and created the world while the Torah declares, IN THE BEGINNING GOD CREATED, BEGINNING referring to Torah, as in the verse, The Lord made me as the beginning of His way (Prov 8:2)." The speaker explicitly appears as the Torah and personified Wisdom. See also n. 1 and n. 4.

---

[319] Bruce K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 420-21. Waltke considers a suitable contextual interpretation instead of the option of an infinitive absolute form. Cf. Is. 26:2, Ps 12:2; 31:24; Prov 14:5, 20:6, 31:17; II Sh 20:19. See also Robert B. Y. Scott, “Wisdom in Creation: The 'Āmôn of Proverbs VIII 30,” *Vetus Testamentum* 10, no. 2 (Apr. 1960): 220. Scott notes, “Particularly, in verse 30 where it corresponds to the adverbs ‘daily’ [sic!] (*yom yom*) and ‘always’ (*bkl ‘t*).” In fact, in light of Hebrew Bible texts, אָמוֹן seems to be related to an adverbial and adjective form which means “faithful,” or “faithfully or truthfully.”

[320] As noted in *Gen. Rab.* i, 1, the interpretation of אָמוֹן as “hidden” can be gleaned from the verses, such as עֲלֵיתוֹלָע הָאֱמֻנִים “they that were clad in scarlet” (Lam 4:5) and אֹמֵן “brought up or hidden” (Esth 2:7). As I noted earlier, the main meaning of *Amun*, who appears as a supreme creator or the sole god of gods in creation hymns in Egyptian sources, is “hidden.” See Pritchard ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 368. In *Amun as the Sole God* [hundredth stanza], we find. *“*One is Amon, hiding himself from them, concealing himself from the (other) gods, so that his (very) color is unknown.” Similarly, “No god came into being before him; there were no other” (iv 10). Amun, who came into being at the beginning, is unknown and has a mysterious nature so that his majesty might be disclosed. In the two-hundredth stanza, we read “All gods are three: Amon, Re, and Ptah, and there is no second to them (This is a statement of trinity)” and ““Hidden” is his name as Amon, he is Re in face, and his body is Ptah.”

[321] Jacob Neusner, and Alan J. Avery-Peck, *Encyclopedia of Midrash: Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism*, (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2005), 941-65. This rabbinic hermeneutic strategy in *Gen. Rab.* i, 1 utilizes the *lemmata* constituted by the same root and its variants to arrive at a polysemous understanding of the word, which lead to the creating of a new theological conception. In particular, this strategy emphasizes the centrality of Torah and a theological relationship with God that is possible through the Torah, which serves as an intermediary between God and humanity.

[322] Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 285-88. Fox notes that even if the image of wisdom in v. 31a is an image of a child or nursling figure, the image of wisdom in vv. 31b, 32 speaks in a sense of parents (or nurse) or teacher. He thereby suggests “three categories: 1) artisan; 2) constant(ly); 3) ward/nursling.” (285).

By contrast, in *Gen. Rab* i. 1, the image of אָמוֹן, which is connected to הָאֹמֵן in Num 11:12, actually refers to the image of a nursing father or a foster-father (e.g.,אֹמְנַיִךְ in Isa 49:23) rather than the image of a "nursling" or "child" (הַיֹּנֵק) being nursed by the father.[327] The most crucial point in this examination is that the various inferential links *in Gen. Rab.* i, 1, which shows the diverse and creative features of rabbinic rhetorics, are profoundly interlocked with various interpretations of many scholars, and they are significantly involved and convergent with the Torah. The roles and status of אָמוֹן thereby appear as a preexistent and independent being, or in an equal position with God in the creation contexts. In this vein, this coincides with Clifford’s interpretation of אָמוֹן as “a sage or teacher” in accordance with the Mesoptamian mythological tradition which is derived from the Akaddian *ummānu*.[328] Indeed, the rhetorical features of personified Wisdom in Prov 8 and her status in creation represent the image of אָמוֹן as a sage or teacher. Moreover, the role of אָמוֹן as a sage appears to be compatible with that of “tutor” or “artisan” (or craftsman or architect) in the creation context as finally translated in *Gen. Rab.* i, 1.[329] In a manner different from its “child” or “son” image, אָמוֹן in a nominal form appears to be profoundly related to a “matured adult” image of “artisan” (or craftsman or master). It is notable that the images and activities of personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31 strongly appear similar to those of “artisan” (τεχνῖτις) in Wis 7:21.[330] This corroborates not only an identical relationship between the “sage” image of אָמוֹן and personified Wisdom but also the image of its matured heavenly figure with profound wisdom. This also substantiates that the image of אָמוֹן is not only referred to as both “a child [or son] nursing or growing up with God” but also as “a sage or master with wisdom and authority who grew up with God,” as well as a divine being existing and working with God in creation. These “sage” and “artisan” images are exegetically and semantically strengthened by the intertextual and theological nexuses between Torah and personified Wisdom. As noted earlier, by considering these literary and textual features, Clifford concludes that the identity of אָמוֹן appears as a sage-like or matured heavenly figure symbolizing wisdom. While I agree with the Mesopotamian origin of אָמוֹן from a philological perspective, I also consider its literary development (from inchoate stage to full-fledge stage) throughout the Persian and Hellenistic periods. In this sense, rather than asserting a rigid position based on a biblical and philological analysis, I will preserve these various interpretations for the phenomenological analysis of the images of Torah later in this study.

---

[323] Ibid.

[324] Ibid.; idem, "'Amon again," 699-702. Cf. 2 Kgs 10:1, 5; Esth 2:7; Num 11:12.

[325] See Scott, "Wisdom in Creation," 222-23. Scott also argues that אמון is meant and interpreted as "binding, uniting" in terms of an intimate relationship with God. This interpretation conveys a similar sense with the translation of ἁρμόζουσα, "to join, to accommodate, bring into harmony," in the LXX despite its grammatical and terminological ambiguity. Scott, in this sense, excludes the possibility of a hypostatic meaning of אָמוֹן in relation to a poetic personification of Wisdom in Prov 3:19-20.

[326] Kenneth T. Aitken, "Proverbs," *The Daily Study Bible Series* (Louidville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1986), 82. Aitken mentions, "In the Old Testament, birth can happily be described as an act of creation (Ps 139:13; Cf. Dt 32:6), and an act of creation just as happily as a birth (Ps. 90:2)." The Masoretic Text keeps the interpretation as "possessed or [acquired]" including the meaning "begotten," while κύριος ἔκτισέν με ἀρχὴν in the LXX, ἔκτισέν is translated into "created."

[327] Freedman, *Midrash Rabbah,* 1. "As an *omen* (nursing-father) [in Num 11:12] carrieth the sucking child."

In all, this examination provides a critical insight into the dualistic conception of the images of personified Wisdom, which represent an angelic and divine-like image of Torah, and which are in a profound relationship with God in the context of creation (e.g., Prov 8:22-31, Gen 1:1, 2:1). This further leads to a critical understanding of the deep nexus between the images of personified Wisdom as אָמוֹן and the images of Torah, which are analogous to the images of the Johannine Logos in Jn 1:1-18 as shown in the Table. 11. Scholars skeptical that personified Wisdom is the basis of the Johannine Logos have noted a number of discontinuities between the Johannine Logos and the personified Wisdom figure in Prov 8:22-31. Waltke points out that a historical critical exegesis of Prov 8:22-31 does not offer a basis for patristic exegesis, which identifies personified Wisdom with Incarnate Jesus in "their preexistence and their assumed roles as agents in the creation" (Prov 3:19-20; cf. Jn 1:3; 1 Cor 8:6; Col 1:15-16; Heb 1:3).[331] He also asserts that the ancient versions of Jewish Wisdom literature, which stand in relation to Prov 8:22-31, do not offer a consistent ground for the Christology of the NT.[332] Karen Jobes points out the difference that personified Wisdom in Proverbs is only a creature created by God and a witness for the creation, whereas Johannine Logos appears as a creator, which is theologically identical with God. Jobes also argues that the nonexistence of the Greek word *sophia* in the Gospel of John, or in the Johannine Epistles, presents a discontinuity between the Christology of the Gospel of John and the ideas of the Logos and *sophia* in Hellenistic Jewish writings.[333] Some scholars also note that a rigid textual nexus between Philo's writings and the Fourth Gospel is ambiguous due to the absence of philosophical vocabulary and its allegorical methodologies in the Fourth Gospel, despite the terminological, semantic, and even theological connectivity between them.[334] Nonetheless, on the basis of my analysis, it cannot be ignored that the Johannine Logos turns out to, intertextually, semantically, and theologically, have an implicit nexus with the images of אָמוֹן, which indicates personified Wisdom herself in Prov 8:22-31. Indeed, the "child or son" image of אָמוֹן as "nursling" in the Prov 8 shows a more critical similarity to the images of the Johannine Logos, i.e., Incarnate Jesus as the Son of God "begotten" in the bosom of God the Father in Jn 1:18: "No one has ever seen God; the only begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known."[335] In Num 11:12, we can see more explicit parallels, in a similar motif and manner, to personified Wisdom (in relation to Torah) in the creation context in Gen 1 and Prov 8. The verse of Num 11:12 is originally represented as a description about Moses' relationship with the people of Israel. As noted earlier, the image of הָאֹמֵן in Num 11:12, appears as a father nursing הַיֹּנֵק, which translates as "a child being nursed." This implicit depiction concerning a "child or son" being nursed and carried by his father in Num 11:12 demonstrates that the term אָמוֹן, as used in reference to personified Wisdom in Prov 8:30-31 similarly reflects an intimate relationship between personified Wisdom (אָמוֹן) and God. This dualistic conception in the "son" and "father" images of personified Wisdom similarly emerges in the dualistic conception of the angelic and divine-like images of Philo's Logos and the Johannine Logos. As also noted earlier, Philo's Logos appears not only as a prerequisite for the Johannine Logos but also has a critical impact on the theological and philosophical ideas of early Christianity. If we assume that Philo's Logos was a pre-existent linkage, which connects a transcendent and immanent divinity to humanity, this also substantiates a shifting process from the pre-existent Logos to the incarnation of the Logos.[336] This further substantiates that the dualistic conception of Philo's Logos as an angelic agent or a second God, which was examined earlier, appears in the angelic and divine-like images of personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos.[337] The allusions to this relationship between Philo's Logos and the Johannine Logos in Jn 1:1-2, 14, 17, 18 (as seen in the Table. 11) demonstrate that this nexus is developed into a profound relationship with other hypostatic notions of Torah, such as *memra* and *shekhinah*. As McHugh noted, the Johannine Logos is explicitly related to the term *memra*, which is manifest in the Targums.[338] The *memra*, which is the Word of God (e.g., Gen 15:6) is semantically related to the Logos in Jn 1:1-2, 18. As Justin Martyr claimed, the relationship between *memra* and Incarnate Logos explicitly appears through the allusion of the appearance of the Logos, i.e., *memra* (i.e., the Word of God in Gen 15:6) in the passages of Jn 8:56-59.[339] This implies that the *memra*, i.e., "Jewish" Logos, which appears in a manner similar to Philo's Logos in the creation context in Gen 1:1-5, has been utilized as an original form of the Johannine Logos, and eventually became convergent with the incarnation of Jesus in early Christianity.

---

[328] Clifford, *Proverbs*, 99-101.

[329] Ibid. Clifford (100) notes that the MT vocalization *’omman*, which means “artisan” in Song 7:2, presupposes its compatibility with a late derivation from Akkadian *ummānu.”*

[330] While Wis 7:21 is a modern reconstructed Hebrew version of the *Wisdom of Solomon*, it seems to show a credible nexus between אומנת and אמון, since החכמה is used in accord with אומנת, which is translated into τεχνῖτις in Greek.

---

[331] Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs*, 127-28.

[332] Ibid.

[333] Karen H. Jobes, "Sophia Christology: The Way of Wisdom?" in *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke,* eds. James I. Packer and Sven Soderlund (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000), 239.

[334] Brown, lvii-lviii. Brown observes a methodological similarity between Philo and John, i.e., a method using the concept of the Logos for the interpretations regarding the hypostatic notions, such as Wisdom and Torah in the Wisdom literature. The concept of the Logos triggers a strong curiosity that Philo's Logos can be the basis of the Johannine Logos. In this sense, Robinson also tries to prove that the Prologue has a close connection with first-century Palestinian *realia.* See Robinson, "The Relationship of the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John," 128.

---

[335] R. L. Roberts, "The Rendering 'Only Begotten' in John 3:16," *Restoration Quarterly* 16 (1973): 4; Everett F. Harrison, "A Study of John 1:14," in *Unity and Diversity in NT Theology: Essays in Honor of G.E. Ladd*, ed. Robert A. Guelish (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978), 32. These scholars think that the verse can be paralleled to the "only one of his kind," but not Jesus being "begotten." In the LXX, μονογενης corresponds to the translation of the Hebrew יחיד. (Roberts, 8). The verse can be related to יחיד, which is used for Abraham's "only" son, in Gen 22:2. For this reason, the title "only" son came to mean particularly "beloved" son, in Jewish texts. They note that in μονογενης (1:14, 18), γεωης etymologically and semantically derives from a word meaning "one of a kind," even though many patristic writers read the term as "only begotten," but this may imply more about second-century Christology. Consequently, it seems to be reasonable to translate ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός," as "the only begotten [only one of his kind] Son, which is in the bosom of the Father." I will discuss, in detail later in this study, the relationship of the images of personified Wisdom to the images and activities of Jesus as "a sage with wisdom and authority who grew up with God" in creation.

[336] Boyarin, "The Gospel of the Memra," 247.

Related to this point, there is a controversial issue about whether the personification of Wisdom and the Johannine Logos is related to the personification or hypostatization of *memra* in the Targums.[340] Despite the ambiguousness of the provenance of the Targums, as Virginia Burrus states, the Johannine Logos appears more as an upshot of "scriptural interpretation" than as a result of Platonic speculation based on Hellenistic influences.[341] As noted earlier, Mchugh and Ronning emphasize that an angelic image of the Johannine Logos is explicitly paralleled in the exegesis of

---

[337] As noted earlier, Philo's Logos provides a critical insight into understanding of the shared theological and philosophical characteristics of the Logos that was shared by early Judaism and Christianity.

[338] McHugh, *John 1-4*, 6. Cf. Ronning, *The Jewish Targums*, 46-69; Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 275-76.

[339] Mack, *Logos und Sophia*, 6. In John 8:56-59, Incarnate Logos, i.e., Jesus claims already to have revealed himself to Abraham before the Incarnation. However, this does not guarantee that Abraham saw a hypostasis in his physical eyes. In Gen 15:1-6, we read that "And it was after these things that 'the word of God' appeared to Abraham" (v.1), and where it says that "Abraham believed in God and he reckoned it for him as righteousness." (v.6) In this connection, in Jn 8:57-58, Jews say, (57) "You are not yet fifty years old, and have you seen Abraham?" Jesus answers them, "(58) Truly, truly I say to you, before Abraham was, I am." This means that Abraham would be one of those "who received him," and became "one of the children of God."

[340] Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 117; Keener, 1:349; Hayward, "The Memra of YHWH," 412-8; Mack, *Logos und Sophia* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 6.

[341] Virginia Burrus, "Creatio Ex Libidine: Reading Ancient Logos Differently," in *Derrida and Religion: Other Testaments*, eds. Yvonne Sherwood, and Kevin Hart (New York; London: Routledge, 2005), 144.

memra (or Word) in the Targums, in a manner similar to Philo's Logos, which appears in an intimate relationship with God.[342] This clearly provides the evidence for the intertextual, theological, and exegetical nexuses of *memra* to personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, and even the Johannine Logos.

In addition to the *memra*, the term, concept, and image of *shekhinah*, as it is manifest in the Rabbinic and Targumic literature as well as the Wisdom literature, as seen in the previous examination, appears to be profoundly related to the concepts and images of other hypostatic notions of Torah.[343] It is notable that in ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο "The Word became flesh" in Jn 1:14, the verb, ἐγένετο is used in ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν "the man became a living being" in Gen 2:7 in the LXX. The incarnation of the Logos in relation to Jn 1:14b, ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν ("His dwelling among us") is elucidated by τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ ("His glory") i.e., the glory of God. This corroborates that a mystical image of "dwelling" Incarnate Logos in the world explicitly reflects a divine-like image of the *shekhinah* as the glory of God.[344] As noted earlier, the motif of a "dwelling" place of God in the Wisdom literature has a profound nexus with the images of *shekhinah* in relation to other hypostatic notions of Torah, such as the Logos, Voice, and *memra*, through the combination of the rabbinic rhetorics and Hellenistic speculations. This illuminates how the concept of *shekhinah* was used as a parallel to other hypostatic notions, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, and *memra*, which appear to be identified with Torah.

In summary, this examination first demonstrates that the intertextual nexus between personified Wisdom and Torah in the Wisdom literature provides not only a critical understanding of the pre-existence and relationship of personified Wisdom with God in creation but also a way of approaching their theological relationships with other hypostatic notions of Torah. This intertextual examination also corroborates not only the profound theological relationships between the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah*, but also the development of the images of Torah personified and hypostatized in various (biblical, philosophical, rabbinic, and Jewish mystical) concepts of Torah, which were manifest during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. The linguistic similarities, intertextual allusions, and semantic continuities solve, to some extent, the puzzles of the relationships among the hypostatic notions of Torah, which are manifest in early Jewish and Christian sources. This examination first demonstrates that the concept of Torah and its relationship with personified Wisdom offers an effective foundation for the significant intertextual and theological nexuses between the hypostatic notions of Torah. Specifically, through the interpretations of אָמוֹן in Prov 8:30, we have examined their intertextual and theological relationships (especially personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, and the Johannine Logos). This thereby shows that their images (a "child or son" image, or an "artisan or master" image, or a "sage or teacher" image), in relation to Torah, emerge in accordance with their semantic and theological relationships. As noted earlier, Philo's conception of the Logos as a mediator, under middle-Platonism's influence, plays a critical role, not only in connecting the various hypostatic notions of Torah but also in providing a significant possibility that the divine Logos can be both the first human being and a "second God" as a hypostatic notion of Torah. Philo's philosophical and theological accounts of the Logos reinforce the intertextual nexuses among the other hypostatic notions, as well as their theological relationships, and had an especially substantial impact on the Johannine Logos. The significant seeds sown for the unique birth of the Johannine Logos and its theology, result from the profound interactions of the hypostatic notions of Torah, especially personified Wisdom and Philo's Logos. The Johannine Logos, as a theological and philosophical notion shared by multi-faceted (Palestinian, Hellenistic, and Rabbinic) Judaism and early Christianity, provides a new interpretative method of understanding the features of Jewish exegetical practices (hypostatizing and personifying the hypostatic notions), which were manifest in Jewish wisdom traditions and early Christian traditions.

---

[342] McHugh, *John 1-4*, 6, 95-96; Ronning, *The Jewish Targums*, 271.
[343] Ibid.; Brant, *John*, 26; Urbach, 40-41; Ronning, 46-69.
[344] Ruzer, "From Man as Locus of God's Indwelling," 383.

It is notable that the dualistic conception of personified Wisdom and Philo's Logos appears in the angelic and God-like images of the Johannine Logos as Jesus. Above all, in addition to the angelic and God-like images of Jesus as the Johannine Logos, Jesus also has an explicit messianic image. In this sense, later in the study, I will expand my argument into the three images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, including a messianic image, while mainly discussing the dualistic conception of the angelic and God-like images of the hypostatic notions of Torah. Under the influences of personified Wisdom and Philo’s Logos, the Johannine Logos plays a prominent role as a bridge for a mutual understanding among other hypostatic notions of Torah (e.g., *memra* and *shekhinah*), which developed within multi-faceted Judaism and early Christianity. This corroborates that the Johannine Logos concretizes a Logos-Wisdom theology, which originally appears in Philo’s Logos, and later developed into Logos-Christology and Wisdom-Christology within the interactive influences of Logos-Wisdom theology. Furthermore, we have seen explicit evidence of the *memra* and *shekhinah*, as the hypostatic notions of Torah, are related to the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah in multi-faceted Judaism as well as early Christianity.

Despite the complicated and combined nature of the hypostatic notions of Torah, this examination regarding the hypostatic notions of Torah illuminates a distinctive set of associations, which can be mainly classified in two supposed traditions: a Logos-centered tradition, such as Philo’s Logos, the Johannine Logos, and *memra,* and a Wisdom-centered tradition, such as personified Wisdom and *shekhinah*. In all, this implies the necessity of a thorough reexamination not only of the distinctive features of the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions but also, as we will see, of theological and philosophical interactions of hypostatic notions of Torah in later rabbinic, philosophical, and Jewish mystical thought.

Chapter II: The Images of Torah in Early Christianity and Multifaceted Judaism

Through the previous examinations of early Jewish and Christian sources, we have seen not only the formative process of the concepts and images of Torah but also the conceptual changes and interactions of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah*, which were manifest in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. Additionally, we have examined the intertextual and theological interactions between the concepts and images of the hypostatic notions of Torah under Greek philosophical influences within multi-faceted (Palestinian, Hellenistic, and Rabbinic) Judaism and early Christianity. The preceding examination shows that the centrality of Torah plays a critical role in regulating the dynamic (intertextual and theological) interactions and development of the hypostatic notions of Torah. It further demonstrates the existence and development of the Greek Logos-centered and Jewish Wisdom-centered traditions. Against this backdrop, in this chapter, we will consider the manner in which the primitive forms of the three images (angelic, God-like, and messianic) of the hypostatic notions of Torah function as a systematic leverage in maintaining the balance between the two different traditions. I first will analyze in detail the primitive forms of the three images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, which appear in the Logos-centered and the Wisdom-centered traditions.

Torah, the Foundation of Jesus as Personified Wisdom and Incarnate Logos

In order to understand the theological foundation of the hypostatic notion of Torah and the accompanying three images of Torah, I will analyze the case of Jesus as a derivative form of Torah, which appears both as Incarnate Logos in the Fourth Gospel in the Logos-centered tradition and as personified Wisdom in the Synoptics in the Wisdom-centered tradition. Prior to undertaking this analysis, I briefly summarize the previous examinations of the intertextual and theological relationships of the hypostatic notions of Torah, starting with a brief summary of the intertextual nexus of Wisdom (חכמה) and Torah (תורה), which are manifest in the Wisdom literature.

Table 12. Intertextual Evidence of Wisdom and Torah in the MT and LXX[1]

ה רְאֵה לִמַּדְתִּי אֶתְכֶם, חֻקִּים וּמִשְׁפָּטִים, כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוַּנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהָי: לַעֲשׂוֹת כֵּן-- בְּקֶרֶבהָאָרֶץ, אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם בָּאִים שָׁמָּה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ ו וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם, וַעֲשִׂיתֶם--כִּי הִוא חָכְמַתְכֶם וּבִינַתְכֶם, לְעֵינֵי הָעַמִּים: אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁמְעוּן, אֵת כָּל-הַחֻקִּים הָאֵלֶּה, וְאָמְרוּ רַק עַם-חָכָם וְנָבוֹן, הַגּוֹי הַגָּדוֹל הַזֶּה ז. כִּי מִי-גוֹי גָּדוֹל, אֲשֶׁר-לוֹ אֱלֹהִים קְרֹבִים אֵלָיו, כַּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, בְּכָל-קָרְאֵנוּ אֵלָיו ח וּמִי גּוֹי גָּדוֹל, אֲשֶׁר-לוֹ חֻקִּים וּמִשְׁפָּטִים צַדִּיקִם, כְּכֹל הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת, אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי נֹתֵן לִפְנֵיכֶם הַיּוֹם	Dt 4:5-8
תּוֹרָה צִוָּה-לָנוּ, מֹשֶׁה: מוֹרָשָׁה, קְהִלַּת יַעֲקֹב	Dt 33:4
ב לָדַעַת חָכְמָה וּמוּסָר; לְהָבִין, אִמְרֵי בִינָה. ח שְׁמַע בְּנִי, מוּסַר אָבִיךָ; וְאַל-תִּטֹּשׁ, תּוֹרַת אִמֶּךָ.	Prov 1:2, 8
ΠΟΛΛΩΝ καὶ μεγάλων ἡμῖν διὰ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατ᾽ αὐτοὺς ἠκολουθηκότων δεδομένων, ὑπὲρ ὧν δέον ἐστὶν ἐπαινεῖν τὸν ᾽Ισραὴλ παιδείας καὶ σοφίας	• Sir 1:1
א החכמה תהלל נפשה ובקרב עם אלהים תתפאר כג כל אלה בספר ברית יי כתובים תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת יעקב כה מלאה חכמה כפישון וכנהר חדקל בימי האביב כו לא גמרי קדמונים החכמה ואחרונים לא ישגוה	Sir 24:1 23-26[2]
כג כל אלה בספר ברית יי כתובים תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת יעקב ב על-עזבנו התורה יוכיחנו, ודרכנו דרך חטאים יקרא ה יען כי-כלאו בניך, אשר על-ידם תינתן התורה לאות עולם	Sir 16:2 18:6
ταῦτα πάντα βίβλος διαθήκης Θεοῦ ῾Υ ψίστου, νόμον ὃν ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν Μωυσῆς κληρονομίαν συναγωγαῖς ᾽ Ιακώβ.	• Sir 24:23
ג לכול פותאים כי להודיע כבוד יהוה נתנה חוכמה ולספל י צדיקים מפתחי צדיקים נשמע קולה ומקהל חסידים יא זמרתה על אוכלמה בשבע נאמרה ועל שתותמה בחבר יב יחדיו שיחתם בתורת עליון אמריהמה להודיע עוזו יג כמה רחקה מרשעים אמרה מכול זדים לדעתה הנה	Ps 154:3, 10-13 (=*11QPs*^{a} 18)
ΘΕΕ πατέρων καὶ Κύριε τοῦ ἐλέους ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ σου א אנא ה' אלוהי אבותי, אל החסד והרחמים, אשר בדברך הכל כוננת	• Wis 9:1
οὐδὲ ἐφυλάξατε νόμον, οὐδὲ κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπορεύθητε. ד ומחוקקי און כולכם, ואת-חוקי אלוהים לא נצרתם	• Wis 6:4
ἀρχὴ γὰρ αὐτῆς ἡ ἀληθεστάτη παιδείας ἐπιθυμία, φροντὶς δὲ παιδείας ἀγάπη, פרק ו יח ראשית חכמה אהבת מוסר, ותוצאות מוסר חסד	• Wis 6:17 (18)

These texts show a particular textual strategy of using Wisdom and Torah (תורת, sometimes substituted as חוק or מוסר) simultaneously within one paragraph. This strategy shows that personified

---

[1] I have not provided the translations of these texts here, as I have provided them in the previous analysis.

[2] Patrick W. Skehan, “Structures in Poems on Wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24,” *CBQ* 41 (3) (1979): 374. This text (Sir 24) is a modern reconstruction in Hebrew.

Wisdom is identified with Torah.[3] As noted earlier, the Hebrew terms, תורה "teaching or instruction," דבר "word," חכמה "wisdom," and חוק or מוסר "law or discipline," all appear to be interchangeable with the Greek terms *logos* and *nomos*, as is seen in "law" νόμον (Sir 24:23; Wis 6:4), "your word" λόγῳ σου (Wis 9:1), and "instruction" παιδείας (Wis 6:17) in the Wisdom literature, such as *Sirach* and *Wisdom of Solomon*.[4] Specifically, the equivalence of Wisdom and Torah in Deuteronomy and *Sirach* is apparent and impressive. As Brooke notes, the association between Wisdom and Torah (Law), especially in Sir 24, is profoundly related to the personification and hypostatization of Wisdom and Torah from a literary and exegetical perspective.[5] This textual combination and conceptual interaction between Torah and Wisdom corroborates their intertextual and theological relationship in the later Jewish wisdom traditions, as I have shown earlier. As Dieter Georgi notes, "Jewish Apologists took the practical consequences of the universal aspects of Jewish wisdom [using the same] dialectic between universalism and particularity as the Hellenistic culture around them."[6] This implies a continuous theological and philosophical interaction between Judaism and Hellenism, i.e., a process of conceptual combination between Torah and personified Wisdom within the Wisdom literature, such as *Sirach*, *Wisdom of Solomon*, and Philo's works.[7] This shows that the scope and impact of the later Jewish wisdom materials was extensive. Indeed, there is an undeniable consensus that the conceptual significance of Torah, garbed as it was in Jewish Wisdom and Greek Logos, was gradually increased in rabbinic[8] and even in early Christian traditions.

---

[3] Wisdom in the stories of Exodus in Wis 11-19 does not appear to be directly connected to the Torah in covenantal and sapiential traditions in *Sirach*. Similar instances of a combination of Wisdom and Torah also appear in Bar 3:9-4:4, and Ps 1 and 119.

[4] The terms λόγος and νομός are frequently translated as Torah within Jewish Midrash. See Eldon J. Epp, "Wisdom, Torah, Word: The Johannine Prologue and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel," in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by His Former Students*, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975), 133-36. Epp also notes that Tannaitic and Amoraic literature contain considerable examples of the identification between personified Wisdom in Prov 8 and the Torah (e.g. *Gen. Rab*. 17:5; 31:5; 44:17; *Lev. Rab*. 11:3; *Pesiq. Rab*. 20:1).

[5] Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran," 219; Sinnott, *The Personification of Wisdom*, 137-8.

[6] Dieter Georgi, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 337.

[7] Friedrich V. Reiterer, "The Interpretation of the Wisdom Tradition of the Torah within Ben Sira," 224-8.

[8] See *Gen. Rab*. i, 1-10.

On the one hand, despite the prominent influences of various contemporary hypostatic notions, such as Wisdom and Logos in the Jewish wisdom traditions, as Urbach and Davies discussed, the centrality of Torah explicitly appears in Rabbinic Judaism.[9] On the other hand, it is also notable that a cross-fertilization of the various hypostatic notions manifested in the late sapiential materials of the Jewish wisdom traditions also emerge in the early Christian sources, which were written during a contemporary period of time (i.e., before and even after the age of Jesus).[10] The frequent presence, in the Wisdom literature, of personified Wisdom, understood as Torah, has critical implications for the concepts and images of Philo' Logos as well as the Johannine Logos (i.e., Incarnate Jesus) in early Christian sources, including the NT.[11]

It is crucial to note that Philo's Logos shows explicit evidence of the harmonization between the Greek Logos of Hellenistic philosophical traditions and Jewish Wisdom, understood as Torah (or the Word of God) in Palestinian Jewish traditions. Philo's conception of the image of the Logos in relation to the Image of God (Gen 1:27) in *Leg.* III. xxxi, 96 and *Conf.* xxvii, 147 provides a critical insight into the term "image" of Torah, which I examine in this study.[12] In order to discover the profound relationships between the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, I briefly discuss Philo's conception of the images of the Logos in relation to Wisdom and Torah. Philo specifically transforms the Platonic term "image," which is usually employed with reference to patterns of things in the visible world, into a term and concept which can describe the "ideas" and the Logos (*Leg.* I.

---

[9] According to Urbach, in *The Sages,* 198-99, "The remnants of the Wisdom myth referring to Wisdom's preexistence and its presence at the creation of the world, found in Proverbs (viii 22 ff), were transferred to the Torah, and it was said that it existed before the creation of the world, while R. Eliezer b. R. Zadok and R. Akiba spoke of the Torah as 'an instrument wherewith the world was created, although this myth militates against the doctrine of Revelation." Cf. William, D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, 2nd ed. (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1995), 170-72; Epp, "Wisdom, Torah, Word," 133-36. Tannaitic literature, which is dated to the first and second centuries C.E., also contains the identifications and depictions of personified Wisdom in Prov 8 with Torah. Ringgren, in *Word and Wisdom Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East*, 123, emphasizes that "personified Torah replaces personified Wisdom in rabbinic tradition."

[10] Ben Witherington, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 381.

[11] Witherington, 381-2.

[12] Wolfson, *Philo,* 1:237-40. As noted earlier, a dualistic conception of the Logos appears in his homily on Gen 2:8, which explicates the creation of man "in the shadow of God." i.e., after the Image of God.

xiii., xxxiii.; III, xxxi., xcvi., 96; *Somn.* II. vi., xlv.).[13] In this vein, as Wolfson notes, the "image" of God conveys a dualistic conception: not only is it a "corporeal" or "visible" image, but it is also an "incorporeal" or "invisible" image.[14] Both of these conceptions meaningfully appear in the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah.

The Logos as the Image of God has a significant implication for the concept and image of Torah (i.e., the Laws of Moses) in the sense of the divine Word (i.e., the Word of God).[15] As examined earlier, Philo's Logos is explicitly related to the "word" in the Septuagint (e.g., Ps 34(32):6; 147:38; 148:8) and is explicitly identified with the Word of God in the Wisdom literature, such as *Wisdom of Solomon* (e.g., Wis 9:1-2).[16] Philo's Logos thereby appears to be identified with the revealed Law (e.g., *Leg.* III. xv, 46) and eventually with the Torah as a hypostatic notion (e.g., Sir 24:23). In particular, Philo's Logos, which is equivalent to the revealed Law, appears as an immanent being in the world.[17] By contrast, Wisdom, mainly depicted as an incorporeal and transcendent being, in the sense of Nous (i.e., the divine or incorporeal mind), appears equivalent to the preexistent Law (i.e., preexistent Torah).[18] Both Logos and Wisdom signify a property of God, identical with His essence, eternal and incorruptible.[19] However, the concept and image of Wisdom, in *Leg.* I. xix, 65 and II. xxi-xxii, and *Ebr.* viii, 31, particularly appears in an eternal and incorporeal sense closer to God than the

---

[13] Ibid. The term "image" is still applied in a Platonic sense to the "patterns" of things in the visible world (e.g., *Opif.* vi, 25; *Plant.* xii. 50; *Ebr.* xxxiii, 13-133). However, Philo, in *QG* I. 4 and 8, clarifies that the "image" is described not only as the "idea" of man created in His Image prior to the creation of the "sense-perceptible" man but also as the Logos of God as the "first principle" and the intelligible and incorporeal "form."

[14] Ibid. This dualistic concept of the images of the Logos is manifest in the writings of Church Fathers, such as Origen, *De Principiis* II. iii, 6.

[15] Wolfson, *Philo,* 1:230-31; 253-61.

[16] Ibid. As Wolfson notes, Philo uses the term Logos to refer to the word of God in Scripture as the source of the creation of the world (Ps 33:6), the governing of the world (Ps 147:18), and of prophecy and revelation (Isa 2:1; Jer 1:2).

[17] Ibid. 332-3; 327-8. Philo describes the immanent Logos of the visible world through the symbolism of the High Priest, who is identified with a divine Word, i.e., the Logos. Cf. Philo, *Fug.* xx, 110.

[18] Ibid., 325.

[19] Ibid., 225, 253-61. Philo uses the term Wisdom in the senses of eternality and God's own wisdom, as a property of God prior to the creation of the world. Cf. *Leg.* II. xxi, 86: "The flinty rock is the wisdom of God, which He marked off highest and chiefest from His powers, and from which He satisfies the thirsty souls that love God."

Logos and the Word of God.[20] This shows that unlike the son-like image of Logos affiliated with the revealed Law (or Torah), the image of Logos affiliated with Wisdom appears as a God-like image related to the preexistent Law (or Torah), which is eventually convergent with the image of Torah. By this logic, this dual conception of Philo’s Logos substantiates a dualistic conception of Torah, which plays a central role in balancing the concepts of Wisdom and Logos.

As noted earlier, Philo’s Logos had a substantial impact on the Johannine Logos, and early Logos Christology.[21] As Edwards notes, the Johannine Logos indeed appears to be identified with the preexistent Torah of *Gen. Rab*. i, 1, which is identical to personified Wisdom, who is in the bosom of the Father in Prov 8.[22] This elucidates that the Johannine Logos appears as a combined and crystalized product of the Jewish wisdom traditions that developed within multi-faceted (Palestinian, Hellenized, and Rabbinic) Judaism and the Logos theology that developed under the Hellenistic philosophical influences. This also authenticates that the unique Johannine Logos was formulated in a gradual (exegetical and hermeneutical) process from the pre-existent Logos to Incarnate Logos, and in a shifting form from a Hellenistic and Jewish Logos-Wisdom theology to Christology.

All of this demonstrates that the conceptual interactions of Wisdom and Torah in the later sapiential materials and even rabbinic sources had a huge impact on the Jesus tradition and Logos-Wisdom Christology under the Hellenistic influences.[23] That is, the concepts and images of Torah, identified as Wisdom and Logos, were dynamically developed into an idiosyncratically theologized form of the Johannine Logos as Jesus within early Christian traditions. The profound interaction between the concepts and images of Wisdom and Logos further substantiates the centrality of Torah within the Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah.[24]

---

[20] Indeed, Philo also interprets קָ֭נָנִי (Prov 8:22) in a “not-created” or “acquired (or obtained)” sense in *Ebr*. viii, 31, which I will elaborates on in detail below.

[21] As examined earlier, it is evident that Jewish Palestinian culture was gradually integrated and was deeply influenced by the Hellenistic ways of life, thought and expressions over the last three centuries B.C.E. It appears that religious and cultural influences from the Greco-Roman environment had a huge impact upon the formative process of the Christian Logos theology. This point shows that the Johannine Logos was derived from influences within Hellenistic Judaism, which were, in turn, influenced by middle-Platonism through Philo’s Logos.

[22] Edwards, “Justin's Logos and the Word of God,” 262.

[23] See Georgi, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians*, 337-38.

Jesus in the Gospels as a Derivative Form of the Hypostatic Notions of Torah

On the basis of the previous examinations, I will analyze the case of Incarnate Logos as Jesus in the Gospels, who prominently appears as a derivative form of the hypostatic notions of Torah. I will examine not only the images and activities of Jesus as Incarnate Logos in the Fourth Gospel in the Logos-centered tradition but also those of Jesus as personified Wisdom in the Synoptic Gospels in the Wisdom-centered tradition. I will then compare them with other hypostatic notions, such as Philo's Logos, *memra* and *shekhinah* while uncovering their intertextual and theological relationships and their developmental processes during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.

Jesus as Incarnate Logos in the Fourth Gospel

As Goodenough notes, the concept of Logos and other variants, as a mediatorial figure, are not very widespread in the philosophical systems of first- or even second-century Judaism and Christianity.[25] Bultmann and Ashton also point out the absence of the Greek *sophia* (or Logos) and its disconnectedness to the Logos in the Prologue, or the Johannine Epistles.[26] These analyses are skeptical not only regarding the relationship between Wisdom-Sophia in Hellenistic Jewish writings and the Christian Logos in early Christian writings but also regarding the relationship between personified Wisdom and Jesus in terms of their roles as agents in the creation. As examined earlier, a direct linguistic and grammatical nexus between the Johannine Logos and the hypostatic notions of

---

[24] See Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 323; William D. Davies, "Reflections on the Spirit in the Mekilta: A Suggestion," *JANESCU* 5 (1973): 72.

[25] Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr,* 140-41.

[26] Bultmann, *The Gospel of John,* 22-25. Bultmann emphasizes the origin of the Johannine Logos in the Gnostic myth rather than the Judaic Wisdom myth and the Stoic Logos, as noted in n. 190 (in Chapter I), above. Ashton, in *Understanding the Fourth Gospel,* 124-159, also notes that the influences of the Hellenistic and rabbinic ideas on the Johannine Logos have been disputed for a long time in the history of biblical interpretation.

Torah, such as personified Wisdom, is difficult to definitively demonstrate and remains controversial. Nonetheless, in my view, these scholars' arguments do not appear to sufficiently offer an alternate and holistic interpretation that takes into account the intertextual, contextual, and theological dimensions regarding the conceptual development of the Johannine Logos as a hypostatic notion of Torah.

As examined earlier, we can infer that the conceptual changes and various usages of Torah had a significant interaction with a Logos-centered tradition at the time of the Johannine community. These changes and usages provide critical insight into the shifting process by which personified Wisdom became the Johannine Logos against the backdrop of other hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos and *memra*.[27] It is notable that Philo's work, which is earlier than the Fourth Gospel, appears critical for an examination of the Hellenistic influences on the Johannine Prologue.[28] As noted earlier, Philo's Logos has a syncretic quality created, as it was, by his own exegetical methodology of combining both Jewish biblical exegesis and Greek philosophy under the influence of middle-Platonism.[29] In *Opif.*, Philo identifies the Logos with the Image of God, mentioned in Gen 1:26-27, and Gen 2:7, as noted earlier.[30] He also identifies the Logos with an "instrument," understood as a copy of a divine Image and the intelligible cosmos, which God used for the creation of the cosmos.[31] He further identifies the Logos with the human mind and its rational thought, i.e., Reason.[32] Following this logic, the Logos is involved with the ideal first man, who was "superior to all rational natures."[33] By this logic, the Logos is not only connected to an angelic agent who is comparable to the demiurge in Plato's *Timaeus*, through which God created the world, but also to the revelatory apparatus of God.[34]Philo thereby offers a way of identifying a profound relationship between God and the Logos, i.e., the Word of God, while ultimately connecting the Logos to the concepts of an angelic agent or even a "second God."[35] As note earlier, Philo's Logos is eventually connected to the images (son-like or father-like) of personified Wisdom under the mixed influences of Greek philosophy and the Jewish exegetical practices of personifying Wisdom in the Wisdom literature.[36] This shows that Philo thereby creates a new way of interpreting the Greek Logos and Jewish Wisdom (personified Wisdom) under the rubric of Torah, and thereby creating of an angelic image of Torah.[37]

---

[27] Edwards, "Justin's Logos and the Word of God," 262. Although the personification of Torah might not have been a widespread phenomenon or exegetic practice as in rabbinic tradition, the conceptual changes of Torah cannot be ignored in the personification of Logos in relation to personified Wisdom, which appears in a Logos-centered tradition of the Johannine community.

[28] Philo, *Philo,* LCL 226, *Opif* (*De Opificio Mundi=On the Creation*). i-xi, 1-40; xxiii- xxiv, 69- 72. As noted earlier, Philo's Logos is crafted by his own exegetical methodology from Greek Hellenistic philosophy and Jewish biblical and wisdom traditions on Genesis. Despite the lack of professional philosophical languages in the Gospel of John, there are shared vocabularies and similar theological and philosophical languages with Philo's works, such as λόγος "word," φως "light," and σκότος "darkness" as well as αλήθεια "truth" as follows: τὸ δὲ ἀόρατον νοητὸν φῶς ἐκεῖνο θείου λόγου γέγονεν "Now that invisible light perceptible only by mind had come into being as an image of the Divine Word,"; μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ νοητοῦ φωτὸς ἀνάλαμψιν, ὃ πρὸ ἡλίου γέγονεν, ὑπεχώρει τὸ ἀντίπαλον σκότος "After the kindling of the intelligible light, which preceded the sun's creation, darkness its adversary withdraw." Also see Philo, *Somn.* xiii, 72-76: ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστι, "God is light."

[29] Sterling, "When the Beginning Is the End," 428-38. Philo's works comprise three independent sets of commentaries on the Pentateuch, and extensive treatment of Genesis. Three sets are as follows: *The Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus, The Allegorical Commentary,* and *Exposition of the Law.* Philo's Logos was a shared theological notion around first-century Judaism, which is based on the middle-Platonic theological notions under the influence of Plato's philosophy.

[30] Philo, *Opif.*, xxiii- xxiv, 69- 72; xlvi-li, 134-46.

It is crucial to note that personified Wisdom (Wis 9:1-2; Prov 8:1-31) plays a critical role in the notion that the revealed Laws of Moses, i.e., Torah (Sir 24:23 ff), is identified with Philo's Logos. As Harry A. Wolfson notes, the affinity and equivalence between the ideas of Logos and Wisdom in relation to Torah is eventually developed into the identification between Philo's Logos, Word of God, and personified Wisdom in the creation context (e.g., Jer 10:12; Prov 3:19; Ps 104:24).[38] In this vein, some NT scholars, such as Brown and James A. T. Robinson, also observe a similarity between the ways in which Philo's Logos and the Johannine Logos are profoundly grounded in the conceptual relationships of Torah and Wisdom in the Hebrew Bible and Wisdom literature, despite the lack of a direct linguistic and literary association between Philo’s writings and the Fourth Gospel.[39] This shows that, beyond a metaphysical dimension, Philo’s Logos allows for the personification and hypostatization of the Wisdom and Torah of God through a synthesis of the literary, exegetical, and theological processes. This thereby authenticates that Philo’s Logos, thus, offers a crucial basis and framework for the personification and incarnation of the Johannine Logos, but also for the formulation of the images of the Johannine Logos, as well as other hypostatic notions of Torah.

---

[31] Sterling, "Different Traditions or Emphases?" 55.

[32] Ibid., 44, 55.

[33] Philo, *Opif.* xlviii-xlix, 139-142; Runia, ed., *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*, 344-45.

[34] As noted earlier, Philo's Logos appears to be different than the Platonic or Stoic Logos.

[35] Sterling, "Different Traditions or Emphases?" 5-9, 48. The divine Logos is a separate being from God, but a part of God.

[36] Ibid., 43-44. The closeness of Philo's Logos to Torah in the descriptions of the cosmology in the opening verses of Genesis alludes to the use of allegory and symbolism as an interpretative tool in the Jewish homiletic and midrashic practices.

[37] The Jewish hypostatic notions appear to be condensed and consolidated in Philo's Logos.

[38] Wolfson, *Philo,* 1:255-58, 287 ff.

Jesus as Personified Wisdom in the Synoptics

Under the general consensus that the Synoptics are chronologically prior to the Fourth Gospel, we can infer that, like the Johannine Logos in the Fourth Gospel, the Jesus tradition in the Synoptics also was significantly influenced to some extent by the Hellenization of early Judaism.[40] Moreover, the later sapiential materials’ impact on the Gospels appears to be more evident in the Jesus tradition in the Synoptics. We can find clear differences, in the images and activities, words and deeds, and parables and aphorisms, between Jesus as Incarnate Logos in the Fourth Gospel, and those of Jesus, as personified Wisdom in the Synoptics. In this context, Ben Witherington observes that John the Evangelist implicitly presents Wisdom as the “private teaching” of Jesus “for those who need *further* instruction,” whereas Matthew explicitly presents Wisdom as the “public teaching” of Jesus “for Christian teachers to use with outsiders or *new* converts.”[41]

The most important characteristic of teaching methods of Jesus in the Gospels appears as a “parable,” which is translated as παραβολή in Greek in the NT, and is also translated as *mashal,* משל in Hebrew in Biblical and Rabbinic literature. As Peder Borgen suggests, the Gospels including the

---

[39] Brown, in *The Gospel According to John*, lvii-lviii, lxxxii-lxxxvi, also notes that the Evangelist's use of Logos triggers a strong curiosity about whether or not Philo's Logos is based on Johannine Logos. John A. T. Robinson tries to prove that the Prologue has a close nexus with first-century Palestinian *realia*. See Robinson, “The Relationship of the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John,” 128.

[40] As I pointed out in n. 184 (in Chapter I), above, scholars such Bultmann and Brown date the Gospel of John as about 80-120 C.E.

[41] Witherington, 338.

Gospel of John, appear to have a literary and exegetical relationship with ancient midrashim in the Jewish wisdom traditions.[42] Craig A. Evans makes a list of NT passages, especially regarding the teachings and parables of Jesus, which include quotations from and allusions and parallels to the Hebrew Bible, the Qumran texts, and the Wisdom literature of the Second Temple period.[43] Interestingly, Harvey K. McArthur and Robert M. Johnston analyze the close parallels between the parables of Jesus in the Gospels and rabbinic parables in the Tannaitic literature. For instance, the "wise and foolish maidens and servants" (Mt 25:1-13, Mt. 24:45-51; Mt 22:1-10; Lk 12: 42-46; Lk 14:15-24) may be compared to the "wise and foolish servants" (b. *Sabb.* 153a; *Qoh. Rab*. 9:8).[44]

These examinations shed light on the relationship of Jesus's parables not only to early Jewish parables but also specifically to a form of narrative *meshalim* that adopt the metaphorical and figurative speech of personified Wisdom.[45] Witherington notes that the majority of the Jesus tradition appears in "the form of some sort of Wisdom utterance, such as an aphorism, riddle, or parable."[46] Indeed, narrative *meshalim* (משלים) that are similar to Jesus's parables and aphorisms in the Synoptics can be found in the Hebrew Bible and in extra-canonical materials. They can be especially found especially in Jewish sapiential materials and traditions.[47] At the same time, it must be acknowledged that there are differences between the synoptics and the Jewish materials. Birger Gerhardsson emphasizes critical ideological, stylistic, and thematic differences.[48] Brandon B. Scott and David Aune also highlight that the halakhic issues and the usages of aphorisms of personified Wisdom found in the Wisdom materials are lacking or absent in the Jesus tradition.[49] However, despite the considerable differences, it cannot be denied that Jesus' sayings, in the mainstream Jesus materials, appear to be profoundly grounded in various forms of Wisdom's sayings in early Jewish wisdom sources and traditions.[50]

---

[42] Peder Borgen, "Observation on the Midrashic Character of John 6," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 54 (1963): 232-40.

[43] Craig A. Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature*, ed. Baker Academic Paperback (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011), 342-417; 419-23.

[44] Harvey K. McArthur, and Robert M. Johnston, *They also Taught in Parables: Rabbinic Parables from the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2014).

[45] Witherington, 205.

[46] Ibid., 155-56; Rainer Riesner, *Jesus Als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung Zum Ursprung Der Evangelien-Überlieferung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981), 392-94. Riesner counts 247 *meshalim* in the Synoptic Gospels.

[47] Birger Gerhardsson, "The Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels: A Comparison with the Narrative Meshalim in the Old Testament," *NTS* 34 (3) (1988): 339-63.

[48] Birger Gerhardsson, "If We Do not Cut the Parables out of their Frames," *NTS* 37, no. 3 (1991): 329-32.

The textual evidence regarding their similarities implicitly appears in some passages of the Synoptics. Unlike a direct intertextual nexus between Jesus and personified Wisdom in the Fourth Gospel, as examined earlier, the Synoptics (e.g. Mt 11:19; Lk 24:44) alludes to indirect relationships and similarities between Jesus and personified Wisdom.[51] As noted earlier, the speeches and activities of Jesus appear very similar to those of personified Wisdom. Specifically, Mt 11:28-30 implies that Jesus purposefully presented himself as a sage or teacher for all believers and audiences., Jesus presents himself as a Jewish prophetic sage of a sapiential mold (i.e., one who speaks is aphorisms, parables) very similar to the earlier Jewish sapiential traditions, such as those found in the book of Proverbs, *Sirach*, and *Wisdom of Solomon*.[52] In Jesus's parables and aphorisms (e.g., Mt 12:42, and in Lk 11:31), we can see an implicit identification of Jesus himself with personified Wisdom depicted as a sage in the book of Proverbs.[53] In addition, the "teacher" and "father" images of Jesus similarly appear in personified Wisdom's approach to "sons" and public audiences.[54] This corroborates that Jesus saw himself as (personified) Wisdom and interpreted his mission in the light of earlier Wisdom poems and hymns.[55]

---

[49] Bernard B. Scott, "Jesus as Sage: An Innovating Voice in Common Wisdom," in *Winona Lake* (Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 407; David Aune, Aune, David. "Oral Tradition and the Aphorisms of Jesus," in *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Jewish and Greco-Roman Antiquity: Collected Essays II* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 256-302.

[50] Witherington, 382.

[51] As Brown, in *The Gospel According to John*, cxxii-cxv, notes, Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is explicitly portrayed with the traits of Woman Wisdom, as noted earlier.

[52] Ibid., 159. The images of Jesus in personified Wisdom can be gleaned from *Sirach* (e.g., Sir 24:7ff) and *Wisdom of Solomon* (e.g., Wis10:10: σοφία δὲ τοὺς θεραπεύοντας αὐτὴν ἐκ πόνων ἐρρύσατο. "Wisdom rescued from troubles those who served her."; Wis 7:27: μία δὲ οὖσα πάντα δύναται καὶ μένουσα ἐν αὐτῇ τὰ πάντα καινίζει καὶ κατὰ γενεὰς εἰς ψυχὰς ὁσίας μεταβαίνουσα φίλους θεοῦ καὶ προφήτας κατασκευάζει. "Though she [Wisdom] is but one, Wisdom can do all things, and while remaining in herself, Wisdom renews all things; in every generation Wisdom passes into holy souls and makes them friends of God, and prophets."

[53] Mt 11:19b: καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς. "But wisdom is proved right by her actions."; Mt 12:42; ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ὧδε. "for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and behold, esomething greater than Solomon is here."; Lk 11:31: ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ὧδε. "for she came from the ends of the earth to listen to Solomon's wisdom, and now one greater than Solomon is here." (Adler, *Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft*, http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/online-bibeln/ueber-die-online-bibeln/ accessed by Oct 28, 2020). Luke's author seems to conclude that Jesus was a teacher of wisdom who was tremendously marked by the possession and employment of wisdom, and was Wisdom itself.

Furthermore, the images and activities of Jesus as a prophet appear to be similar to those of the *mashal* of personified Wisdom. A prophetic and eschatological message in Jesus's approach to public audiences can be found in the literary form of *mashalim*.[56] As Claus Westermann analyzed, the parables of Jesus adapted a prophetic and eschatological feature adapted from the narrative *meshalim* of personified Wisdom in the Jewish sapiential materials, such as *Sirach*, *Wisdom of Solomon*, and the Qumran texts.[57] Pheme Perkins states that Jesus uses *meshalim* in order to give a new message and interpretation of the Torah to His people and to defend his prophetic vision of the Kingdom of God.[58] Specifically, as Witherington notes, the prophetic and eschatological features in their speeches not only reflect a lived socio-political context but also have two levels of metaphoric meaning: physical and spiritual, sight and insight, and darkness and light, and death and eternal life.[59] This corroborates that the prophetic and eschatological aspects of the parables (i.e., *meshalim*) of both Jesus and personified Wisdom both aims to disclose the mystical aspects of the teachings of the Torah (i.e., the Laws of Moses).[60]

In all, this examination demonstrates that the parables of Jesus, understood against the backdrop of the *meshalim* of personified Wisdom, represents a combination of law, wisdom, prophecy, and eschatological vision.[61] This also substantiates profound nexus between personified Wisdom and

---

[54] Pheme Perkins, *Jesus as Teacher* (New York; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 44.
[55] Witherington, 384. Insofar as Jesus identifies himself as a particular historical person, this involves a turn towards a historical particularism. This becomes a controversial issue.
[56] Ibid., 202.
[57] Claus Westermann, *The Parables of Jesus in the Light of the Old Testament,* tans., eds. W. Golka and Alastair H.B. Logan (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990), 201-2. Westermann also points out that "comparisons and parables" form an essential part of the Hebrew Bible and NT. "The function of comparisons and parables differs according to the context in which they are found and from which in turn they derive their function" (202).
[58] Perkins, *Jesus as Teacher*, 44.
[59] Witherington, 381.
[60] Ibid., 159-60.
[61] James Breech, and Amos N. Wilder, *Jesus' Parables and the War of Myths: Essays on Imagination in the Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 79.

Jesus that emerges from the literary and hermeneutic strategies manifest in both the Jesus material and Jewish sapiential materials. One of the critical findings is that unlike the son-like and angelic images of Torah as Jesus in the Fourth Gospel in the Logos-centered tradition, the images and activities of Jesus as a sage or prophet in the Synoptics appear close to a God-like image of Torah in a Wisdom-centered tradition.

Three Images of Torah: Angelic, Messianic, and God-like

On the basis of this above examination, I will analyze in detail the features and images of Jesus as Incarnate Logos and personified Wisdom in the Gospels (the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic Gospels), which mirrors the process of the conceptual changes of Torah based on the dynamic interactions of Wisdom and Logos. I will thereby substantiate my contention that Philo's Logos is a bridge between personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31 and the Johannine Logos in Jn 1:1-18. Specifically, I now will delve into the features of the three images (angelic, God-like, and messianic) of the hypostatic notions of Torah by further elaborating and reevaluating the interpretations of אָמוֹן in Prov 8:22-31 against the backdrop of the intertextual and theological relationships between the hypostatic notions of Torah, which were dynamically developed within the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. I thereby will crystalize not only the particular features of Jesus, as a derivative form of the hypostatic notions of Torah from the literary, exegetical, and theological allusions but also the existence of the three (angelic, God-like, and messianic) images of Torah, reflected in Jesus, which dynamically emerge within the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions.

An Angelic Image of the Hypostatic Notions of Torah

As discussed earlier, the interpretations of אָמוֹן (i.e., personified Wisdom) in Prov 8:30 are at the basis of the relationships between personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, and the Johannine Logos. On the basis of this discussion, I first will try to uncover an angelic image of the hypostatic notions of Torah by analyzing the images and activities of personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31 and of the Johannine Logos in the Prologue in Jn 1:1-18. It is notable that the concept of "son(s)" of God in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Gen 6:1-4), in some manuscripts of the Septuagint, and in the Qumran texts, and in Apocryphal sources are closely associated with the expressions of "angels."[62]

We have seen that Philo's Logos can serve as the representative of God, as an angelic being, i.e., "the intelligible cosmos," which exists between God and the perceptible cosmos (including human beings).[63] The Logos, as an angelic being, appears to be a "separate intellect" or "incorporeal soul," which functions as a mediator between the Prime Cause and things existing in the world. It is crucial to note that, as Brant analyzes, Philo's Logos is analogous to portrayals of personified Wisdom as a "heavenly agent" (i.e., angelic being) in Jewish wisdom literature, such as Proverbs, *Sirach*, and *Wisdom of Solomon*.[64] As discussed earlier, Philo, in *Opif. Creation.*, conceptualizes the "Image of God" in Gen 1:26-27 and 2:7 by elucidating the relationship between God and the Logos through the combination of scriptural and philosophical interpretations.[65] Philo intellectualizes the biblical concept of the angels of God thereby transforming it into the philosophical concept of the Logos of God (ὁ θεού λόγos), which is eventually identified with the Word of God (i.e., Torah).[66] More importantly, Philo explicates that the Logos is related to ideal first man, who is "superior to all rational natures," on the basis of the equivalence of the Logos and Reason.[67] Specifically, Philo's conception of the Logos relates to the Greek term πρωτόγονος, instead of πρωτότοκος as the LXX translation of the Hebrew (בְּכוֹר).[68] This shows that Philo connects the concepts and images of the "firstborn" and "son" of God (also in the biblical sense of the relationship between son and father in Ps 2:7) to the image of an angelic agent ("artisan" or "instrument") as the Logos of God (i.e., Torah), who is created by God and works for creation with God.[69] This shows that through a literary and hermeneutic strategy, the image of Philo's Logos, rather than an essential unity with God, mainly appears as an angelic image of Torah as a mediator, which connects God and human beings. This corroborates that the angelic image of Philo's Logos eventually allows for the nexus that connects personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos. This also provides explicit evidence for the relationships between the (angelic) images of the other hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, the Johannine Logos, and *memra*.[70]

---

[62] The son(s) of God in the Hebrew Bible are also described as the righteous children of Seth, as just and pious men, and as the kings of Israel. Some manuscripts of the Septuagint, such as Codex Vaticanus, read "sons of God" of Genesis 6:1-4 as "angels." The references of בני האלהים (Job 1:6 and 2:1) in the Hebrew Bible are traditionally translated as "sons of God" in the Enochic literature, the Qumran texts [the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the *Damascus Document*, 4Q180=4QAgesCreat)], 2 *Baruch*, and so forth.

[63] Ibid. This assumes the identification of the image of God with the Logos under the influence of the Platonic tradition.

[64] Brant, *John*, 26.

[65] See Philo, *Opif.* i-xi, 1-40; xxiii- xxiv, 69- 72; xlvi-li, 134-146.

[66] Sterling, "When the Beginning Is the End," 5-9, 48; According to Runia's translation of *Opif.* xx., the cosmos composed of the ideas has its place on the divine Logos. See Runia, *On the Creation of the Cosmos*, 51, 142-3.

[67] Sterling, 337, 344-45; *Opif.* xlviii-xlix, 139-142; xxiii- xxiv, 69-72. Philo explicates that the Logos, i.e., the Word of God, which is even superior, is connected to the first man who "created, as I think, in body and soul, surpassing all the men that now are and all that have been before us." (xlix, 140)

For instance, in a manner similar to Philo's Logos, the *memra*, which is a biblical and rabbinic term for the Word of God, appears as one of the hypostatic notions of Torah and appears to have an angelic image of Torah. It is notable that the *memra* appears, in the Targums, as a divine agent (in a similar sense as a voice or name or messenger, instead of God Himself) who hypostatizes and personifies the Laws of Moses.[71] As many scholars analyzed, the image of *memra*, developed under the influence of the Hellenistic ideas, is parallel to a preexistent and personified Torah, although whether the *memra* is personified and hypostatized in the Targums and Rabbinic sources is still a controversial issue.[72] Nonetheless, the conceptual affinities of *memra* to the personification and hypostatization of Wisdom and Torah reinforce the relationship between the hypostatic notions of

---

[68] Peder Borgen, et al., *The Philo Index: A Complete Greek Word Index to the Philo's Works* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 303. There are descriptions of a critical function of the Logos as the firstborn in Philo's works, such as *Post*. xviii, 63-65; *Agr*. xii, 51; *Conf.* xiv, 63; xxviii, 146; *Fug.* xxxviii, 208; *Somn.* I. xxxvii, 215.
[69] Wolfson, *Philo,* 1:2; Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 165.
[70] Sterling, "When the Beginning Is the End," 428-38.
[71] Cf. Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 116-7; Keener, 1:349; Robert Hayward, "The Memra of YHWH," 24, 147; Mack, *Logos und Sophia*, 6; Clarke, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy,* 23-24.
[72] Ibid.

Torah and help us understand a theological framework, which can explain the different usages of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo’s Logos and the Johannine Logos.

It is crucial to remember that, as noted earlier, the image of *memra* is profoundly connected to the Logos-Son image, which appears in Philo’s Logos and in the Johannine Logos.[73] This authenticates that the concept and image of *memra* shows a profound relationship to the son-like or angelic image of Torah in relation to Philo’s Logos, the Johannine Logos, and other hypostatic notions of Torah. Specifically, the son-like and angelic images of *memra* are based in the grammatical and contextual interpretations of אָמוֹן as the son-like image of personified Wisdom (in Prov 8:30-31), i.e., “child,” “nursling” or “son” who was “growing up” or “nestling in and being embraced” in the arms of God as His delight.[74] As Fox and Lenzi analyzed, the Hebrew terms, שַׁעֲשׁוּעִים, שַׁעֲשֻׁעַי and מְשַׂחֶקֶת in Prov 8:30-31 show a profound association with a “son-like” image of personified Wisdom who is “playing” and “enjoying” with God.[75]

It becomes evident that the son-like and angelic images of the Johannine Logos and personified Wisdom reflect an intimate relationship with God in the context of creation.[76] The phrase “the only begotten Son” in Jn 3:16, which means the “beloved” and “chosen” son, strengthens the son-like and angelic images of the Johannine Logos, hypostatized and personified, as they are, by the Evangelist’s particular exegetic and hermeneutic strategy (e.g., a systematic allegorization and mythologization of the Logos).[77] The “begotten” son-like image of the Johannine Logos (i.e., Jesus) in the bosom of God the Father in Jn 1:18 culminates in the incarnation of Jesus as the Son of God.[78] This shows that the son-like image of אָמוֹן implies a concept of a heavenly (i.e., angelic) agent. The intertextual and theological allusions between the hypostatic notions of Torah, especially between the Johannine Logos and personified Wisdom, show that the images of a son growing up in the arms of God the Father alludes to an angelic figure, who is an agent of God, and substantiates an angelic image of Torah. Consequently, this examination shows that the Logos-Son image not only appears in the Logos-centered or related notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, and the *memra*, but also provides a critical insight into understanding the Logos theology within multi-faceted (Palestinian, Hellenistic, and Rabbinic) Judaism and early Christianity.[79] This substantiates the existence of an angelic image of Torah, which mainly appears in a Greek Logos-centered tradition and was developed in the thought of the authors and readers of the Jewish and Christian sources of the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.

---

[73] Clarke, 23-24; Sperber, et. al., *Targum Onkelos to Numbers*, 270. There are *Tg. Neof.* Dt 1:32, *Tg. Onq.*, Num 27:14.

[74] Fox, “’Amon again,” 699-702; Victor A. Hurowitz, “Nursling, Advisor, Architect? and the Role of Wisdom in Proverbs 8, 22-31,” *Biblica* (1999): 396-97. In a primary reading, I agree with Clifford and Lenzi’s interpretation of אָמוֹן as a sage or master in accordance with the Mesopotamian tradition, since this shows explicit intertextual evidence among the studies so far.

[75] Fox, *Proverbs* 1-9, 287; idem, “’Amon again,” 699-702. As noted earlier, Fox’s interpretation of אָמוֹן as a “child” who is “growing up” cannot be excluded on the basis of its literary development and my phenomenological study of the images of Torah. Cf. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 285; Hurowitz, “Nursling, Advisor, Architect?” 398-99; Lenzi, “Proverbs 8:22-31,” 694-95, 708-9.

[76] Heb 1:3a: ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ “The Son is the radiance of God’s glory and the exact representation of his being” (NIV; cf. 2 Cor 4:4) and “sustaining all things by his powerful word” (NIV; cf. Heb 9:14).

[77] The Septuagint translates Gen 22:2 (“thine only son”) as “thy beloved son,” which is used as a synonym of the “only begotten.”

A God-like Image of the Hypostatic Notions of Torah

Unlike the son-like and angelic images of personified Wisdom (אָמוֹן) in Prov 8:22-31, Wisdom also appears as a sage-like or God-like image, which preexists creation, as examined earlier. Specifically, the interpretation of קָנָנִי (Prov 8:22), which contains both the meanings of "created" and "acquired (or obtained) or begotten," allows not only for the angelic image of personified Wisdom but also for her God-like image. The angelic and divine-like images of personified Wisdom also can be found explicitly in the dual conception of Philo's Logos. As Wolfson notes, Philo's Logos, in *Ebr.*

---

[78] In the Synoptic Gospels, we can also find an explicit and implicit relationship between Jesus and the concepts of the "son" of God: the "son" of the master in the parable of the faithless laborers and the vineyard (Mark 22), and in a voice speaking from heaven in the baptismal scene (Mt 3:13-16), as well as some occasions reported by various individuals who appear in the Synoptic Gospels.

[79] As discussed earlier, a phenomenological distinction between early Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism was not clear until the end of the fourth century, and then only through a complicated process, i.e., a prolonged and repeated segregation and rapprochement with ambiguity and fuzziness between the two religions. Nonetheless, the Jewish *memra* theology undeniably plays a crucial role in understanding not only the developmental process of the Logos theology but also the profound interactions of the hypostatic notions of Torah within multi-faceted (Palestinian, Hellenistic, and Rabbinic) Judaism and early Christianity.

viii, 31, encompasses not only son-like and angelic images but also appears as a seemingly uncreated divine or God-like being (a divine agent or a creator) in an equal position to God in creation (cf. Prov 3:14, 19).[80] As also examined earlier, in the self-narratives (*meshalim*) of personified Wisdom in Prov 8-9, Wisdom appears in a sage-like, father-like, or divine-like image, who urges mankind, conceived as "sons," to listen to her teaching and to seek wisdom (in Prov 8), while inviting them to her house as disciples (in Prov 9).[81] In addition, we can see that in *Sirach* and *Wisdom of Solomon*, Wisdom appears in the images of a creator or savior, with a divine or God-like image, who pre-existed the beginning of creation and has a special relationship with God's beloved city of Jerusalem.[82] It is notable that, as Winston notes, personified Woman Wisdom in the *Wisdom of Solomon* (e.g., Wis 7:25-30; 8:2-9) appears as a sage or mystic, who is conceived as a divine agent who is an eternal emanation of the glory and power of God.[83]

In addition, the forms of personified Wisdom in the *Wisdom of Solomon* implicitly convey the concept of the *pneuma* (πνεῦμα) in a non-physical form, as a spiritual entity that appears closer to a God-like image of *shekhinah*.[84] The personified Wisdom figure in Wis 7:25-8:1 appears to be symbolized or mythologized not only as a "savior" figure but also as a divine entity, emanated from God or God Himself. [85] The conception of *shekhinah*, which implies a symbolic manifestation of the divine presence in the world, characterizes the features of the divine attributes and divine essence, which was later developed into the sefirotic system in the Middle Ages, as I will elaborate later in this study.[86] In this sense, the God-like image of *shekhinah*, which can be regarded as one of the hypostatic notions, is profoundly related to the God-like images of both Wisdom and Torah.[87] The omnipresence of God-*shekhinah* as the hypostasis of the divine presence, as seen in the Talmudic and Targumic sources, implies both an divine entity created and separated from God, and a divine being identical with God.[88] More importantly, as noted earlier, the God-like image of *shekhinah* appears to be profoundly related to the "indwelling" image of the Johannine Logos in the Gospel of John (e.g., Jn 1:14) insofar as both reflect a sense of divine immanence. This relationship substantiates not only the personality and divinity of Jesus as the Logos-Son of God but also a God-like image of the Johannine Logos. This analysis demonstrates that the divine-like *shekhinah* is intertextually and theologically interlocked with the divine-like images and activities, which can be gleaned from the sage-like or father-like or God-like images of other hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos and personified Wisdom in the creation context.

---

[80] Philo, *Ebr*. viii, 31; cf. *Virt* x, 62; As Harry Wolfson, in *Philo*, 1:225, notes, it does not mean that Philo believed that Wisdom was not created by God but was "only obtained by Him after it had existed apart from God from eternity."

[81] Fox, *Proverbs 1-9,* 289. In comparison with Women Wisdom in Prov 8, the wisdom in Prov 5, 7, and 9 seems a literary personification without a mythological background.

[82] Andrew T. Glicksman, *Wisdom of Solomon 10,* 122-23. Glicksman observes that Wisdom is placed in the heavenly court or the Temple in Jerusalem in Sir 24:8-11.

[83] David Winston, "The Sage as Mystic in the Wisdom of Solomon," in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, eds. John G. Gammie, and Leo G. Perdue (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 387-93.

[84] Pohlenz, *Die Stoa: Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung* 1, 368. The *pneuma* as the Stoic reason symbolizes a living spirit (*neshema*, נשמה), which God breathed in the creation of Adam.

[85] Sinnott, 161-2. For instance, "savior" in σοφίᾳ ἐσώθησαν in Wis 9:18 and as a "guide" in διέσωσε ἔσωσεν σοφία in Wis 10:4, in οδηγος in Wis 7:15, and in ὡδήγησεν in Wis 10:10.

In order to concretize the God-like image of Torah in the images and activities of personified Wisdom and Jesus, I will delve not only into their intertextual and theological relationships but also the exegetical strategies employed in the Wisdom literature and the Gospels with special focus on the theological intentions and compositional practices of the authors' of each. In particular, it is notable that the images and activities of Jesus in the Gospels are replete with considerable allusions to the personified Wisdom figure in a banquet as described in Prov 9. I begin by examining the God-like images and activities of personified Wisdom and its parallels to those of Jesus.

---

[86] Urbach, in *The Sages*, 65, notes that the *shekhinah* conveys both philosophical and mystical concepts of Torah. It can also be inferred that the concepts of *shekhinah* are developed into their profound relationships in the sefirotic system: Wisdom (*ḥokhmah*, upper *shekhinah*) and *shekhinah* (*malkhut*, lower *shekhinah*).

[87] The term "*shekhinah*" appears to signify "the personification and hypostasis" of the divine presence, even though this is controversial in classical Rabbinic literature, as examined in Chapter 1, pp. 95-99.

[88] Ibid. 40-45. With reference to the verse in Ex 34:29, in *Tanḥ.* (*Ki Tissa'*, xxxiii), the Sages say, "The Holy One, blessed be He, taught him Torah, he received the beams of glory from the sparks that issued from the *shekhinah*." This means that the *shekhinah* is none other than God; In *Sifre Naso*, xli. 44, Nathan illustrates a notion of the light of the *shekhinah* with reference to the verse "The Lord make His face to shine upon thee" (Num 6:25).

Table 13. Parallelism between Woman Wisdom and Wisdom Folly

Woman Wisdom	Woman Folly
א חָכְמוֹת, בָּנְתָה בֵיתָהּ; חָצְבָה עַמּוּדֶיהָ שִׁבְעָה.	יג אֵשֶׁת כְּסִילוּת, הֹמִיָּה; פְּתַיּוּת, וּבַל-יָדְעָה מָּה.
ב טָבְחָה טִבְחָהּ, מָסְכָה יֵינָהּ; אַף, עָרְכָה שֻׁלְחָנָהּ	יד וְיָשְׁבָה, לְפֶתַח בֵּיתָהּ-- עַל-כִּסֵּא, מְרֹמֵי קָרֶת.
ג שָׁלְחָה נַעֲרֹתֶיהָ תִקְרָא-- עַל-גַּפֵּי, מְרֹמֵי קָרֶת.	טו לִקְרֹא לְעֹבְרֵי-דָרֶךְ; הַמְיַשְּׁרִים, אֹרְחוֹתָם.
ד מִי-פֶתִי, יָסֻר הֵנָּה; חֲסַר-לֵב, אָמְרָה לּוֹ.	טז מִי-פֶתִי, יָסֻר הֵנָּה; וַחֲסַר-לֵב, וְאָמְרָה לּוֹ.
ה לְכוּ, לַחֲמוּ בְלַחֲמִי; וּשְׁתוּ, בְּיַיִן מָסָכְתִּי.	יז מַיִם-גְּנוּבִים יִמְתָּקוּ; וְלֶחֶם סְתָרִים יִנְעָם.
ו עִזְבוּ פְתָאיִם וִחְיוּ; וְאִשְׁרוּ, בְּדֶרֶךְ בִּינָה.	יח וְלֹא-יָדַע, כִּי-רְפָאִים שָׁם; בְּעִמְקֵי שְׁאוֹל קְרֻאֶיהָ

The majority of scholars follow the classification of Prov 9 depicted in the Table. 13: “Woman Wisdom’s invitation to her banquet (vv. 1-6), and a Woman Folly’s counter-invitation (vv. 13-18), as well as an interlude (vv. 7-12).”[89] The speeches of Woman Wisdom and Woman Folly demonstrate a parallelism in the structure of Prov 9.[90] There is particular antithesis between Woman Wisdom (vv. 1-6), and Woman Folly (vv. 13-18).[91] This parallel structure illustrates, in an antithetic form, the unfolding process and speech styles of each character.[92]

Importantly, the literary attempt to personify wisdom is conceivably based on the author’s desire for his theological views to have a strong impact on audiences. Through the use of vivid literary expressions, such as Woman Wisdom and Woman Folly, he explains two different paths of wisdom and foolishness.[93] In Prov 9, Wisdom’s speeches are accentuated by a metaphorical distinction from Woman Folly. In th first sentences of the speeches of the two Women, there are the similar designations for the subjects, חָכְמוֹת (wisdoms) (v. 1) and אֵשֶׁת כְּסִילוּת (foolish women) (v. 13), and there are the detailed descriptions of the two Woman figures. Woman Wisdom (חָכְמוֹת) makes a house

---

[89] Clifford, *Proverbs*, 103. Prov 9 holds a critical position as the final edition within Prov 1-9.
[90] Note that parallelism and antitheses are literary and exegetical features of Jewish wisdom literature.
[91] Fox, in *Proverbs 1-9*, 339, argues that the term Wisdom must be female as opposed to a masculine word, such as *sekhel* (שכל), in order to function as an erotic counterweight to the “explicitly sexual pull” of the Strange Woman or female Folly. Clifford also, in *Proverbs*, 102, notes, “The chapter contains Women Wisdom’s invitation to her banquet (vv. 1-6, +11), a counter-invitation by Women Folly (vv. 13-18) and five independent sayings (vv. 7-10,12).” Harrington, in *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 34, summarizes that Woman Folly in Prov 9 is personified as a street prostitute, whereas Woman Wisdom is personified as a symbolic warning for young male students against Woman Folly’s attractions in Prov 8, and invites young people to her house in Prov 9.
[92] Clifford, in “Proverbs 9: A Suggested Ugaritic Parallel,” *VT* 25 (1975): 299, suggests an Ugaritic origin based on the paralleled structure and similar images and activities of the Wisdom figure in Prov 9 and Anat, as a hostess in a scene of divine banquets, which appears in the Ugarit texts. The scene with a stereotyped language used in column vi (*CTCA* 17 =*UT* 2 Aqht) clearly appears as a divine banquet of the gods.
[93] The author intends to encourage the audience to choose the right ways of wisdom. Similarly, Jesus as Wisdom, encourages audiences to choose and follow the way that Jesus instructs. Paul similarly teaches that Jesus is the wisdom of God. He also contrasts wisdom and folly (e.g., 1 Cor 2:6-8).

(בֵּיתָהּ) with seven pillars, which she hews for her special feast (vv. 1-3).[94] The depiction of the personified Woman Wisdom figure in vv. 1-3 has a sequential process: building, slaughtering, invitation, and feast.[95] Her banquet is very well-organized and well-prepared on the table (עָרְכָה שֻׁלְחָנָהּ), with lavish meals with meat and well-mingled wine (טָבְחָה טִבְחָהּ, מָסְכָה יֵינָהּ). She also appears "deliberate, and confident," and to be capable of preparing and inviting her guests.[96] In v. 3, she sends her maidens to invite her guests for her feast (שָׁלְחָה נַעֲרֹתֶיהָ), and she cries out to her guests (or her maidens) from the highest places of the city (תִקְרָא, מְרֹמֵי קָרֶת עַל-גַּפֵּי). This description alludes to her high and special position such that she can send down her maidens and invite her guests to go up to her house. In v. 4, her voice invites the simple (מִי-פֶתִי יָסֻר הֵנָּה) and the one who lacks understanding (חֲסַר-לֵב, אָמְרָה לּוֹ) to come to her.[97] She also urges the one who lacks understanding and is gullible to come and eat of her bread, and drink of her wine (v. 5). Furthermore, she speaks in the imperative mood, "forget all thoughtlessness, and live!" (עִזְבוּ; פְתָאיִם וִחְיוּ) and gives commands in a strong manner, "and walk in the way of understanding!" (וְאִשְׁרוּ, בְּדֶרֶךְ בִּינָה).

---

[94] Bruce K. Waltke, in *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1-15* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 124, summarizes the characteristics of Wisdom's house and its seven pillars as three dimensions: cultic, cosmological, and literary. Fox, in *Proverb 1-9*, 297, comments, "Perhaps the notion of wisdom's house predates Prov 9:1, but if so, it has been appropriated and demythologized." Yet it still seems to convey not only a geographical and archeological meaning but also has a cultic character in the ancient Near East. In addition, חָצְבָה עַמּוּדֶיהָ שִׁבְעָה seems to represent not only a specific type of craftsmanship but also a particular style to hew stones hewn out of the rocks.

[95] Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs*, 1:432. Waltke notes, "The scene depicted in 9:1-3 is particularly close to the dedication of Baal's palace in Ugaritic texts."

[96] In particular, we can see an interesting parallel between the Wisdom's banquet of Prov 9 and Ben Sira's descriptions regarding a moderate manner for consuming food (Sir 31: 19-24) and drink (Sir. 31: 25-31) in a banquet (e.g., Sir 15:3, 24:21, Sir 32; 37:27-31). Ben Sira might have tried to rephrase and rewrite Prov 9 through an exegetical and theological lens which transforms the mysterious and metaphorical expressions into ordinary and practical ones. The text below, Sir 31:22-27, is a modern reconstruction in Hebrew. See Skehan, 374.

שמע בני וקח מוסרי ואל תלעיג עלי ובאחרית תמצא דברי   טוב על לחם תברך שפה עדות פובו נאמנה
רע על לחם ירגז בשער דעת רועו נאמנה   וגמ על היין אל תתגבר כי רבים חכשיל תירוש
כור בוחן מעשה לוטש כן היין למצות לצים   למי היין חיים לאנוש אמ ישתנו במת[ ]תו

> "Instruction for bread and wine together (31:22-27): (22) my son, hear my instruction. Do not challenge me, and in the end, you will find out my words. (23) You will bless the word that bread is good. Their testimony to his excellence is trustworthy. (24) He will complain in the gate that bread is bad. Their testimony to his niggardliness is accurate. (25) Do not be valiant over wine, for wine has fall down many people. (26) Fire and water control the temper of steel, so wine tests hearts in the strife of the proud. (27) whom wine is life to men, if you drink it in moderation."

[97] Robert C. Stallman, "Divinity Hospitality and Wisdom's Banquet in Proverbs 9:1-6" in *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke,* eds. Bruce K. Waltke (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000), 126.

In a structure similar to that of the speech of Woman Wisdom, Woman Folly (אֵשֶׁת כְּסִילוּת) also appears to prepare for her own kind of banquet in her house.[98] Yet, if structurally the banquet of Wisdom (vv. 1-6) is parallel to that of Folly (vv. 13-18), there is a clear contrast in their contents. Unlike Woman Wisdom, Woman Folly, who is riotous (הֹמִיָּה) and totally gullible (פְּתַיּוּת), is just sitting near the door of her house (יָשְׁבָה, לְפֶתַח בֵּיתָהּ) on a seat in the high places of the city (עַל-כִּסֵּא, מְרֹמֵי קָרֶת), and is waiting to invite the gullible passerby, who are thoughtless like her, to her banquet.[99] She also calls out the passersby who are going right on their ways (לְעֹבְרֵי-דָרֶךְ הַמְיַשְּׁרִים אֹרְחוֹתָם), “one who is thoughtless, let him return to here,” with the same expressions as Woman Wisdom (vv. 4, 16). Woman Folly with an evil intention, in contrast to Woman Wisdom, also entices the one who lacks understanding to drink “stolen waters,”[100] which will be sweet (מַיִם-גְּנוּבִים יִמְתָּקוּ), and to eat “bread which will be pleasant in secret (לֶחֶם סְתָרִים יִנְעָם).” The author of Prov 9 concludes the narrative of the Woman Folly figure by mentioning the deadly end of her way, “he does not know that the dead are there;[101] that her guests are in the valley of the grave (*sheol*) (וְלֹא-יָדַע, כִּי-רְפָאִים שָׁם; בְּעִמְקֵי שְׁאוֹל קְרֻאֶיהָ).”

It is worth noting that there is an interlude (vv. 7-12) between the contrasting descriptions of the two Woman figures. In v. 7, the narrator warns not to admonish a wicked man or scorner, who can take revenge on the admonisher with shame (קָלוֹן) and blot (מוּמוֹ). In vv. 8-9, he advises, “do not reprove a scorner, lest he hates you; do reprove a wise man, then he will love you!” (אַל-תּוֹכַח לֵץ, פֶּן-יִשְׂנָאֶךָּ; הוֹכַח לְחָכָם, וְיֶאֱהָבֶךָּ), and “Give to a wise man, then he will be wiser; teach a righteous man, he will add learning!” (תֵּן לְחָכָם, וְיֶחְכַּם-עוֹד; הוֹדַע לְצַדִּיק, וְיוֹסֶף לֶקַח). It is notable that the interlude, which appears to be spoken by a third person (i.e. the author of Prov 9), has a chiastic structure (in the narrative, vv. 7-9) that reveals the parallel natures of the statements of the scoffer and the wise.

---

[98] Woman Folly is deciphered as a more concrete version of the “loose woman” in Prov 2, 5, 6, and 7.

[99] This means her lack of will “to leave her ignorance and complacency to do what is right.” (Waltke, 1:443)

[100] Waltke (1:445) explains that water instead of wine is “an incomplete metaphor for sexual pleasure” so that “no contrast with Wisdom’ offer of wine is intended.”

[101] Waltke (1:146) Waltke interprets that those who are invited (call out in v. 3) refers to the apostates who followed her siren invitation (v. 18). *Sheol* refers to the corpses in her festive house.

Table 14. Chiastic Structure of Prov 9:7-9

7	A a scorner who get teaching and correction gives you a shame
	B a wicked man who get reproach will give you a blot
8	C a scorner who get reproach will hate you
	C’ a wise man who get reproach will love you
9	B’ a wise man who get reproach will be wiser.
	A’ a righteous man who get teaching and correction increases learning

In summary, the portrayals of a wise man and righteous man in A’, B’, C’ are in direct oppositions to the depictions of a scorner and wicked man in A, B, C. In vv. 10-12, as a concluding statement, we read, “The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom, and understanding is the knowledge of the Holy One” (תְּחִלַּת חָכְמָה, יִרְאַת יְהוָה; וְדַעַת קְדֹשִׁים בִּינָה); “your days will be multiplied, and the years of your life will be added to you if (or because) you are in the God (i.e., the fear of God)” (כִּי-בִי, יִרְבּוּ יָמֶיךָ; וְיוֹסִיפוּ לְּךָ, שְׁנוֹת חַיִּים); “if you are wise, the wisdom is for you; and if you scorn, you alone will suffer” (אִם-חָכַמְתָּ, חָכַמְתָּ לָּךְ; וְלַצְתָּ, לְבַדְּךָ תִשָּׂא).[102]

Through this textual analysis, we can infer that the purpose of the contrastive parallel between Woman Wisdom and Woman Folly appears to be deeply related to the authors’ theological intentions and exegetical practices, given their socio-historical and religious situations. This analysis not only substantiates that Prov 1-9 has particular theological significance, in context of the entire text of Proverbs, but also allows us to examine the intertextual and theological relationships between Prov 1-9 and other texts in the Wisdom literature, such as *Sirach* and the Synoptic Gospels in early Christian wisdom sources.

In this context, I will further look into the features of personified Wisdom as a master in a banquet, as it appears in Prov 9, in relation to other relevant texts. This below table shows not only an intertextual nexus between Prov 1 and 9 but also an exegetical and compositional practice shared by the author(s) of Prov 1-8 and Prov 9. It is notable that the identity of Woman Wisdom in Prov 9 appears to be that of a builder and confident hostess.[103] This appears very similar to the image of God, who is depicted as a divine host (e.g., Ex 17:1-16).[104]

---

[102] The Holy One, the plural קדושים usually refers to holy or saintly persons or to heavenly beings or angels. Most commentators take it to be an epithet of God- hence the translation, “the Holy One.”

Table 15. Intertextual and Compositional Nexus between Prov 1 and 9 on Personified Wisdom

Prov 9	Prov 1
א חָכְמוֹת, בָּנְתָה בֵיתָהּ; חָצְבָה עַמּוּדֶיהָ שִׁבְעָה	כ חָכְמוֹת, בַּחוּץ תָּרֹנָּה; בָּרְחֹבוֹת, תִּתֵּן קוֹלָהּ.
ב טָבְחָה טִבְחָהּ, מָסְכָה יֵינָהּ; אַף, עָרְכָה שֻׁלְחָנָהּ	כא בְּרֹאשׁ הֹמִיּוֹת, תִּקְרָא: בְּפִתְחֵי שְׁעָרִים בָּעִיר--
ג שָׁלְחָה נַעֲרֹתֶיהָ תִקְרָא-- עַל-גַּפֵּי, מְרֹמֵי קָרֶת	כב עַד-מָתַי, פְּתָיִם-- תְּאֵהֲבוּ-פֶתִי ,אֲמָרֶיהָ תֹאמֵר
ד מִי-פֶתִי, יָסֻר הֵנָּה; חֲסַר-לֵב, אָמְרָה לּוֹ	וְלֵצִים--לָצוֹן, חָמְדוּ לָהֶם; וּכְסִילִים, יִשְׂנְאוּ-דָעַת.
ה לְכוּ, לַחֲמוּ בְלַחֲמִי; וּשְׁתוּ, בְּיַיִן מָסָכְתִּי	כג תָּשׁוּבוּ, לְתוֹכַחְתִּי: הִנֵּה אַבִּיעָה לָכֶם רוּחִי;
ו עִזְבוּ פְתָאיִם וִחְיוּ; וְאִשְׁרוּ, בְּדֶרֶךְ בִּינָה	אוֹדִיעָה דְבָרַי אֶתְכֶם
ז יֹסֵר, לֵץ--לֹקֵחַ לוֹ קָלוֹן; וּמוֹכִיחַ לְרָשָׁע מוּמוֹ.	כד יַעַן קָרָאתִי, וַתְּמָאֵנוּ; נָטִיתִי יָדִי, וְאֵין מַקְשִׁיב.
ח אַל-תּוֹכַח לֵץ, פֶּן-יִשְׂנָאֶךָּ; הוֹכַח לְחָכָם,	כה וַתִּפְרְעוּ כָל-עֲצָתִי; וְתוֹכַחְתִּי, לֹא אֲבִיתֶם..
וְיֶאֱהָבֶךָּ	כט תַּחַת, כִּי-שָׂנְאוּ דָעַת; וְיִרְאַת יְהוָה, לֹא בָחָרוּ
ט תֵּן לְחָכָם, וְיֶחְכַּם-עוֹד; הוֹדַע לְצַדִּיק, וְיוֹסֶף לֶקַח	ל לֹא-אָבוּ לַעֲצָתִי; נָאֲצוּ, כָּל-תּוֹכַחְתִּי.
י תְּחִלַּת חָכְמָה, יִרְאַת יְהוָה; וְדַעַת קְדֹשִׁים בִּינָה	לא וְיֹאכְלוּ, מִפְּרִי דַרְכָּם; וּמִמֹּעֲצֹתֵיהֶם יִשְׂבָּעוּ
יב אִם-חָכַמְתָּ, חָכַמְתָּ לָּךְ; וְלַצְתָּ, לְבַדְּךָ תִשָּׂא	לב כִּי מְשׁוּבַת פְּתָיִם תַּהַרְגֵם; וְשַׁלְוַת כְּסִילִים
יג אֵשֶׁת כְּסִילוּת, הֹמִיָּה; פְּתַיּוּת, וּבַל-יָדְעָה מָּה	תְּאַבְּדֵם.
	לג וְשֹׁמֵעַ לִי, יִשְׁכָּן-בֶּטַח; וְשַׁאֲנַן, מִפַּחַד רָעָה.

As we can see in the Table. 15, the terms and features of vv. 1-6, 13-18 in Prov 9 appear similar to or identical to earlier materials found in Prov 1.[105] The chronological orders in Prov 1 and Prov 9 are antithetical to one another: Wisdom in Prov 1 calls out outside (בַּחוּץ) while Wisdom in Prov 9 invites guests inside her house (בֵיתָהּ). The author(s) of Prov 1 and 9, in speeches with similar nuances, warn of the seriousness of the judgment of God and encourage the audiences to choose the fear of God and the way of wisdom by making a sharp distinction between the ways of the foolish and wise. The speeches of the two Wisdom figures demonstrate similar metaphorical and poetic expressions. In all, the intertextual and exegetical nexuses between Prov 1 and 9 appear to concretize the divine-like images of personified Wisdom. As we can see in the Table. 16 below, there is explicit evidence of the use of similar images and activities of personified Wisdom in Prov 8 and 9. They share similar vocabularies, speech styles, and describe the same unfolding processes. One of the common ideas of Prov 8 and 9 is the fear of God. According to Prov 9:10, the beginning of wisdom is the fear of God.

---

[103] Wisdom in Prov 9 prepares meats for a lavish banquet. It is comparable to an abundant banquet of meat and wine provided by the generosity of God in Isa 25:6. Cf. Stallman, *Divine Hospitality in the Pentateuch: A Metaphorical Perspective on God as Host* (PhD Diss.; PA: Westminster Theological Seminary, 1999), 121.

[104] God provides plentiful water from the rock, and manna and quails through Moses. This implies the personified Wisdom figure in Prov 9:1-6 has an image of God as a host.

[105] For example, "Do not rebuke mockers" (אַל-תּוֹכַח לֵץ) in Prov 9:8 alludes to "my rebuke" (תוֹכַחְתִּי) in Prov 1:25. In addition, "my bread" (בְלַחֲמִי) in Prov 9 seems to be symbolized as "my words" (דְבָרַי) in Prov 1:23.

The fear of God in Prov 8, which is equivalent to hating evil (v. 12), is accentuated by wisdom (v. 11). These similarities notwithstanding, Wisdom in Prov 9 has quite a different sense than personified Wisdom in Prov 8 in the context of creation.

Table 16. Intertextual and Compositional Relationship between Prov 8 and 9

Prov 8	Prov 9
א הֲלֹא-חָכְמָה תִקְרָא; וּתְבוּנָה, תִּתֵּן קוֹלָהּ.	א חָכְמוֹת, בָּנְתָה בֵיתָהּ; חָצְבָה עַמּוּדֶיהָ שִׁבְעָה
ב בְּרֹאשׁ-מְרֹמִים עֲלֵי-דָרֶךְ; בֵּית נְתִיבוֹת נִצָּבָה.	ב טָבְחָה טִבְחָהּ, מָסְכָה יֵינָהּ; אַף, עָרְכָה שֻׁלְחָנָהּ
ג לְיַד-שְׁעָרִים לְפִי-קָרֶת; מְבוֹא פְתָחִים תָּרֹנָּה.	ג שָׁלְחָה נַעֲרֹתֶיהָ תִקְרָא-- עַל-גַּפֵּי, מְרֹמֵי קָרֶת
ד אֲלֵיכֶם אִישִׁים אֶקְרָא; וְקוֹלִי, אֶל-בְּנֵי אָדָם.	ד מִי-פֶתִי, יָסֻר הֵנָּה; חֲסַר-לֵב, אָמְרָה לּוֹ
ה הָבִינוּ פְתָאיִם עָרְמָה; וּכְסִילִים, הָבִינוּ לֵב.	ה לְכוּ, לַחֲמוּ בְלַחֲמִי; וּשְׁתוּ, בְּיַיִן מָסָכְתִּי
ו שִׁמְעוּ, כִּי-נְגִידִים אֲדַבֵּר; וּמִפְתַּח שְׂפָתַי,	ו עִזְבוּ פְתָאיִם וִחְיוּ; וְאִשְׁרוּ, בְּדֶרֶךְ בִּינָה
מֵישָׁרִים.	ז יֹסֵר, לֵץ--לֹקֵחַ לוֹ קָלוֹן; וּמוֹכִיחַ לְרָשָׁע
ז כִּי-אֱמֶת, יֶהְגֶּה חִכִּי; וְתוֹעֲבַת שְׂפָתַי רֶשַׁע	מוּמוֹ
ח בְּצֶדֶק כָּל-אִמְרֵי-פִי: אֵין בָּהֶם, נִפְתָּל וְעִקֵּשׁ.	ח אַל-תּוֹכַח לֵץ, פֶּן-יִשְׂנָאֶךָּ;
ט כֻּלָּם נְכֹחִים, לַמֵּבִין; וִישָׁרִים, לְמֹצְאֵי דָעַת.	הוֹכַח לְחָכָם, וְיֶאֱהָבֶךָּ
י קְחוּ-מוּסָרִי וְאַל-כָּסֶף; וְדַעַת, מֵחָרוּץ נִבְחָר.	ט תֵּן לְחָכָם, וְיֶחְכַּם-עוֹד;
יא כִּי-טוֹבָה חָכְמָה, מִפְּנִינִים;	הוֹדַע לְצַדִּיק, וְיוֹסֶף לֶקַח
וְכָל-חֲפָצִים, לֹא יִשְׁווּ-בָהּ.	י תְּחִלַּת חָכְמָה, יִרְאַת יְהוָה;
יב אֲנִי-חָכְמָה, שָׁכַנְתִּי עָרְמָה; וְדַעַת מְזִמּוֹת אֶמְצָא.	וְדַעַת קְדֹשִׁים בִּינָה
יג יִרְאַת יְהוָה, שְׂנֹאת-רָע	יא כִּי-בִי, יִרְבּוּ יָמֶיךָ; וְיוֹסִיפוּ לְּךָ, שְׁנוֹת חַיִּים

The personified Wisdom figure in Prov 8 directly introduces herself as Wisdom (v. 12), who speaks in an equal or close position with God, whereas Woman Wisdom in Prov 9 shows a seemingly fundamental distance from God.[106] However, Woman Wisdom in Prov 9 also implicitly appears to have a position (i.e., as a master in a banquet) close to an image of God through a poetic and literary strategy, which I will further discuss in comparison to the images of Jesus in the Gospels.

Furthermore, intertextual allusions from Prov 2, 3, 5, 7 and 31 which appear in Prov 9, provide the evidence of an exegetical practice of rewriting, a practice that shows a profound nexus between Wisdom and Torah.[107] This woman figure (e.g., Prov 31:26) also appears as a sage-like or teacher-like figure who teaches wisdom and the Laws of Moses (i.e., Torah) in a manner similar to the images of personified Wisdom in Prov 8.

---

[106] In Prov 8, Wisdom has a role of subject, whereas in Prov 9, God has a role of subject. It can be inferred that there is diversity in the personification of wisdom such that in one instance it is depicted as a hypostasis and in another as a literary figure.

[107] In Prov 9, the fear of God is a prerequisite for the life of wisdom, whereas in Prov 8, the fear of God is a consequence and its explanation, which is derived from personified Wisdom. Torah does not appear in Prov 8 and 9 but seems to be implicitly mentioned תְּבוּנָה, בְּצֶדֶק כָּל-אִמְרֵי,מוּסָרִי,וְדַעַת קְדֹשִׁים בִּינָה in the teaching of wisdom and Torah in vv. 8-10.

Table 17. The Intertextual Allusions between Prov 9 and 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 31 in Proverbs

Prov 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 31		Prov 9	
לָדַעַת חָכְמָה וּמוּסָר; לְהָבִין, אִמְרֵי בִינָה	1:1	חָכְמוֹת, בָּנְתָה בֵיתָהּ; חָצְבָה עַמּוּדֶיהָ שִׁבְעָה	1
הַעֹזֶבֶת, אַלּוּף נְעוּרֶיהָ; וְאֶת-בְּרִית אֱלֹהֶיהָ שָׁכֵחָה.	2:17	עִזְבוּ פְתָאיִם וִחְיוּ; וְאִשְׁרוּ, בְּדֶרֶךְ בִּינָה	6
יִרְאַת יְהוָה, רֵאשִׁית דָּעַת; חָכְמָה וּמוּסָר	1:7		
יִשְׁמַע חָכָם, וְיוֹסֶף לֶקַח	1:5	אַל-תּוֹכַח לֵץ, פֶּן-יִשְׂנָאֶךָּ;	8
אַל-תְּהִי חָכָם בְּעֵינֶיךָ; יְרָא אֶת-יְהוָה	3:7	הוֹכַח לְחָכָם	
אֹרֶךְ יָמִים, בִּימִינָהּ; בִּשְׂמֹאולָהּ, עֹשֶׁר וְכָבוֹד	3:16	תֵּן לְחָכָם, וְיֶחְכַּם-עוֹד; הוֹדַע לְצַדִּיק, וְיוֹסֶף לֶקַח	9
קָלוֹן כָּבוֹד, חֲכָמִים יִנְחָלוּ; וּכְסִילִים, מֵרִים	3:27	תְּחִלַּת חָכְמָה, יִרְאַת יְהוָה; קְדֹשִׁים בִּינָה וְדַעַת	10
בְּנִי, לְחָכְמָתִי הַקְשִׁיבָה; לִתְבוּנָתִי	5:1	כִּי-בִי, יִרְבּוּ יָמֶיךָ;	11
כִּי שָׁחָה אֶל-מָוֶת בֵּיתָהּ; וְאֶל-רְפָאִים, מַעְגְּלֹתֶיהָ	2:18		
דַּרְכֵי שְׁאוֹל בֵּיתָהּ; יֹרְדוֹת, אֶל-חַדְרֵי-מָוֶת	7:27	אֵשֶׁת כְּסִילוּת, הֹמִיָּה; פְּתַיּוּת, וּבַל-יָדְעָה מָּה	13
אֵשֶׁת-חַיִל, מִי יִמְצָא; וְרָחֹק מִפְּנִינִים מִכְרָהּ	31:10	וְלֹא-יָדַע, כִּי-רְפָאִים שָׁם;	18
פִּיהָ, פָּתְחָה בְחָכְמָה; וְתוֹרַת חֶסֶד, עַל-לְשׁוֹנָהּ	31:26	בְּעִמְקֵי שְׁאוֹל קְרֻאֶיהָ	

As Stuart Weeks notes, Prov 9 employs literary and symbolic imagery in a complicated poetic and compositional form that expresses the mystical images of the personified Woman figure in regard to Torah.[108] This substantiates a particular literary and exegetic strategy for formulating a God-like image of Torah, which utilizes the personified Wisdom characters as figurative imagery for Wisdom and Torah.

On the basis of this previous examination, I now turn to discuss the presence and features of personified Wisdom in early Christian sources, including the Gospels, which need thorough explanations, as they are profoundly involved with the Wisdom literature that was mainly composed over a period of a thousand years between around 900 B.C.E and 100 C.E.[109] Georgi asserts that "Jewish Apologists took the practical consequences of the universal aspects of Jewish wisdom [using the same] dialectic between universalism and particularity as the Hellenistic culture around them."[110]

---

[108] Stuart Weeks, *Instruction and Imagery in Proverbs 1-9* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 127, 135-138. The features and functions of the personified Wisdom figure in Prov 9 are amplified by the contrast with the Woman Folly. For instance, the expression of "the highest places of the city" (v. 3) and "on a seat in the high places of the city" (v. 14) alludes to a motif of the imagery of personified wisdom. Woman Folly, on the middle of her way to go up to the highest places of the city, entices the simple, who were invited by Woman Wisdom to a joyous banquet. This evokes an imaginative power about the way to gain wisdom. In other words, Wisdom's students should overcome Woman Folly's seduction to get to Woman Wisdom's house and her banquet as a destination for those who seek wisdom and the fear of God. Washington also argues that the woman must be understood within the context of the post-exilic campaign against marriage to foreign women. See also Washington, "The Strange Woman (אשה זרה/ נכריהה) of Proverbs 1-9 and Post-Exilic Judean Society," 217-42.

[109] Witherington, *Jesus the Sage,* 381.

[110] Ibid., 382.

This primarily elucidates a theological and philosophical process combining Judaism and Hellenism within the Wisdom literature, such as *Sirach*, *Wisdom of Solomon*, as well as Philo's works.

The sapiential materials in the NT illuminate that a universalistic Jewish Wisdom movement existed and had a huge impact on the Jesus tradition in the NT under Hellenistic influence.[111] It cannot be denied that there were great changes and influences in which, in early Jewish Christianity, the locus of Wisdom as Torah is replaced with Jesus, and that the Jesus tradition was influenced, to some extent, by the Hellenization of early Judaism, which appears in the Jewish Wisdom materials. On the basis of this appraisal, Witherington summarizes the striking resemblance between personified Wisdom and Jesus in the Fourth Gospel.[112] In considering the chronology of the origins of the materials, it is generally accepted that the Synoptics came prior to that of the Fourth Gospel (the Gospel of John).[113] The relationship between personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos, which we have intertextually, exegetically and theologically examined above, also provides a critical insight into the similar images and activities of personified Wisdom in their corrollary texts, such as the Synoptics. Yet in comparison to the Fourth Gospel, where the influence is more complex, the sapiential materials' impact on the Synoptic Gospels appears to more straightforwardly influence the Jesus tradition. In this context, we can find the striking similarities between personified Wisdom and Jesus in the Synoptics. Mack examines the "earliest Christology" in order to prove its Jewish derivations from "anthropological poetries of contemporary Jewish wisdom writings" as well as apocalyptic texts.[114] "Sophia-Christology" in Q and Matthew, which Marion J. Suggs, John S. Kloppenborg, and James M. Robinson have discussed, is very critical for understanding various expressions of the images of Wisdom as aspects of "a high Christology," especially in the Synoptics.[115] It is evident that the earlier sapiential materials, such as Proverbs, offer a direct parallel to the Synoptics in terms of the Jewish Wisdom-centered traditions.[116] The images and activities of Jesus in the Synoptics also show parallels to those of personified Wisdom.[117] As noted earlier, in both the Jesus tradition and early Jewish traditions, a *mashal* is supposed to be constructed as an ordinary phenomenon, derived from standard human communications. This is the case, as well, with the *mashal* of personified Wisdom, which is precisely constructed in this manner.[118] An examination of personified Wisdom in a *mashal* form, i.e., a figurative Wisdom speech, appears to prove the presence of the components of Wisdom in the Jesus tradition.[119]

---

[111] Ibid., 381; Georgi, 337-38. As noted earlier, we can infer that the cross-fertilization between the NT and the late Jewish sapiential materials within various Jewish Wisdom traditions influenced Gentiles as well as Jews in the Second Temple period and Late Antiquity throughout the Mediterranean crescent. This also shows that early Jewish Christianity was not only part of the Jewish Wisdom movement but also maintained its Christological uniqueness.

[112] Witherington, in *Jesus the Sage*, 374, summarizes the resemblances as follows: 1) the Logos hymn; 2) "I am" saying and discourses; 3) the use of father-language, and teacher-learner language; 4) various aspects of Christology, soteriology, and pneumatology.

[113] Moulton, in "The Dating of the Synoptic Gospels," summarizes, "During the remaining years of the century one can trace a growing unanimity in these conclusions, as well as in the belief that all three Synoptic Gospels were written during the last thirty years of the first century, although a few scholars still continued to keep the first decade of the second open for Matthew and Luke." See Bultmann and Brown's notes about the dates of the Gospel of John as mentioned in Chapter I, n. 184, above.

The relationship between the narrative *meshalim* and the parables of Jesus is of critical significance since they have many common sources. It is necessary, therefore, to examine various theories and interpretative methodologies about the relationship of Jesus's parables to early Jewish parables. Birger Gerhardsson asserts that narrative *meshalim* found in the Hebrew Scriptures, in extra-canonical materials, and especially in the Wisdom materials are similar to Jesus's parables and aphorisms in the Synoptics.[120] A point of particular contention among scholars is whether Jesus himself, as a sage-like figure, shows an explicit parallel to the depiction of personified Wisdom as a sage-like figure in Proverbs.[121] In Mt11:19b; 12:42 and in Lk 11:31, there is clear evidence of Jesus's attempt to identify himself with Wisdom embodied with flesh and of the interpretation of Jesus's mission in light of the earlier Wisdom traditions.[122] This personification of wisdom appears to develop into a particularism, identifying Jesus himself as a specific historical person.[123]

---

[114] Burton L. Mack, *The Christ and Jewish Wisdom*, in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, eds. James H. Charlesworth, J Brownson, M. T. Davis, S. J. Kraftchick, and A. F. Segal (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 197-209. Mack classifies the anthropology of Jewish Wisdom into three categories: 1) personified Wisdom; 2) the kingly figure who rules by wisdom; 3) the righteous and wise salvific figure. The mythological depiction of the Wisdom figures as divine can be found, as examined earlier, in the Wisdom literature of the Hebrew Bible, as well as in Sirach, Wisdom of Solomon, Maccabean literature, and Philo's works.
[115] Marion J. Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014).; John S. Kloppenborg, "Wisdom Christology in Q," *Laval Theologique et Philosophique* 33/34 (1977-78), 129-47; James M. Robinson, "Jesus as Sophos and Sophia: Wisdom Tradition and the Gospels," in *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. R. Wilken (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975), 1-16; Several scholars, such as R. Hamerton-Kelly, Jack T. Sanders, and Elisabeth S. Fiorenza, discussed the patterns of the theological subjects, such as preexistence, humiliation, and exaltation of Wisdom in its hymnic formulations in terms of a "high Christology." As discussed earlier, the implicit images and backgrounds of Wisdom are explicit in the Johannine Logos in relation to Christology. See Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973); Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background*, vol. 162 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).; Fiorenza, "Wisdom Mythology and the Christological Hymns of the New Testament," in *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. R. Wilken (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, c1975), 17-41.
[116] Mack, *Logos and Sophia*, 1-6. Cf. Epp. "Wisdom, Torah, Word: The Johannine Prologue and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel," 133-36.
[117] Witherington, 161-83, 384.
[118] Ibid., 205.
[119] See Witherington, 155, 382; Riesner, *Jesus Als Lehrer*, 392-94.

The exegetical practices of the personification or hypostatization of wisdom can already be found in the pre-Christian wisdom material, such as the earlier Jewish sapiential traditions like *Sirach* and *Wisdom of Solomon*, as examined earlier. In this sense, it is generally reasonable to assume that it is a symbolic identification and personification, which as in the earlier material, does not mean an actual historical and individual personification. However, in the Jesus tradition, in that Jesus presented himself as a Jewish prophetic sage who adopts a sapiential form of *meshalim* (e.g. aphorisms, parables), we can see that the images of Jesus are intertwined with an actual historical personification and hypostatization through a particular hermeneutic strategy.[124] As noted earlier, several passages in the Gospels, such as Mt 11:28-30, illuminate the sage-disciple relationship, and especially the image of Jesus as a sage who is personified embodiment of wisdom. In Jesus's attempt to identify his incarnated self with personified Wisdom as a sage in the Wisdom literature (e.g., Wis 10:9-10), a divine image (i.e., a God-like image) of Jesus is clear.[125] These parallels and interrelationships between Jesus and Wisdom as a sage reveal the divine or God-like images of Jesus, who is a *mashal* himself, and who reinterprets prophetically and eschatologically the divine message to His people for the Kingdom of God.[126]

---

[120] Gerhardsson, "The Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels," 339-63.
[121] Luke's author seems to conclude that Jesus was a teacher of wisdom who was tremendously marked by the possession and employment of wisdom, and he was the entity itself of Wisdom itself. See Witherington, 191.
[122] Lk 11:31: ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ὧδε. "For she came from the ends of the earth to listen to Solomon's wisdom, and now one greater than Solomon is here." Mt 11:19b: καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς. "But wisdom is proved right by her actions." It appears to be clear that Jesus saw himself as Wisdom and interpreted his mission in the light of the earlier Wisdom poems and hymns. Cf. Mt 12:42; Sir 24:7ff.
[123] Witherington, 384.
[124] Ibid., 159.

In view of Wisdom Christology, many scholars tried to discover in the divine images of Jesus a unique and unprecedented identification of Jesus as personified Wisdom in a female form, which conveys abstract qualities and images of God. This implies that early Jewish Christian thinkers created the sapiential Christological hymns, found in early Christian sources including the Gospels, which symbolically identify Jesus as personified Wisdom. It also demonstrates that, unlike an allegorical interpretation, Jesus's parables in the Synoptics allude to a symbolic strategy which expresses personified Wisdom's prophetic ability to reveal the truth and to reveal aspects of the character of God.[127] As previously discussed by Gerhardsson, despite the fact that the early Jewish and rabbinic parables and Jesus's narrative *meshalim* have features distinct from each other, the significant impact of narrative *meshalim* of personified Wisdom on the parables of Jesus is not compromised. Rather they provide a new perspective for considering the relationship between the Jewish wisdom material and Jesus's own appropriations of this material.[128] This further corroborates that the divine (or God-like) images of Jesus appear to be formulated through a process of "cross-fertilization" between various forms of personified Wisdom's speech, which address prophetic, apocalyptic, and salvific ideas and messages.[129]

---

[125] Wis10:9-10: σοφία δὲ τοὺς θεραπεύοντας αὐτὴν ἐκ πόνων ἐρρύσατο. 10 αὕτη φυγάδα ὀργῆς ἀδελφοῦ δίκαιον ὡδήγησεν ἐν τρίβοις εὐθείαις· ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ βασιλείαν θεοῦ καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ γνῶσιν ἁγίων· εὐπόρησεν αὐτὸν ἐν μόχθοις καὶ ἐπλήθυνεν τοὺς πόνους αὐτοῦ. "10 Wisdom rescued from troubles those who served her 11 When a righteous man fled from his brother's wrath, she guided him on straight paths; she showed him the kingdom of God, and gave him knowledge of angels [holy things]; she prospered him in his labors, and increased the fruit of his toil."(RSV) This illustrates that the role of Jesus is very similar to the role of Wisdom.

[126] Witherington, 202.

[127] Ibid., 159-60. Scholem, *Major Trends*, 27. Scholem notes that while allegory demonstrates logically "an expressible something by another expressible something," symbolism represents intuitively "something which lies beyond the sphere of expression and communication." I will discuss the comparison between allegory and symbolism in detail later in this study.

[128] Gerhardsson, "If We Do not Cut the Parables out of their Frames," 329-32.

[129] Witherington, 201, 384-5.

On the basis of these examinations, I will further try to prove a profound nexus between the images and activities of personified Wisdom and those of Incarnate Logos, i.e., Jesus in the Gospels in relation to other hypostatic notions of Torah. As examined above, in a long discourse in Prov 1:21-30 and 8:17 (cf. Job 11:6-7; Wis 6:4, 17-18, 22; Wis 9:9-10, 18), personified Wisdom provides answers to humans' questions regarding life, wisdom, divine will, and teachings of Torah. Clifford notes that personified Wisdom's instructions in Prov 8-9 are analogous to the "father-son" instructions elsewhere in the book of Proverbs.[130] In this vein, a father-like image of personified Wisdom appears in the teachings of wisdom against the gang of men in Prov 1 and 2 (e.g., Prov 1:8-19; Prov 2:12-15) and against the strange woman in Prov 2, 5, 6, 7 and 9 (e.g., Prov 2:16-19; 5:3-5, 20; 6:20-35; 7:5-27; 9:13-18).[131] Wisdom's father-like image is profoundly based on not only a divine-like image of Wisdom, as a hypostatic notion of Yahweh, but also implicitly a God-like image of Torah as a superior source of wisdom in Prov 1-9, as noted earlier.

These images (sage-like or father-like) and activities of personified Wisdom resemble those of Jesus who provides answers to humans' questions in long discourses in the Gospels, such as *Sermon on the Mount* in Mt 5-7.[132] In Jesus's speeches and discourses, we can find significant exegetical, semantic, and theological similarities to those of Widsom in Prov 1-9. Strikingly, the "I am" sayings of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel (e.g., Jn 6:35; Jn 14:6) have a similar character to those of the "I am" sayings of personified Wisdom in Proverbs and several other Wisdom texts.[133] Wisdom first calls (κηρύξεις, κηρύσσεται and παρεδρεύει) her people in Prov 1:20-21 and 8:1-4 (cf. Wis 6:16). In a similar manner, Jesus lets his disciples and his people follow, and come and see (ἤκουσαν, λέγει, and Ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε) what Jesus does in Jn 1:35-51; 9:35 (cf. Mt 4:18-20; Mk 1:14-20, Lk 5:1-11). These verses imply that Jesus also calls his people. Just as Wisdom raises her voice and cries out (θαρροῦσα λέγει, and ὑμνεῖται) in public places in Prov 1:20-21 and 8:1-4, so too Jesus cries out (ἔκραξεν) in a public place in Jn 7:28, 37 and 12:44 (cf. Mt 21:46). Wisdom calls the audience her children (υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπω and υἱέ) in Prov 8:31-32 (cf. Sir 4:11; 6:18), like Jesus, who seems to acknowledge his disciples as children (τέκνα θεοῦ and τεκνία) in Jn 1:12 and 13:33. The attitudes of personified Wisdom and Jesus to their audiences demonstrate an intimate relationship, like a father-child or teacher-student relationship, and these attitudes concretize the intimacy between God and His people through the medium of the teachings and images of Torah. In addition, Wisdom gives a warning about the coming future in Prov 1:15-19 and Prov 8:36; 9:12,18,[134] and asks the people for repentance, just as Jesus asks them for repentance in Mt 3:2; Mk 6:12; Lk 5:32; 15:7, or for the dwelling or return to the loving word of God in Jn 15:4-10. Furthermore, personified Wisdom in Prov

---

[130] Clifford, "Proverbs 1-9 as Instruction for a Young Man and for 'Everyman,'" 131-5. Personified Wisdom in Prov 8-9 also appears as a "parent (father or mother)," who urges mankind as "sons" to listen to her teaching and to seek wisdom, while inviting them to her house as disciples. Clifford emphasizes that the analogical approach can preserve both a literal and symbolic meaning while not separating the parent's instructions from the teachings of personified Wisdom in Prov 8. See ibid., 131-41. Analogy is defined as "a comparison between the two things, typically their structure and for the purpose of explanation or clarification." See Angus Stevenson, and Christine A. Lindberg, eds., *New Oxford American Dictionary,* 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 55. For Fox, the teachings of personified Wisdom reflect an inner-worldly dimension in an allegorical sense. See Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 276, 293.

[131] Ibid., 136-41. Clifford notes that the "father-son" instructions are extended to the youth, and a general audience in the future.

[132] The images and beatitudes of Jesus, who ascends on the Mount and gives a new teaching of the Law, appear to be profoundly related to the images and activities of Moses who ascends to receive the Law unto Mt. Sinai. Cf. William F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew* (Anchor Bible; Garden City, NY: Doubleday &, 1971), 65-72.

---

[133] There is a significant hint that "I am" sayings of Jesus are indebted to "I am" discourse of Wisdom in Wisdom materials. The "I am" discourse recalls a critical feature of the speeches of Wisdom. Some examples of the "I am" discourse of wisdom include: Prov 8:12, אֲנִי־חָכְמָה (BHS), ἐγὼ ἡ σοφία (LXX) "I am Wisdom"; Sir, 24:17 ἐγὼ ὡς ἄμπελος ἐβλάστησα χάριν "I am like a vine putting out graceful shoots," The evidence directly relates to the influence of sapiental material on the Fourth Gospel. While not an "I am" discourse, another important passage is Wis 7:26: ἀπαύγασμα γάρ ἐστιν φωτὸς ἀιδίου καὶ ἔσοπτρον ἀκηλίδωτον τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνεργείας καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ. "She is a reflection of eternal light, untarnished mirror of God's active power, image of his goodness." In a similar manner, in the Fourth Gospel, the "I am" (*ego eimi*) sayings of Jesus are characterized variously as living bread, light, the gate, life, the true vine, and so on.

Jn 6:35 Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς "I am the bread of life."; 51 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν "I am the living bread" (NIV)
8:12 Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου "I am the light of the world."
10:7 ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων "I am the gate for the sheep." ;9 ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα "I am the gate";
11,14 Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός "I am the good shepherd.";
11:25 Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή "I am the resurrection and the life."
12:46 ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα, "I am a light comes into the world"
14:6 Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή "I am the way and the truth and the life."
15:1 Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινὴ "I am the true vine"; 5 ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος "I am the vine"

[134] Jesus even prophesies the apocalyptic events in detail in Mt 24, Mk 13 and Lk 21.

8:17 tests her people or disciples until they love her, just as Jesus sanctifies his children with his word, love and truth in Jn 13:3-17; 15:1-17; 16:27; 17:17.[135] Due to her speeches about truth, Wisdom is rejected in Prov 1:24-25. Similarly, Jesus is rejected in Jn 8:46, 59; 10:25 (cf. Mt 13:53-58; Mk 6:3; Lk 4:24 29; 14:34).[136] In all, the images and activities of personified Wisdom in Prov 8 as a sage or teacher of Torah, have clear analogs in the images and activities of Jesus as a sage or teacher in the Gospels. This close relationship between the images of Jesus and of Wisdom substantiates that the God-like image of Jesus is related to to the God-like images of personified Wisdom and Torah.

In addition, as examined above, the similarities between the images and activities of personified Wisdom in a banquet, as described in Proverbs and *Sirach* substantiate the relationships of the images and activities of personified Wisdom to those of Jesus in the Gospels. It is instructive to recall the exegetical and semantic relationships between the personified Wisdom figures in Prov 8:22-31 and 9, as examined earlier. The image of Wisdom building a house in Prov 9:1 conveys a significant meaning and connection with the God-like images and activities of personified Wisdom in Prov 8. The main goals of the activities of personified Wisdom and Jesus are profoundly connected to sharing a banquet or festival in the house, which needs guests who enjoy the joyful and glorious banquet by eating (meat or bread) and drinking (wine or water). Woman Wisdom in Prov 9 invites people to eat meat and drink wine in her lavish banquet; whereas Woman Folly offers a poor banquet with bread and water.[137] In a manner similar to Woman Wisdom, Jesus symbolizes himself as “bread” (e.g., Jn 6:35) and “water” (e.g., Jn 4:13-14) in regard to giving life and salvation.[138] Jesus also invites his disciples to eat bread as his body and to drink wine as his blood in the Last Supper (e.g., Mt 26:26-28; Lk 22:7-38; Mk 14:12-26).[139] Lenzi argues that the words אהיה שלחני, and שם אני in Prov 8: 22-31 implicitly allude to a “master” image of personified Wisdom, which is directly related to the image of Yahweh, who sends prophet-like messengers in an immediate context in Ex 3:14 and Isa 48:16.[140] In this similar manner, Woman Wisdom in Prov 9 appears as a “master” image, who actively sends maidens to invite and welcome guests to her banquet. This is comparable to the wedding banquet in Jesus’s parable of the Kingdom of God, in which a king sends his servants to invite his people (Mt

---

[135] Prov 8:17 ἐγὼ τοὺς ἐμὲ φιλοῦντας ἀγαπῶ, οἱ δὲ ἐμὲ ζητοῦντες εὑρήσουσιν “I love those who love me, and those who seek me find me.” In Jn 15:15: οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους, ὅτι ὁ δοῦλος οὐκ οἶδεν τί ποιεῖ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος· ὑμᾶς δὲ εἴρηκα φίλους, ὅτι πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν “No longer do I call you servants, for the servant does not know what his master is doing; but I have called you friends, for all that I have heard from my Father I have made known to you”; Jn 16:27: αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐμὲ πεφιλήκατε καὶ πεπιστεύκατε ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ [τοῦ] θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον “for the Father himself loves you, because you have loved me and have believed that I came from God.”

A manner similar to the activities of personified Wisdom and Jesus can be gleaned from the late sapiential materials, such as *Sirach* and the *Wisdom of Solomon*. See the English translations in Susan Cady, *Wisdom's Feast: Sophia in Study and Celebration* eds. Marian Ronan, and Hal Taussig (Kansas City, MO: Sheed & Ward, 1996), 202-8. Sir 4:12: ὁ ἀγαπῶν αὐτὴν ἀγαπᾷ ζωήν, καὶ οἱ ὀρθρίζοντες πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐμπλησθήσονται εὐφροσύνης “Woever loves her loves life” (208). Sir 6:20-22: “20 ὡς τραχεῖά ἐστιν σφόδρα τοῖς ἀπαιδεύτοις, καὶ οὐκ ἐμμενεῖ ἐν αὐτῇ ἀκάρδιος· 21 ὡς λίθος δοκιμασίας ἰσχυρὸς ἔσται ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ, καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ ἀπορρῖψαι αὐτήν 22 σοφία γὰρ κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς ἐστιν καὶ οὐ πολλοῖς ἐστιν φανερά. “How very harsh she is to the undisciplined! The senseless man does not stay with her for long: 21 she will weigh on him like a heavy stone, and he will lose no time in throwing her off; 22 for discipline is true to her name” (202). Wis 6:17: ἀρχὴ γὰρ αὐτῆς ἡ ἀληθεστάτη παιδείας ἐπιθυμία, φροντὶς δὲ παιδείας ἀγάπη, 18 ἀγάπη δὲ τήρησις νόμων αὐτῆς, προσοχὴ δὲ νόμων βεβαίωσις ἀφθαρσίας “Of her the most sure beginning is the desire for discipline, care for discipline means loving her” (202).Wis 7:14: ἀνεκλιπὴς γὰρ θησαυρός ἐστιν ἀνθρώποις, ὃν οἱ κτησάμενοι πρὸς θεὸν ἐστείλαντο φιλίαν διὰ τὰς ἐκ παιδείας δωρεὰς συσταθέντες. “For she is an inexhaustible treasure to men, and those who acquire it win God’s friendship, commended as they are to him by the benefits of her teaching” (202).

[136] Prov 1:24 ἐπειδὴ ἐκάλουν καὶ οὐχ ὑπηκούσατε καὶ ἐξέτεινον λόγους καὶ οὐ προσείχετε, 25 ἀλλὰ ἀκύρους ἐποιεῖτε ἐμὰς βουλάς, τοῖς δὲ ἐμοῖς ἐλέγχοις ἠπειθήσατε, “Because I have called and you refused to listen, have stretched out my hand and no one has heeded,”; Jn 8:46 τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας; εἰ ἀλήθειαν λέγω, διὰ τί ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετέ μοι; “Which one of you convicts me of sin? If I tell the truth, why do you not believe me?”; Jn 10:25 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε· τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρός μου ταῦτα μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ. “Jesus answered them, “I told you, and you do not believe. The works that I do in my Father's name bear witness about me.”

---

[137] However, Woman Folly sitting on the sidewalk lures foolish pedestrians with false claims by giving bread and water, and by attracting them to fall into a deadly sin.

[138] Jn 6:35 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς· ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ διψήσει πώποτε “Then Jesus declared, "I am the bread of life. He who comes to me will never go hungry, and he who believes in me will never be thirsty.” (cf. Sir 24:19: προσέλθετε πρός με “come to me.” Prov 9:4: ἐκκλινάτω πρός με “Let all who are simple come to my house!” (NIV); a water of life: Jn 4:13-14, 13 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Πᾶς ὁ πίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου διψήσει πάλιν 14 ὃς δ᾽ ἂν πίῃ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος οὗ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ διψήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἁλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Jesus answered, “Everyone who drinks this water will be thirsty again, but whoever drinks the water I give him will never thirst. Indeed, the water I give him will become in him a spring of water welling up to eternal life.” (NIV)

[139] The significant allusions to his body and blood as a bread and wine are as follows.

Mt 26:26-28	26 λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον, Λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 27 λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν 28 τὸ αἷμά μου, ἁμαρτιῶν.
Mk 14: 22-24	22 λαβὼν ἄρτον, Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 23 λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, 24 τὸ αἷμά μου
Lk 22:19-20	19λαβὼν ἄρτον Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου 20 αἵματί μου

[140] Lenzi, “Proverbs 8:22-31,” 711-4. It is notable that there is a textual nexus between אהיה “I am” in Prov 8:22-31 and “I am Who I am” in Exod 3:14. Cf. Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 288.

22:1-14). The texts connected to Jesus's Last Supper (Jn 13:1-32) in the Fourth Gospel, in contrast to the Synoptics, do not overtly mention the eucharistic contents of the remembrance of Jesus' body and blood. However, in Jn 6:41-58, Jesus explicitly asserts his "flesh and blood" as the true food and drink.[141] The "flesh and blood" of Incarnate Logos, i.e., Jesus, alludes to the expression of "food and drink" in the account of personified Wisdom.[142] As previously noted, the image of Jesus inviting his disciples and people to his Last Supper is reminiscent of the image of Woman Wisdom's invitation in Prov 9.[143] Even if Jesus did not provide meat as Wisdom did, Jesus mentions that the bread (cf. מַצּוֹת in Ex 12:15) is his flesh. Jesus's statement also reminds us of the regulations about "the unleavened bread" and "the blood of the lambs" in Passover in Ex 12:6-15. Moreover, Jesus is the "Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" (Jn 1:29). The symbolism of bread and wine appears to be enough to remind the audience of Jesus's sacrifice of his flesh and blood for his people's sins. The symbolic connotations of the meat and wine of personified Wisdom are vividly associated not only with Jesus's sacrifice and the suffering of his flesh and blood on the cross but also with what Jesus gave his guests and people through his sacrifice: life, truth, and wisdom. The sacrifice of Jesus giving his body (flesh) and blood as bread and wine endows Jesus with the image of savior and the Lord providing life and wisdom.

Furthermore, Jesus in Lk 11:49 controversially appears to identify himself as personified Wisdom, who is a wise sage knowledgeable of the Torah. Jesus speaks of ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ "the Wisdom of God," as he says, "For this reason also the Wisdom of God said, 'I will send to them prophets and apostles, and some of them they will kill and some they will persecute.'" In Lk 7:35, Jesus also refers directly to the Wisdom of God: καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς "Yet Wisdom is vindicated by all her children." In Mt 11:19b, we read, "Wisdom is justified by her deeds." Regarding the parable of the children playing in the market place, Marion J. Suggs explains that the "men of this generation" are like spoiled children, and John and even Jesus are Wisdom's children.[144] However, a direct relationship between personified Wisdom and Jesus is still controversial to prove by textual evidence. Nonetheless, it becomes clear that wisdom in the verses in Mt 11:19 and Lk 7:35, appears not only as a property of Jesus, which is proven by his deeds and miracles, but also a property of God, i.e., a divine wisdom or even God Himself as it appears as a subject of "deeds," with personality.[145] By referring to "children," as in Lk 7:35, the image of wisdom more clearly appears similar to the father-like or divine-like images of personified Wisdom who teaches "children" in Prov 8:31-32. In Mt 12:42 and 23:34, Jesus also alludes to the images and activities of Wisdom who sent prophets and apostles, while implying a self-recognition that his wisdom is greater than Solomon's wisdom and is the Wisdom of God Himself.[146] These strikingly similar images and activities of two figures provides critical implications for their theological and phenomenological relationships regarding the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah.

---

[141] The rhetorical analogy of "food and drink" and "flesh and blood" also appears to be terminologically, phraseologically, and theologically developed in the Gospel of John and in even early Jewish sources, e.g., Prov 9, Sir 1:1-4; 15:3; 24:8, 19-21; 32:1-13, as well as Wis 9:1-2, 4. These passages in *Sirach* and the *Wisdom of Solomon* are related to a concept of eating and drinking in relation to personified Wisdom, which provides the righteous with ἄρτον συνέσεως "bread of understanding" and ὕδωρ σοφίας "water of wisdom" in a banquet. In this sense, the character of banquet is also linked to an imagery of eating and drinking. A motif of eating and drinking in relation to activities in the ministry of Jesus as the personified Logos in the Prologue, seems to provide significant evidence of the relationship to personified Wisdom.

[142] Clifford, in *Proverbs*, 32, observes, "Jesus speaks in long discourses", and "Jesus recruits disciples" and "gives the bread [and wine] of life" in a similar form to that of Woman Wisdom. Cf. Brown, *The Gospel of John*, 32.

[143] Jesus however promises, "never thirst again," while personified Wisdom in Sir 4:19-21 alludes to the repetition of their thirsts. See Keener, 1:682.

Prov 9 is critical for understanding the core message of these passages in the Gospels. By making the contrastive parallel between Woman Wisdom and Woman Folly, Wisdom's ultimate purpose is to invite the gullible and foolish to her banquet and to give them wisdom and life. The ultimate aim of her banquet is to give life itself and instruct in the way of life in contrast to Woman Folly's way of death. The images and activities of personified Wisdom, who tries to invite the gullible and foolish to her banquet, are parallel to the images of Jesus, who invites not only his disciples but also the gullible, such as the “gluttonous man and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners” (Lk 7:34).[147] The expression regarding the hidden efforts and wise activities of Wisdom to lead people to the way of light, truth and life, in Lk 7:35, alludes to a similar motif concerning the hidden efforts and wise activities of Jesus. It allows us to infer that his guests who finally will become his children will also vindicate Jesus’s activities and accomplishments. Interestingly, the images of activities of Jesus as a master sending servants (or maidens) to invite people in Lk 14:15-21 show particular semantic similarities to the images of the Woman Wisdom as a mistress in Prov 9:3.[148] The descriptions of Jesus as a master (or Lord) in a banquet can be similarly found, albeit in different words, in several passages in the NT, such as Mt 22:1-14, where Jesus is depicted as a master or Lord, and the image of a banquet or wedding feast as an emblem of the Kingdom of God is often used.[149]

---

[144] Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel*, 35; Mack, *The Christ and Jewish Wisdom*, 211-12. As Mack notes, "The shift in characterization from Jesus as sage (early layer Q) to Jesus as prophet (later layer Q) can be understood as an exercise in wisdom mythology" (212). This connection between the images of Jesus as a child of wisdom and as a prophet of wisdom also appears to be aligned with the conception of Jesus as the Son of God.

[145] William F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Mathew*, 139-40.

[146] Suggs (39) connects it to the context in Wis 7:27: "In every generation she passes into holy souls and makes them friends of God, and prophets," while explaining "the idea of Wisdom's persistent quest for men by means of her envoys."

In all, the images and activities of personified Wisdom in Proverbs 1, 8, and 9, as an adult teacher or a sage or as a master in a banquet, are directly connected with those images and activities of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels. These intertextual and theological relationships between the activities of personified Wisdom and Jesus substantiate not only their semantic similarities but also their shared images as a sage (or teacher) teaching the Torah or a master (or Lord) of the secrets of Torah. The personification and hypostatization of the mystical concept of wisdom, as examined earlier, provides a critical insight into the symbolization and mythologization of the image of Torah as God-like.

---

[147] Lk 7:34: ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε, Ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. “The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and you say, 'Here is a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners’.”

[148] ἀπέστειλεν τοὺς ἑαυτῆς δούλους in Prov 9:3: “She has sent out her maids” (NIV); ἀπέστειλεν τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ δείπνου εἰπεῖν τοῖς κεκλημένοις in Lk 14:17: “He sent his servant to tell those who had been invited; Prov 9:5 φάγετε τῶν ἐμῶν ἄρτων “Come, eat my food.”; Μακάριος ὅστις φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ in Lk 14:15: Jesus said, “Blessed is one who who will eat at the feast in the kingdom of God!” In addition, like Jesus in Lk 14:19-21, Woman Wisdom warns of the foolish responses to and decisions regarding the temptations of Woman Folly (Prov 9:17-18).

[149] Mt 22:4 (NIV): “Tell those who have been invited that I have prepared my dinner; my oxen and my fattened cattle have been butchered and everything is ready; come to the wedding banquet.’”

Consequently, this examination shows that the images of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels appear to be similar to the God-like images and activities of personified Wisdom as a sage or a master, which symbolically represent the specific actions and images of God and are centered around the God-like image of Torah. This also corroborates a profound relationship between the images and activities of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, and *shekhinah* which all authenticate the existence of the God-like image of Torah. In particular, it shows that the formulation of the God-like image of the hypostatic notions of Torah is grounded in mythic and anthropomorphic imaginations, which utilize the images and symbols of wisdom, which are manifest in early Jewish and Christian literature. It also provides some critical implications not only for the conceptual development of Jewish Wisdom, as a pattern and mode of thinking—that is a model—which was prevalent throughout early Judaism and Christianity, but also with regard to an implicit nexus between Christology and Jewish wisdom mythology.

In summary, this investigation demonstrates not only the developmental process and profound interactions between the Greek Logos-centered tradition and the Jewish Wisdom-centered tradition but also the existence of a specific literary and exegetical strategy that formulates the roles and images of Torah. The angelic image of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, and the *memra*, appears to be related to a mediator between God and human beings, based in a Logos-centered tradition. In contrast to the son-like and angelic images of personified Wisdom (אָמוֹן) in the Logos-centered tradition, the images of personified Wisdom, Jesus in the Synoptics, and *shekhinah* in the Wisdom-centered tradition appear close to a God-like being or divine entity, based on the mystical conception of Torah.

There is thus a critical difference between the angelic and God-like images of Torah. The angelic images of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah appear as visualized mediator, whereas the God-like images of the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah appear as seemingly God Himself without a mediator or, at most, as a hidden mediator mythologized and symbolized in the mythic and anthropomorphic descriptions, as noted earlier. Significantly, this substantiates the existence of a particular literary and hermeneutic strategy, which creates and formulates the images of Torah, and thereby explains an intimate relationship between the hypostatic notions of Torah and God, and, furthermore, as we see further, expresses a religious experience through the hypostatic notions of Torah as a mediator which connects human beings and God.

A Messianic Image of the Hypostatic Notions of Torah

Like the angelic and God-like images of Torah, the formulation of a messianic image of Torah is grounded in the messianic concepts implicitly manifest in the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah*. As I will show, the messianic concepts and images of Torah are profoundly intertwined with the angelic and God-like images of Torah that I examined earlier. To the end, I will examine in detail the explicit and implicit manifestations of a messianic image of Torah in relation to the angelic and God-like images of Torah within the two categories: Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah.

A Messianic Image related to an Angelic Image of Torah

I begin with a messianic image connected to the angelic image of Torah, which can be found in the images of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, and *memra*. Intriguingly, the son-like and angelic images of personified Wisdom, in the interpretations of אָמוֹן in Prov 8:22-31, which we examined earlier, also appear as messianic images in salvific roles as divine agents for God's works in the creation.[150] In particular, we have seen that he son-like and angelic images of personified Wisdom are profoundly related not only to the "first born" or "elder son" image of Philo's Logos in relation to the Image of God but also to the

---

[150] Sinnott, 161-2. The figure of the king (Wis 1:1; 6:10) is also imaginatively related to the righteous ones (Wis 3:8; 4:16; 5:1-2).

"king" image, which allegorically conceptualizes a messianic image of the Logos.[151] In the Hebrew Bible, the son-like and kingly images are clearly connected to messianic ones. For example, David—a proto-messianic figure—is described as the "firstborn" or "the highest of the kings" promised by God in Ps 89:27.[152] It is worth noting that scholarship on Mesopotamian and Egyptian religions has shown that the "image of God" typically appears in kingly images in the Assyro-Babylonian religion and thought, and the son-like divine images, which symbolize a divinization of the king as a "son" of God, explicitly appear in the Egyptian religion and thought.[153]

It is remarkable that the application of the term "son" of God to the Messiah in early Jewish sources chiefly appears to be connected to the status and image of a "king" who descended from the physical Davidic line.[154] In addition, we can see various messianic figures and their son-like images in the Second Temple Jewish sources and Rabbinic literature, including the Talmud and Midrash, as well as in early Christianity.[155] In Rabbinic and Targumic literature, such as b. *Sukk.* 52a, the image of David is in detail described as an ideal messianic figure who combines the images of "son" of God and "king" in Ps 2:7-8.[156] The Greek term πρωτόγονον, which means "firstborn," is apparently related to the images of Philo's Logos, which politically speaking, appears as a "king," and, intellectually or religiously speaking, as a "son" of God.[157] Philo, in his interpretations of Num 24:7 in *Praem.* xvi, 95-97, creates a messianic figure by assimilating his conception of the Logos with the biblical concept of the messianic figure as the "firstborn or son" and "king."[158] The kingly images of Philo's Logos (e.g., *Leg.* II. xxi, 86) appear to profoundly symbolize the authority and powers (i.e., spiritual and immaterial entities) of God as they are revealed in the images of Torah and personified Wisdom (e.g., Wis 7:25).[159] In this regard, Philo explains that the "son" and "king" images ultimately echo a messianic role of the Logos by expounding the descriptions which allude to the personal Messiah of the prophecy of Isaiah (Isa 11:1-10).[160] As Wolfson points out, Philo's messianic figure does not reflect a historical or personal character who placates the expectation of a militant Messiah, even though, in the "native" Jewish tradition, the messianic figure implies exactly that—a political and nationalistic figure.[161] Nonetheless, the description of the messianic figure in *Praem.* xiv, 79-84 is not just an abstract philosophical concept related to the Stoic Logos but appears close to a Judaized messianic figure who conveys the ultimate purpose of the Logos in relation to the Torah.[162] As Goodenough notes, Philo's messianic conception of the Logos appears to be profoundly involved with a historical and political context, which explains the apocalyptic and eschatological features.[163]

---

[151] Fox, "'Amon again," 699-702. Cf. 1 Kgs 10:1, 5; Esth 2:7; Num 11:12; Isa 49:23; Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 285-88; Aitken, "Proverbs," 82.

[152] Borgen, *The Philo Index*, 303. In Christianity, Jesus allegedly appears as a symbolic and figurative firstborn like Isaac in Gen 22 instead of Ishmael and like Jacob in Gen 25, 27 instead of Esau in light of the Hebrew Bible.

[153] Jean G. Heintz, "Royal Traits and Messianic Figures: A Thematic and Iconographical Approach," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 52-66.

[154] James M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4.1* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 53-57; George Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985). The language of sonship, in 4Q174 1-3 1:10-12, appears to be applied to the king expected at the end of times. There are also some allusions in these biblical texts to the divine sonship of the king: 1 Chr 28:9-10; 2 Chr 7:17-20; the royal Psalms (e.g., Ps 2, Ps 110), 2 Sam 7:14, which is repeated in 1 Chr 17:13-14 and 22:10-11, and clearly evoked in Ps 89:27-30 in relation to the dynastic oracle of Nathan in 4Q504 (=4QDibHam^2) 1-2 4:6-8. In addition, the mythological languages of the royal Psalms (Ps 2, Ps 110) provide the textual basis for the development of the messianic idea at the end of times at Qumran.

[155] Craig A. Evans, "Messianic Hopes and Messianic Figures in Late Antiquity," *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 3 (2006): 9-10.

[156] There is a midrash interpretation of Messiah ben Yosef (Zech 12: 10-12) who was killed by Gentiles in *Gen. Rab*. 44, and Messiah ben David (Ps 2: 7-8) who receives eternal life (Ps 21: 4).

In this context, Wolfson and Hengel show that Philo strategically esotericizes the messianic concept of the Logos in order to solve a tension between a present political condition and an eschatological ideal.[164] For instance, Philo integrates a messianic prophecy about the "man" (in *Mos.*

---

[157] Ibid.
[158] See Philo, *Opif.* xxvi, 79-81; *Conf.* xiv, 62-63. Philo connects the images of a "man" to the images of "His first-born" as a messianic figure who is related to the Logos.
[159] Compare Philo, *Leg*. II. xxi, 86. ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν, ἣν ἄκραν καὶ πρωτίστην ἔτεμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεων to Wis 7:25 ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστιν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως.
[160] Wolfson, *Philo*, 1:415-7.
[161] Ibid., 2:407, 413-4.
[162] Philo, *Praem*. xiv, 79-84; *Leg.* I. xix, 65.
[163] Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938), 25. For Goodenough, the messianic figure appears close to a pre-Christian figure who accomplishes a covenantal realization.
[164] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:395; Martin Hengel, "Messainische Hoffnung und politischer 'Radikalismus' in der judisch-hellistischen Diaspora: Zur Frage der Voraussetzungen des judisch-hellistischen Diaspora: Zur Frage der Voraussetzungen des judischen Aufstanders unter Trajan" 115-17 n. Chr., in *Apocalypticism in the Medieterranean World and the Near East*, ed. D. Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 679-83.

II. i-vii, 1-44) who echoes the features of the personal Messiah into the Jewish eschatological ideal and, in doing so, relates it to the centralization of the Mosaic Law, i.e., the Torah.[165] In *Leg.* I. viii, 19-20, Philo directly identifies the Logos with the Torah, i.e., the Laws of Moses (i.e., divine commandments).[166] Philo's descriptions of the personal Messiah are eventually connected to the perfect activities of the Logos (in *Somn.* xi, 64-67), which is identified with the Word of God, i.e., divine Torah.[167] As noted earlier, it becomes evident that Philo dealt with biblical and rabbinic (or Jewish traditional) discussions through the Logos-centered (i.e., middle-Platonic) tradition. In all, this examination shows that Philo's Logos plays a critical role not only as an allegorized designator for those who understood the Law of Moses to affirm the biblical and rabbinic visions of messianism, but also as an allegorized mediator who accomplishes an ideal state governed by Stoic ideas and the teachings of the Torah.[168] This demonstrates that Philo's Logos appears as a new messianic image, which conceptually combines a "son-like" figure (which alludes to an angelic mediator as examined earlier), a messianic concept and figure, and the Torah, and thereby create a messianic image of Torah that conveys an intellectual deliverance, and has salvific and eschatological implications.

On the basis of this examination, it is imperative to note that the messianic image of Philo's Logos, which appears close to a son-like and angelic image of Torah, is primarily related to the son-like and angelic images of personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31.[169] As noted earlier, the "firstborn" image of Philo's Logos appears very similar to the particular image of a pre-existent Logos-Son of the Johannine Logos (Jn 1:1-18) who accompanied God the Father.[170] In addition, we can see critical references to a messianic image of Jesus in the Synoptics, such as a direct messianic genealogy of Jesus as the "firstborn" (πρωτότοκος) of the Virgin Mary (cf. Mt 1:25; Lk 2:7), and an indirect messianic description, which contains both son-like and kingly images and which mention the Son of God and the Kingdom of God (e.g., Lk 7:31-35; Mt 11:16-20; 25-30).[171] The son-like and angelic images of Jesus, e.g., "the Son of God" (Jn 12:34; 11:27; 20:31) and "the Son of Man" (Jn 12:34), have both an angelic (i.e., heavenly agent) and messianic (i.e., salvific and eschatological) implication of giving "eternal life" (Jn 5:21-40) in a manner similar to the messianic images of Philo's Logos. Furthermore, the biblical and rabbinic concept of *memra* has a salvific message of the Word of God, as examined earlier, involves the salvation of Israel (e.g., 1 Sam 3:21; Isa 45:17), and is correlated to the "savior" image of personified Wisdom and Incarnate Jesus in connection to a messianic image of Torah.[172] This examination shows the formative process of a messianic (i.e., salvific) image of the hypostatic notions which appears close to an angelic image of Torah. This substantiates the profound intertextual, exegetical, and theological relationships between the messianic ideas and images of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, and *memra*, which are manifest in early Jewish and Christian sources.

---

[165] Géza Vermès, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*, 2nd Rev. ed. (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 159-60.

[166] Wolfson, *Philo,* 1:255-58. 287 ff. As noted earlier, Philo's allegorization of the Laws of Moses to the Logos, which is based on personified Wisdom, provides a critical insight into the personification and hypostatization of the Word of God (*memra*) and *shekhinah*.

[167] Goodenough, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus*, 115-9.

[168] Philo, *Praem*, xxix, 169-171.

[169] Hurowitz, "Nursling, Advisor, Architect?," 398-99. Hurowitz also analyzes the connotations of a son-like or royal imagery of personified Wisdom in the poetic context.

[170] Dunn, *The Parting of the Ways*, 220-29; Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, 78-83; Charles H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 69-71, 73, 278, 285. As Dodd acknowledges, despite the striking differences, both Philo's Logos and the Johannine Logos appear to

More interestingly, we can find a relationship and interaction between the messianic ideas and images of the hypostatic notions of Torah with the messianic figures in the Dead Sea Scrolls. After the discovery in Qumran in 1947, many scholars attempted to examine the intertextual and

---

be derived from personified (or divine) Wisdom in creation under Hellenistic Jewish thought, and reflect the influence of Philo's Logos on the Johannine Logos.

[171] L. Michael White, in *Scripting Jesus: The Gospels in Rewrite,* 1st ed. (New York: HarperOne, 2010), 317, points out, "The Jesus of the Gospel of Matthew is understood as the apocalyptic Messiah form the line of David." The title "Son of God" facilitates a peculiar relation between the Messiah and God in traditional Jewish ways in Mathew and John, whereas the title "Son of God" appears not to dramatically function in Mark. Despite these witnesses, the relationship between them and the Son of God is still ambiguous and suspicious in the Gospels since the title "Son of God" is limitedly used to refer to the Messiah. See Wis 3:1-3: "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and no torment will ever touch them. They seemed, in the eyes of the foolish, they seemed to have died…. But they are at peace."

[172] As examined earlier, the concept of *memra* in Aramaic is connected to the depiction of the Word of God as an extension of Himself in the Hebrew Bible. The translations of Gen 1:1-3, 2:3 in *Tg. Neof.* imply that the *memra* is not just a being, which is a distinct essence apart from God, but a being which is with God and acting as God. This corroborates that the *memra* is not only the revelation of God's presence in the Hebrew Bible but is also the anticipated divine Word of the Lord in Jewish thought, well-known throughout the Targums.

theological relationships between the messianic and eschatological aspects of Philo's works, the Qumran texts, and the NT, including the Gospels. As James H. Charlesworth argues, referring to the notes of Philo and Josephus, the Qumran texts appear to be the work of the extremely conservative branch of the two supposed branches of Essenes, who enthusiastically held messianic and eschatological hope for a restoration of God's covenant in accordance with biblical prophecies.[173] The Qumran texts provide critical insights into not only the historical and ideological backgrounds of the times of Jesus, early Christianity, and multi-faceted Judaism, but also the messianic ideas of early Jewish and Christian sources.[174] Hengel compares and analyzes numerous linguistic and theological parallels between the Qumran texts and the Gospel of John, such as ideological and eschatological themes (e.g., dualism, predestination, and messianism), which reflect the historical and theological contexts of the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.[175]

The relationship between the Johannine and Qumran communities, which was deliberated upon by many scholars from different angles and perspectives, is primarily based on the chronological proximity of the closing period of the Qumran community with the starting period of the early Christian communities. Shemaryahu Talmon notes that "The Qumran scrolls reflect the creedal concepts of a group of Jewish extremists who propounded a millenarian messianism."[176] He argues that the Qumran community was an organized separate society and envisioned an organized form of community roles. The Johannine community, by contrast, was not a socially homogeneous group defined by clear criteria of status, but an organized movement of disciples around a master and guide, which oriented itself towards the surrounding hostile world through the announcement of the message of Gospel.[177] Still, despite differences in the communal organization of the two groups, their closely related historical and ideological backgrounds led to messianic and eschatological affinities.

---

[173] Charlesworth, "The Fourth Evangelist," 161. The eschatological and messianic concepts of the Qumran texts appear to be fundamentally driven by the expectation of a covenantal restoration in a specific social and religious context.

[174] Ibid., 161-63. Some scholars, after the recovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, attempted to discover linguistic and theological parallels between the Gospel of John and the Qumran texts, while excluding external influences, i.e., the influences of multi-faceted (Palestinian, Hellenistic, and Rabbinic) Judaism on the Johannine Logos. However, the evidence from the Scrolls still does not seem to elucidate entirely the backgrounds of the Johannine Logos, even if these examinations give a critical insight into the study of the Johannine community. In this context, it is desirable to reexamine the theological and philosophical backgrounds, and the compositional and exegetical intentions of the author of the Johannine Prologue in the Johannine community in addition to examining the role of Palestinian Judaism in the formation of the Johannine context.

[175] Hengel, *The Johannine Question*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1989), 111, 281.

[176] Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Concepts of Masiah and Messianism in Early Judaism," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* ed. James H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 101.

Against this theoretical background, we can infer that the son-like, angelic, and messianic images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, and the Johannine Logos (i.e., Jesus), appear to be profoundly associated with the son-like and kingly images of a divine sonship related to the messianic figures in the Qumran texts.[178] Indeed, we can first see numerous cases in which "son" and "king" images are related to a messianic figure in the Qumran texts.[179] As noted earlier, the messianic implications of Ps 89:27-30 are developed in the Qumran texts. These include a "son" image as the "first born" (בכור), "the beloved" (לידיד in line 1, and הידיד in line 2) in 4Q458 1, and a "king" image as "anointed with the oil of kingship" (משיח בשמן מלכות) in 4Q458 2 ii 6, which explicitly refers to the kingly or royal Messiah.[180] The examples of the messianic figures in the Qumran texts (e.g., 1QSa), are clearly linked to an "anointed" messianic figure, that is the Davidic King-Messiah. As Tryggve N. D. Mettinger explains, the Davidic King-Messiah, who is described as both a "king" (i.e., divine kingship) and a "son" of God (i.e., divine sonship) in Ps 2 and 110, and in the Davidic covenant in Ps 89 (e.g., 4Q Ps 89), refers to an angelic being who is the Image of God i.e., The First Man (*Urmensch*).[181] The conception of divine sonship also appears in the description of the "anointed" i.e., messianic figure in 1QSa 2:11-14 of *the Rule of the Congregation*, who is "begotten" by God within the community.[182] It is worth noting that the divine sonship ascribed to the children of Israel as a whole in the Qumran texts is an intensification of the covenantal context in the Hebrew Bible. The divine sonship also conveys a "king" image in Rabbinic literature, and is explicitly related to a "king" image of the personal Messiah in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, such as *Enoch* and *IV Esdras*.[183]

---

[177] Destro Adriana, and Mauro Pesce, "The Gospel of John and the *Community Rule* of Qumran: A Comparison of Systems," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, vol. 2: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds., Alan J. Avery-Peck, Jacob Neusner, and Bruce D. Chilton (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 219-20.

[178] Brendan Byrne, *'Sons of God'-'Seed of Abraham'-A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of all Christians in Paul Against the Jewish Background* (PhD Diss.; Oxford: Oxford University, 1977), 17-18; James L. Kugel, "4Q369 'Prayer of Enosh' and Ancient Biblical Interpretation," *DSD* 5 (1998): 119-48.

[179] Jonas C. Greenfield, et al., *Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 22 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 165-84. The "son of God" in the Qumran texts, such as 4Q246 (=4QapocrDan ac) ii 1-6, mirrors the language of divine sonship, which symbolically designates a messianic figure. The divine sonship in the Qumran texts is applied and expanded to the expected eschatological King, i.e., Messiah, as an individual character.

[180] See Stephen Pfann and Philip S. Alexander, eds., *Qumran Cave 4: Volume XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1: Miscellaneous Texts from Qumran*, vol. 36 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 353-65; Markus N. A. Bockmuehl, *Redemption and Resistance: The Messianic Hopes of Jews and Christians in Antiquity* ed. James C. Paget (London: T & T Clark, 2008), 27-28.

It is notable that a historical and messianic figure, who is prepared for the covenantal deliverance of His people, appears to convey a salvific image combined with the "son" and "king" images in the Qumran texts. Interestingly, as Devorah Dimant notes, the images of the messianic figures, which reflect both an apocalyptic and eschatological sensibility in the Qumran texts, similarly appear in the messianic ideas and images in the Gospel of John.[184] As Charlesworth also emphasizes, despite fundamentally different theological tendencies, the shared features of the messianic images and descriptions in the Qumran texts and the Gospel of John shed light on a messianic and eschatological conceptualization rooted in a similar biblical interpretation and exegetical practice.[185] In a manner similar to the messianic figures in the Qumran texts, who convey an angelic or son-like image, we can see that the images of Jesus in the Gospel of John convey both a son-like (or angelic) image and a salvific (or messianic) image, such as "the Son of God" (e.g., Jn 11:27, 20:31), and "the Son of Man" (e.g., Jn 12:34). This suggests that the image of Jesus, which combines the angelic and son-like images, is related to messianic figures, such as a Davidic King-Messiah in the Qumran texts, who combines the son-like and kingly images. In addition, we can infer that the messianic figures in the Qumran texts, who combine the angelic, salvific, and kingly images, appears to be profoundly related to the angelic and son-like images of personified Wisdom in Prov 8 and Philo's Logos, which all are identified with Torah, on the basis of the intertextual and theological relationships between the hypostatic notions of Torah, which were examined earlier.

---

[181] Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (Lund: Gleerup, 1976), 254-93.

[182] Dominique Barthélemy, Józef T. Milik, and Roland De Vaux, eds., *Qumran Cave 1* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 108-18, 127.

[183] See 3 *Enoch*, cv, 2; *IV Esdras* vii, 28-29; xiii, 32, 37, 52; xiv, 9.

[184] Devorah Dimant, "Dualism at Qumran: New Perspective," in *Caves of Enlightenment*: *Proceedings of the American Schools of Oriental Research Dead Sea Scrolls Jubilee Symposium (1947-1997)*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (North Richland Hills, TX: BIBAL Press, 1998), 55, 160; Marinus de Jonge, *Jesus, the Servant-Messiah* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 777.

[185] Charlesworth, "The Concept of the Messiah," 163-4.

In all, these features of the messianic figures in the Qumran texts are intertwined with the angelic and son-like images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, which convey a messianic and salvific image of Torah. This examination shows that the angelic, son-like, and kingly images of the messianic figures, which are manifest in early Jewish and Christian sources during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods, are intertwined with the images of various hypostatic notions of Torah. This eventually demonstrates the existence and significance of a messianic image of Torah.

A Messianic Image related to a God-like image of Torah

Interestingly, we can also find a different kind of a messianic image that appears close to a God-like image of Torah in the hypostatic notions of Torah. Mack and Neusner analyze and compare the divine-like images of Jewish (i.e., personified) Wisdom in early Jewish thought to that of Jesus in early Christian thought, while also examining their priestly, prophetic, and messianic images.[186] They investigate the messianic and divine-like images symbolized and mythologized in the thought and narrative of Jesus and Jewish Wisdom and their relationships with the images of Torah, by analyzing the shared messianic (i.e., eschatological) themes (e.g., the Kingdom of God or "world to come") with those commonly found in early Jewish and Christian sources.

---

[186] Mack, *The Christ and Jewish Wisdom*, 192-93. Neusner criticizes the research limited by only analyzing the messianic figures in Jewish apocalyptic literature in the field of Christological background studies. He emphasizes the necessity of thoroughly investigating various etymological and terminological usages related to the profound messianic and eschatological implications profoundly related to the kingdom of God or the "world to come" in terms of a broader apocalyptic hypothesis. See Jacob Neusner, *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, eds. W. Green and E. Frerichs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), preface, ix-xiv.

Specifically, the salvific and divine-like images of the messianic figures in the Qumran texts shed light on the relationships between the images of the messianic figures in early Jewish and Christian sources. As Géza Vermès notes, "The coming of the prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," mentioned in CD (Cairo Damascus Document) 19:10-11, 1QS9:11, and I QS^{b}15-21, implies a multi-faceted (a kingly, priestly, and prophetic) messianic figure.[187] Charlesworth also points out that a supernatural or eschatological figure, who is different from a messianic figure with the son-like and kingly images (e.g., David or the Messiah of Israel), also emerges in the Qumran texts and in many Jewish texts, including Rabbinic literature around the first centuries C.E., following the Second Temple period.[188] The images of the messianic (divine-like or eschatological) figures can be classified as two models: a priestly figure connected to the Messiah of Aaron, and a prophetic figure related to Moses, Elijah or the Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran community.[189] As Talmon and Charlesworth argue, the peculiarity of the Qumran "Twin Messianism" implies a "richly varied phenomenon," which reflects the messianic ideas and sociopolitical realities of Second Temple Judaism.[190] Intriguingly, Michael O. Wise notes that the "Branch of David" mentioned in *Frag.* 5 in 4Q285 is connected to a suffering and executed Messiah, which covertly alludes to a prophetic image of the Interpreter of the Law as well as to a priestly image of the Messiah of Aaron.[191] The messianic figure of high priest at "the end of days," which can be found in *Melchiẓedek Midrash* in 11Q13, appears as a divine-like and priestly Messiah who will proclaim the "Day of Atonement" for all the Sons of Light.[192]

---

[187] Géza Vermès, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin Books, 2004), 159. In addition, the three images of Messiah are depicted in *the Damascus Document* in 4Q266 and 4Q268.
[188] Charlesworth, "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity,* 3-35.
[189] Michael O. Wise, *A Critical study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (Chicago, IL: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990).
[190] Talmon, "The Concepts of Masiah and Messianism in Early Judaism," 104-5; Charlesworth, "The Concept of the Messiah," 191.
[191] Michael O. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls-Revised Edition: A New Translation,* eds. Martin G. Abegg, and Edward M. Cook (New York: Harper Collins, 2005), 293. Schiffman, in "Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 118-9; 124-25, examines, on the basis of the textual analysis of 1QS 8:15B-9:11 and 4QD^b, CD 14:19, two possibilities of a messianic vision in the Qumran texts: only one Messiah, or a "two-Messiah scheme," which distinguishes between the present and the coming of a messianic era. The rise of a Davidic Messiah in "the end of days," in the two-Messiah scheme, is prominent in the interpretation of Isa 10:28-32 (*frags.* 5-6), and Isa 11:1-5 (*frags.* 8-10, lines 11-24), 4Q161 (*Peshar* Isa^a).

More interestingly, in the *Community Rule* in 1QS 3:18-4:1 and 4:23-26, a dualistic idea of a good and evil spirit (e.g., the Prince of Light and the Angel of Darkness) is deliberately developed as part of an eschatological messianism in the context of division and conflict between the Wicked Priest, as betrayer and violator of the Covenant with God, and the Teacher of Righteousness.[193] Floyd V. Filson asserts that various messianic figures, including the Teacher of Righteous, in the Qumran texts commonly appear as eschatological figures, rather than historical ones.[194] Although the Teacher of Righteousness himself in *Geniza* B 20 does not appear precisely as a historical messianic figure, there is, nevertheless, a particular expectation of the Qumran sect for a messianic figure associated with its prophetic concept and images.[195] Importantly, this messianic figure also appears similar to the image of "the Teacher of Righteousness" as a heavenly or divine agent in *A Commentary on Habakkuk,* in 1QpHab 1:12-14, and 2:1-10, 9:9-10, and "the Instructor" of Torah in *the Character for Israel in the Last Days* in 1Q28a.[196] These messianic features of prophetic and priestly figures appear to be profoundly related to the teachings and interpretations of Torah. In this vein, we can infer that the "prophet" and "priest" images of the messianic figures in the Qumran texts, such as the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel (e.g., 1QS9:11) and the Teacher of Righteousness (e.g., *Geniza* B 20) not only reflect the apocalyptic and eschatological messages of Torah but are also related to a salvific and divine-like image of Torah.

---

[192] Craig A. Evans analyzes that the scheme of the two messianic (kingly and priestly) figures evokes the two figures in Zech 4:14 (i.e., Zerubbabel who is related to the royal Davidic Messiah, and Joshua who is linked to the Great Priestly Messiah). See Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature*, ed. Baker Academic Paperback (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011), 8, 455-56.

[193] Schiffman, "Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls," 129-30.

[194] Floyd V. Filson, *The Gospel According to John* (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press,1963), 135.

[195] Ibid., 59. *Geniza* B 20 says, "The beloved Teacher dies until the Messiah from Aaron and from Israel appears" (p. 59). The Teacher of Righteousness seemingly does not appear as a Messiah unlike the two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.

[196] Schiffman, "Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls," 114-22, 130, 143-50. In the *Geniza* B 19 of *the Damascus Documents*, the image of the "Messiah of Aaron" similarly appears as a final Teacher of Righteousness at the end of days. See also 1QpHab 7:4-5. In addition, the prophetic and messianic figures, which we can see in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Dt 18:15-18; 33:8-11), also appears to be specifically interpreted in 1QS9, 11 and in 4Q175 (=*Testimonia*).

Above all, it is crucial to note that the prophetic and divine-like images of messianic figures in the Qumran texts appear to be profoundly related to the "sage" and "savior" images of the hypostatic notions of Torah (e.g., personified Wisdom figures in Wisdom literature, Philo's Logos, Jesus in the Gospels, and *shekhinah*) in the previously examined texts from early Jewish and Christian sources.[197] It is also notable that John A. T. Robinson explains that the three (kingly, priestly, and prophetic) types of messianic images in the Qumran material and Rabbinic literature have a profound nexus with the images of Jesus in the Gospels.[198] As Charlesworth also point outs, the messianic and eschatological manner in which the early first-century Judean Jews behind the Qumran texts spoke and thought is incontrovertibly similar to that of the early Christian community, and especially to the way Jesus speaks in the Gospels.[199] Indeed, the priestly and prophetic images of messianic figures in the Qumran texts, as noted earlier, involve not only the images and activities of personified Wisdom as a sage and master (in Prov 8 and 9) but also the image of *shekhinah* in the Johannine Logos in Jn 1:14, which implicitly conveys a salvific and divine-like image of the divine presence and glory of God's "indwelling" within Israel (e.g., Ex 40:34; Ex 25:8 in *Trg. Onq.*).[200] In particular, the images of the messianic figures in the Qumran texts are reminiscent of the images and activities of Jesus in the Synoptics, which convey a divine-like, prophetic, and salvific image, as examined earlier, in which Jesus symbolizes himself (i.e., "flesh and blood") as "bread" (e.g., Jn 6:35) and "water" (e.g., Jn 4:13-14), and eventually prophesizes an eschatological salvation.

---

[197] Sinnott, 161-2. The figure of the king (Wis 1:1; 6:10) is also imaginatively related to the righteous ones (Wis 3:8; 4:16; 5:1-2).

[198] John A. T. Robinson, *The Priority of John,* ed. Jennifer F. Coakley (London: SCM Press, 1985), 23-28. Robinson also notes that the Gospel of John contains a multi-faceted messianic image, including an early source, which reflects Jesus' view of eschatology in the Synoptics (See ibid., 339-41).

[199] Charlesworth, "The Concept of the Messiah," 163-4.

[200] Mack, *The Christ and Jewish Wisdom,* 209. The similarities between narrative *meshalim* of personified Wisdom and the parables and aphorisms in the Jesus tradition are also manifest in the Jewish wisdom literature, as well as ancient Near Eastern narratives.

In all, this examination shows that the images of messianic figures in the Qumran texts are interlocked with the sage-like, prophetic, and priestly images and activities of the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Jesus, and *shekhinah*. This also implies that a messianic and divine-like image of Torah implicitly appears in the images and activities of the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah manifest in the messianic figures, which are alluded to in their priestly, prophetic, and salvific roles.

Furthermore, the messianic of the hypostatic notions of Torah, which combine the priestly, prophetic, and salvific images, also appear to be related to the prophetic and salvific images of Philo's Logos, which implicitly combines the Greek Logos and Jewish Wisdom. Philo, in *Leg.* II. xxi., xxii., conceives the status and identity of personified Wisdom as a created or angelic being in accordance with the scriptural verses, as rendered in the Septuagint, "The Lord created me the beginning of His ways for His works (Prov 8:22)."[201] As noted earlier, in addition to the sense of "creation," in *Ebr.* viii, 31, personified Wisdom also is implicitly described as a God-like being, which was not created by God, but only "obtained" (קָנָנִי) by Him.[202] As Wolfson shows, the dualistic conception of the angelic and God-like images of Wisdom is applied to a dualistic conception of the Logos and Torah. The God-like image, as it connects to messianic figures, such as "prophet" and "high priest," in its relation to the Logos, seems very similar to the "sage" and God-like images of personified Wisdom.[203] Philo eventually associates the God-like and messianic images of Wisdom and Logos with the pre-existent and divine images of the Laws of Moses, i.e., the Torah, which is the source of Wisdom and Logos.[204]

Moreover, it is notable that, as examined earlier, Philo conceptualizes a messianic era, without using the term Messiah to refer to a messianic figure, as an era where in the teachings of Torah are fully accomplished in accord with the Jewish traditional interpretations.[205] Philo first describes the messianic era of the "ingathering of the exiles" in *Praem*. xxix, 165 as the initial stages of the history of Jewish messianism from a political or national perspective.[206] He does so while considering the historical contexts, such as the continuous existence of the empires of Alexander the Great and the Romans. Philo specifically tries to integrate a biblical (and apocalyptic) aspect with a mystical (and eschatological) aspect of messianism into the concepts and images of the Logos.[207] Philo thereby appears to de-historize the messianic era as a historical progression based upon Stoic ideas in *Praem.* xiv-xxix, 79-172.[208] Instead, Philo appears to describe an individual and spiritualized experience in relation to the Logos in the descriptions of the messianic era, which will be governed by the Laws of Moses as a divine Logos.[209] Philo's Logos thereby plays a critical role in neutralizing a political desire of acute (militant or apocalyptic) messianism, and in encouraging an inner (or spiritualized) experience of the human soul (or intellect) in the intelligible world.[210] This demonstrates that Philo, through making an allegorical connection between a political and a spiritualized component in the messianic era, alleviates not only a tension between philosophy and politics, but also a conflict between the present condition and an eschatological ideal, insofar as, even in the present historical circumstances, the individual can still achieve a eschatological state.

---

[201] Philo, *Leg*. II. xxi., xxii; Wolfson, *Philo,* 1:256.
[202] Philo, *Ebr.*viii, 31; cf. *Virt.* x, 62; Wolfson, *Philo,* 1:25.
[203] Wolfson, *Philo*, 1:258-91; 327-8.
[204] Ibid. Philo's logic principally appears to prioritize the Laws of Moses, which are the source of Wisdom and provides its sources to the Logos.

On the basis of this theory, we can see that Philo's Logos explicitly shows a dual conception of the messianic image of Torah: Messiah as a historical and philosophical concept, and a messianic and eschatological era as an abstract and mystical concept. The dualistic conception of Philo's Logos produces not only the “son” and “king” images of a messianic figure allegorized as an angelic image of the Logos but also the “sage” and “prophet” images of a messianic figure symbolized as a God-like image of the Logos. As I will argue, the “son” and “king” images are in keeping with the historical messianic concept while the “sage” and “prophet” images are in keeping with the abstract and mystical messianic concept.

---

[205] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:395-420.
[206] Cf. Dt 30:3-5.
[207] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:395, 415, 420, 425-6.
[208] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:419; *Mos*. II. vii, 43-44; *Mos.* II. li, 288; Philo, in *Praem.* xiv -xxix, 79-172, de-historicizes the messianic era while he particularizes a vision of a Golden Age in *Praem.* xvi. 95-97, and xxix. 168-170. Philo actually neither follows nor opposes the Stoic messianic ideal, even though he utilized Stoic ideas in order to create the Jewish ideal of a messianic era, which would be governed by the Laws of Moses, as a divine Logos, in a kind of reinterpretation of the Stoic ideals governed by universal laws of reason and nature.
[209] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:417-9; *Mos*. II. iii, 14; Yehoshua Amir, "The Messianic Idea in Hellenistic Judaism," 58.
[210] Philo, *Somn*. ii. 71, ii. 34, and ii. 217. See also Richard D. Hecht, "Philo and Messiah," in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, eds. Ernest S. Frerichs, William S. Green, and Jacob Neusner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 154-63. cf. *Lev. Rab.* 2:2; 9:7; 27:12.

On the one hand, we can infer that Philo projects a personal and historical messianic figure as an allegorical designator for the Logos. Philo thereby creates a messianic concept and image of the Logos in his hermeneutical system (i.e., allegorization), which is connected to a son-like and angelic image of Torah as noted earlier.[211] Against the backdrop of this theory, Philo further conceptualizes a messianic era, which would be brought by the ideal messianic figure in accordance with the teachings of the Torah (the Laws of Moses).[212] On the other, the God-like image of the “sage” and “prophet” is correlated with a spiritualized messianism. On this basis, as Scholem argued, Philo neutralizes the political messianic desires by transforming the messianic ideas into a de-historized, allegorized, and spiritualized messianism.[213] As Richard D. Hecht also analyzes, Philo, while describing a specific historical or mythical figure as an allegorical designator for the Logos, radically transforms a messianic era, through the use of his exegetic and hermeneutic strategies, into a spiritualized and intellectualized experience through the Logos.[214] Philo here utilizes an eschatological conception for formulating the symbolized and mythologized concepts of the Logos and a thoroughly spiritualized messianism, which is profoundly involved with an ahistorical context.[215]

---

[211] Julien de Savingnac, “Le Messianisme de Philon d’Alexandrie,” *NT* 4 (1959): 319-24; Philo, *Praem.* xxix, 172; *Conf.* xiv, 63*; Mos. II.* vii, 44*; II.* li, 288; *Opif.* xxvi, 79-81.

[212] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:423-31; Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 115-16.

[213] Scholem, “The Neutralization of the Messianic Element in Early Hasidism” in *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), 201-2. Philo’s neutralization of messianism appears to be related to the political context of Alexandria around the second half of the first century C.E.

[214] Hecht, “Philo and Messiah,” 162-63. Hecht regards Philo’s messianic conception of the Logos as a “realized eschatology.”

[215] Ibid., 154; Yohoshua Amir, “The Messianic Idea in Hellenistic Judaism,” *Mahanayim* 124 (1970): 54-67 (Hebrew).

Taken together, this substantiates that Philo, by this logic, creates not only a new Jewish messianic blueprint or drama through the combination of the Hellenistic intellectual and the Jewish wisdom traditions but also a messianic image of Torah which associates it with an angelic or God-like image of Torah.[216] In all, Philo's Logos, allegorized as a historical (i.e., apocalyptic) messianic figure, appears close to an angelic or visualized mediator, who accomplishes the teachings of the Laws of Moses, i.e., Torah, on the basis of the traditional Jewish messianism. At the same time, the dualistic conception of Philo's messianism, in relation to the Logos, embraces not only an apocalyptic aspect of messianism, which conservatively neutralizes its historical and political aspects but also an eschatological (abstract) aspect of messianism which radically symbolizes and spiritualizes the particularistic concepts of messianism. Consequently, Philo's Logos creates a messianic image of Torah, which appears close to both an angelic and a God-like image, and which variously combines multi-faceted aspects of messianism. This shows that the critical features of the images of the messianic figures in the early Jewish and Christian sources are profoundly connected to the teachings of the Torah and relate to the judgment and ultimate salvation of God, and thereby create a messianic image, which appears close to the angelic and God-like images of Torah.

Furthermore, Philo's dualistic conception of messianism in relation to the Logos gives a critical insight into the messianic implications of the images of messianic figures who are conjoining in the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom and Jesus in the Wisdom literature, the Qumran texts. As also noted earlier, Philo's dualistic conception appears in the apocalyptic and mythologized images of Jesus in the Gospels in relation to a messianic image of Torah. As Mark notes, the messianic implications in the images of Jesus can be divided into an apocalyptic and historical figure "realized or now" and an eschatological concept "futuristic or then."[217] Anthony A. Hoekema calls it "inaugurated" eschatology—that is an eschatological age which not only "has indeed begun," but also which is "by no means finished."[218] Thus, through the Johannine eschatology, we can also infer two dimensions, which can be categorized as "realized" and "futuristic" messianisms.[219] Clear evidence of this is found in Jn 5:24-29, which provides a two-dimensional conception: "already," that is, realized, and "not yet," that is, futuristic in terms of a "world to come" or "the Kingdom of God."[220] Some NT scholars, such as Robinson, Bultmann, and John J. Collins, profoundly discuss the relationship between the Gospels and the eschatology of the Qumran texts, which also combine present and futuristic characteristics.[221] As Collins explains, the Qumran texts appear to represent a more "realized eschatology" which focuses on ritual purity and Temple piety, whereas the Gospel of John shows a more futuristic conceptualization (e.g., Jn 14:2-3), which is related to the Second Coming of Jesus.[222] However, in contrast to the Synoptics, the Gospel of John also puts a greater emphasis on a present aspect in which an eschatological understanding of truth is ultimately directed to a practical realm, which has bearing on everyday life.[223] In this context, the characteristics of their eschatological messianisms reveal a more complex system, which profoundly combines the historical and apocalyptic features, as well as symbolized and spiritualized features. It becomes evident that an apocalyptic emphasis on the Kingdom of God in the Synoptics appears different from a present or spiritualized emphasis upon expected eternal life and its eschatological implications in the Gospel of John. Despite the degree of the difference in emphasis, both the Synoptics and the Gospel of John have a dualistic feature of messianism: an apocalyptic feature and a "realized" eschatological feature, which emphasizes the ultimate existential position of the individual.[224] This corroborates the dualistic conception of the images of Jesus in the Synoptics and the Gospel of John and the relationship with the dualistic conception of the images of Philo's Logos in relation to a messianic image of Torah.

---

[216] Ibid., 158. Philo's messianic expectation is primarily based on the normative importance of the Messiah in ancient Jewish texts and contexts.

[217] Mack, *The Christ and Jewish Wisdom*, 192-207.

---

[218] Anthony A. Hoekema, *The Bible and the Future* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979), 17-18. The "inaugurated" eschatology not only encircles the start and finish of the eschatology but also guarantees an eschatological accomplishment in the future.

[219] George E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974), 306.

[220] Cook W. Robert, "Eschatology in John's Gospel," *Criswell Theological Review* 3 (1988): 99. The structure of the eschatological dualism of Johannine thought is characterized as an interpenetrating dual division, which consists of an apocalyptic present and eschatological future. See also Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, 338-39.

[221] The cosmological dualism of Gnosticism had a critical impact on its dualistic and eschatological motifs. This also supports the Hellenistic and Gnostic influences on the formative process of a realized eschatology. See Robert, "Eschatology in John's Gospel," 82.

[222] Collins, *Qumran, Apocalypticism, and the New Testament*, 137-38.

[223] Robert, "Eschatology in John's Gospel," 99.

In summary, this examination shows a shared religious and exegetical phenomenon of drawing a messianic figure and imagining a messianic (apocalyptic or eschatological) image of Torah, which is associated with the angelic or God-like image of Torah. This analysis demonstrates that there was a profound (theological and hermeneutical) interaction between the messianic (apocalyptic and eschatological) figures, such as Philo's Logos and Jesus as well as various messianic figures manifest in early Jewish and Christian sources including the Qumran texts and Wisdom literature. This further substantiates that a messianic image of the hypostatic notions of Torah emerges from the dynamic interactions between the angelic and God-like images of Torah within the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions.

Critical Findings and Implications: Exegetical and Phenomenological

Supposed Primitive Forms of the Images of Torah as a Mediator

The preceding examinations regarding the intertextual and theological nexuses between the hypostatic notions of Torah (such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, *memra*, and *shekhinah*) demonstrate the existence of the three images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, which are manifest in early Jewish and Christian sources of the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. Despite the limited linguistic and grammatical relationship and theological discontinuities claimed by many scholars, I have presented sufficient evidence of the intertextual and theological relationships of the hypostatic notions of Torah and of the existence and developmental process of the three images of Torah within the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah. As emphasized above, the three images of Torah are dynamically formulated by the literary and exegetical strategies, which utilize the hypostatic notions that convey the biblical, philosophical, rabbinic, and mystical concepts of Torah.

---

[224] Robinson, *The Priority of John*, 339-41.

The more we examine personified Wisdom in the Jewish wisdom materials, the more the nexus between personified Wisdom and Torah becomes evident. On the basis of this profound nexus, I specifically delved into the intertextual, semantic, and theological relationships of a son-like image of personified Wisdom (אָמוֹן) in Prov 8:22-31 to the images of the Johannine Logos (Jn 1:1-18). I also examined the theological and philosophical debates regarding the shift from personified Wisdom to Jesus in the Gospels, from two perspectives: 1) from personified Wisdom to the Johannine Logos; 2) from personified Wisdom to Jesus in the Synoptics. This examination substantiates the three significant images: an angelic image related to the image of a son begotten as the firstborn being in creation, a God-like image related to the image of a sage or teacher with great and profound wisdom, and a messianic image related to the image of a prophet or priest for salvation. The son-like image of Incarnate Logos begotten from God, who was growing up in the bosom of God the Father, is related to the "son" images of personified Wisdom in Wisdom literature. It is also notable that the son-like images of personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos profoundly interact with Philo's Logos and *memra* from the perspective of Jewish Logos theology. The son-like images of the hypostatic notions of Torah are deeply related to the angelic image of a heavenly agent created in the creation context. This provides critical insight not only into the process by which the angelic images of the hypostatic notions of Torah are formulated but also into the formation and functions of the angelic image of Torah as a mediator connecting human beings and God.

In addition, the God-like image of Torah can be explicitly found in the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Jesus in the Gospels, Philo's Logos, and *shekhinah* in rabbinic tradition, as examined earlier. It is notable that in addition to the son-like image of personified Wisdom (אָמוֹן) in Prov 8, we have also seen its God-like image as a "sage or teacher" in the creation context. The God-like image of personified Wisdom explicitly appears in the God-like image of Incarnate Logos (i.e., Jesus), which reflects an equal position with God. We have also seen that the speech styles and God-like image of personified Wisdom as a master in a banquet in Prov 9 is parallel to the images of Jesus in the Gospels. Both of these images are related to the God-like image of Torah.

As seen earlier, Jesus' speeches, discourses, and attitudes to the audiences allude to an intimate father-children relationship, which explicitly appears in the activities and images of personified Wisdom.[225] Specifically, the image of Jesus in the Synoptics (Mt 11:16-20, 25-30; Lk 7:31-35, etc.) as a sage or teacher is exclusively associated with the God-like image of personified Wisdom as "a sage with wisdom and authority who grew up with God," i.e., a symbolic divine being, pre-existing and working with God in creation.[226] This association helps us understand the nexus of Torah and personified Wisdom in the Wisdom literature, in which the image of a sage conveys a matured heavenly figure with profound wisdom and authority in regard to the Torah. It is crucial to note that Torah signifies not only God's teachings of the Law (νόμος) but, also parallel to Incarnate Jesus, a sage with great wisdom and knowledge of Torah. This examination thereby corroborates that the God-like image of Torah as a hidden mediator appears in the images (e.g., a creator or sage or teacher with wisdom) and activities of personified Wisdom as well as of Jesus as Incarnate Logos. In all, out of these images emerge a God-like or heavenly figure, a divine agent or a semi-creator who accompanies and works with God. This shows that the symbolized images as a sage or master appears in the close proximity to God, and thereby create the God-like image of Torah. This implies that the advanced linguistic and hermeneutic strategies utilizing the symbolic terms and concepts have a critical impact on the process of formulating the God-like image of Torah, which as we will see is mainly manifest in the later Jewish mystical tradition. Above all, this substantiates that the implicit identification between God and the hypostatic notions of Torah creates a God-like image of Torah as a hidden mediator who symbolizes a divine entity, which appears identical to God, but does not function as a mediator between God and human beings.

---

[225] Jesus' speeches asking for repentance in Mt 3:2; Mk 6:12; Lk 5:32; 15:7; Jn 15:4-10 is a reverberation of Wisdom's speeches in Prov 1:15-19; 8:36; 9:12,18.

[226] The examination of the angelic and God-like images of Jesus related to the images of personified Wisdom implicitly allow us to understand his personality and divinity.

In summary, the angelic and God-like images of Torah are dynamically formulated, in accordance with the degree of emphasis and weight one side or another of the dualistic conceptions, by a literary and exegetical strategy which expresses the religious experiences of the divine realms on the basis of the theological and philosophical tendencies of the authors. As noted, the Logos-centered tradition appears behind the angelic image insofar as the Logos serves as a mediator between God and humans, while the Wisdom-centered tradition appears behind the God-like image insofar as Wisdom is together with and not fully separable from God. Furthermore, the messianic image of Torah appears in a hybrid form, which employs either an angelic image or a God-like image of Torah. As examined earlier, Philo's dual conception of the Logos shows a particular hermeneutic strategy for formulating the messianic images of Torah, which are profoundly connected to both the angelic and God-like images of the hypostatic notions. As also examined earlier, the messianic images of Torah intertwined with the angelic and God-like images explicitly reappear in the descriptions of a historical messianic figure, Jesus, who synthesizes the rabbinic, philosophical, and mystical features. Notwithstanding the complexities of the hypostatic notions of Torah, in broad terms, their messianic images ultimately appear to be dynamically developed through the profound interactions between the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah. The messianic figures and concepts are profoundly intertwined with particular theological and hermeneutical strategies which formulate the messianic images of Torah by combining with the images of the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions manifest during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.

Two Supposed Primitive Traditions: Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered

The above observations and examinations of the three images of Torah demonstrate the existence and developmental process of the two supposed primitive traditions: Greek Logos-centered and

Jewish Wisdom-centered which dynamically developed the three images of Torah during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. These examinations illuminate not only how early Christian traditions appropriated the concepts and images of Torah for their own systems and theologies but also how they idiosyncratically applied the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah in formulating the activities and images of the Johannine Logos and Jesus in their theological and philosophical contexts. It is notable that the results of this examination show the pre-existence and emergence of two distinctive conceptual and ideological frameworks composed of the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions which, as I will show, continued to dynamically formulate three images of Torah: angelic, messianic, and God-like throughout the history of religious and Jewish thought into the Middle Ages.

On the one hand, through the intertextual and theological relationships between personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos, we have seen the existence of a Logos-centered tradition focused on the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as in personified Wisdom, Philo’s Logos, *memra*, and the Johannine Logos. We have also studied its developmental process and critical features as they are manifest in early Jewish and Christian sources. As noted earlier, their exegetical relationships can be seen in their terminological and phraseological dimensions—that is, in the keywords that convey a literary interplay and reflect the theological and philosophical ideas regarding the hypostatic notions of Torah. These intertextual, exegetical, and theological features demonstrate the Logos-centered concepts of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as the son-like images of personified Wisdom, Philo’s Logos, *memra*, and Incarnate Logos (i.e., Jesus) as the “begotten” Son of God. In particular, Philo’s Logos plays a critical role in allowing us to identify the exegetic and theological association between personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos in relation to the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah. As noted earlier, the influences of Greek and Hellenistic philosophies are important in analyzing the hypostatization and personification of the hypostatic notions of Torah in reference to the exegetical practices and theological beliefs of multifaceted Judaism and early Christianity. As examined earlier, the personification and hypostatization of wisdom in Prov 8:22-31 reverberate in Philo’s Logos, *memra*, and the Johannine Logos (Incarnate Jesus). This demonstrates the existence of a Greek-Logos-centered tradition, which reflects the conceptual changes of Torah along with Hellenistic (philosophical and mythological) influences.

Above all, the images and activities of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah appear to function as an angelic mediator, connecting God and human beings. The Johannine Logos corroborates not only a synthesis between the Logos-centered hypostatic notions (Philo’s Logos and *memra*) and the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions (personified Wisdom and *shekhinah*) but also concretizes a Logos-Wisdom theology, which interacted and developed within multi-faceted Judaism and early Christianity. This corroborates the presence of a hermeneutic strategy (i.e., allegory) and theological intention, one which utilizes the hypostatic notions of Torah as a mediator, and thereby creates an intimate relationship between God and human beings.

On the other hand, we have found the existence of a Jewish Wisdom-centered tradition based on the images and activities of the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah (such as personified Wisdom, Philo’s Logos, and *shekhinah*). We have also examined the development and critical features of these hypostatic notions. As also noted earlier, the personification and hypostatization of Torah appears as one of the dominant compositional and hermeneutical strategies formed through theological and philosophical interactions between the Jewish wisdom traditions and Hellenistic influences. As noted earlier, the features of the Jewish Wisdom-centered tradition are also found in the early Christian sources, which were significantly influenced by and interacted with the Jewish wisdom materials. I have provided clear evidence of the intertextual and theological relationships between personified Wisdom and Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, and we have seen the shared exegetical and hermeneutical features (a poetic and symbolic approach) manifest in their “sage” or “master” images in relation to other Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah. The God-like images of personified Wisdom as a mature sage who is working together with God in creation in Prov 8, are directly analogous to the God-like images and activities of Jesus as a sage (prophet or teacher) with profound wisdom in the Synoptics. Indeed, the narrative *meshalim* of personified Wisdom, as a sage who utters prophetic sayings in Proverbs, are semantically and theologically related to the sayings and images of Jesus according to which Jesus presented himself as a Jewish prophetic sage in a sapiential form (e.g. aphorism, parable) in the Jesus tradition. The literary and exegetical practices, which are manifest in the images and activities of Jesus's parables in the Synoptics, also appear to be profoundly related to those of personified Wisdom. For instance, some passages of the Synoptic Gospels explicitly offer obvious evidence of the direct nexuses connecting Jesus with personified Wisdom as an ontological wisdom (e.g., Mt 11:19). As examined earlier, the God-like images and activities of personified Wisdom, as a master in a banquet, corroborate a close nexus with those of Jesus, as a Lord in the Last Supper, in the Gospels.

Thus, my analysis substantiates not only the deep relationships among personified Wisdom, Jesus, and other Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, but also the particular literary and exegetical strategies that allow for the formulation of the God-like image of Torah. These specific exegetic strategies are reflected in the images, activities, and sayings (i.e., narrative *meshalim* as a popular form of aphorisms and parables) of personified Wisdom and of Jesus in the Synoptics. Both are personified and hypostatized by a poetic, mythic, and symbolic approach. Based on these strategies, the Wisdom-centered tradition appears to have been developed through the reinterpretation, combination, and integration of the early Jewish (biblical and rabbinic) traditions and the Hellenistic contexts. The images of the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah as a non-visual or symbolized mediator, without a physical and philosophical mediator, ultimately appears to generate the God-like image of Torah. The hermeneutic strategies thereby demonstrate a possibility of revealing the divine realm and creating a symbolic and metaphoric connection between the infinite divine and the finite human realm through a linguistic symbolism. These strategies ultimately allow for a possibility of experiencing God through the God-like image of Torah as a mediator personified and hypostatized through the linguistic symbolism, as I will further discuss in this study.

In summary, this examination reveals that there are multi-faceted conceptions and images of the hypostatic notions of Torah as angelic, God-like, or messianic, in accordance with the degree of weights and emphases on the two traditions: Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered. This also demonstrates that the three (angelic, God-like, and messianic) images of the hypostatic notions of Torah appear through these complicated intersections between the two traditions under the interactive influences of Wisdom-Logos theology. It is crucial to note that I do not intend to present a clear-cult and neat categorization of the two traditions (Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered) in this study. As shown earlier, for instance, the traits of personified Wisdom in the Wisdom-centered tradition appears closer to the portrayal of the images and activities of the Johannine Logos of the Fourth Gospel in the Logos-centered tradition than those of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, which can be mainly categorized as the Wisdom-centered tradition. The Johannine Logos demonstrates not only a synthesis between the Logos-centered hypostatic notions (Philo's Logos and *memra*) and the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions (personified Wisdom and *shekhinah*), but also concretizes a Logos-Wisdom theology, which interacted and developed within multi-faceted Judaism and early Christianity. In this sense, this also substantiates not only the profound interaction between the two traditions in both the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic Gospels but also the peculiarity of each tradition as a heuristic apparatus without implying that the two traditions are mutually exclusive. This complex state of affairs shows the profound interactions between the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, which are formulated by utilizing the rabbinic, philosophical, and mystical concepts of Torah. Moreover, as I will argue, the existence of the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions has critical implications for the history of Jewish mystical thought regarding the images of Torah.

Phenomenological Implications

So far, I traced through the intertextual (exegetical and semantic) and theological relationships between the hypostatic notions of Torah in order to further concretize the existence and features of the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions and show how their respective interactions generate the three images of Torah. My analysis proves that the images of Torah were dynamically formulated and developed by changes in the way in which Torah was conceptualized and by the emergence and interactions of various hypostatic notions of Torah within the Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered traditions during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. As noted earlier, changes in the conception of Torah throughout the history of Jewish thought played a central role in the formulation of the hypostatic notions of Torah. Specifically, the prominent intertextual relationships between the hypostatic notions of Torah substantiate the theological and philosophical nexuses between the two traditions, in addition to the centrality of Torah in their developmental processes, which are manifest in early Jewish and Christian sources. This shows that the Logos-centered and the Wisdom-centered traditions were developed as the result of the dynamic interactions of the ideas of Logos and Wisdom with the hypostatic notions of Torah, along with the conceptual changes in the understanding of Torah that were the result of the centrality and uniqueness of Torah manifest during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. The categorization of the two traditions also provides a critical apparatus for analyzing the formation of the images of Torah within various religious phenomena and traditions. It also demonstrates that in spite of the strong influences of Hellenistic and early Christian traditions, the centralization of Torah, discussed earlier, buttressed by the exegetic and hermeneutic strategies of the rabbinic and Jewish wisdom traditions, testifies to the uniqueness and significance of Torah. The significance of Torah in the hypostatic notions is a critical religious phenomenon and a great catalyst for the conceptual interactions between Logos and Wisdom, as well as the dynamic formulation of the images of Torah within multi-faceted (Palestinian, Hellenized, and Rabbinic) Judaism and early Christianity. Torah’s significance also plays a critical role in conceptualizing and clarifying the formative processes and interactions of Wisdom-Logos theology in relation to the development of the hypostatic notions of Torah. It further allows for the discovery and identification of the developmental process and dynamic interactions between the two religions (multi-faceted Judaism and Christianity). This examination of the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, based on the centrality of Torah, demonstrates not only the further necessity for reexamining the interactions between the various (biblical, philosophical, rabbinic, and mystical) traditions but also the broader possibilities of the multifaceted features of the images of Torah. It also demonstrates the necessity of comprehensively and thoroughly reexamining various interpretative methodologies within early Jewish and Christian sources, without taking a one-sided (e.g., Christological) interpretation favoring one tradition or imposing a theological and philosophical presupposition, all in accordance with Idel's panoramic approach and phenomenology of models. Such a reexamination would provide critical insight not only into the parting of ways of the two religions but also into an effective method of appreciating their convergent positions regarding the images of the hypostatic notions despite the conceptual changes and deviations in the understanding of Torah in each religion.

Furthermore, this phenomenological observation shows the value of categorizing the three images of Torah as a comprehensive model in accordance with Idel's methodology of models. It allows for a reappraisal of the developmental process of the hypostatic notions of Torah within the two (Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered) traditions during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. It also provides a means by which to examine their development into the full-fledged forms of the images of Torah within the full-fledged forms of two branches of the medieval Jewish thought- philosophical and mystical. It thereby offers an efficient way of substantiating the continuity of the history of ideas regarding the hypostatic notions of Torah in the two Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions, which as I will argue, are continued in the Middle Ages by Jewish philosophy and Kabbalah, respectively.

My argument calls special attention to the further necessity of understanding and analyzing various different theological, philosophical, and hermeneutical perspectives on a deeper and broader level in order to discover the continuity and development of the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah within the Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered traditions throughout the history of Judeo-Christian thought. As implied earlier, the literary and hermeneutical strategies, combining a homiletic, midrashic, allegorical, and symbolical approach, which especially appear in the various texts (e.g., Prov 8:22-31, Jn 1:1-14, etc.), are intertwined with the authors' theological tendencies, which are expressed in the manner in which they formulate the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah. The literary and hermeneutic strategies, which formulate the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, implicitly illuminate a religious experience, which occurs along with the concept of a (visible and invisible) mediator that creates an intimate relationship between God and human beings.

In the next section of my study, I will engage in a detailed discussion of the existence and features of the essential ideas (i.e., the concept of a mediator, and the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica*), related to religious experiences of the authors and their theological intentions and literary and hermeneutic strategies, within their respective philosophical frameworks. In later chapters, we will turn to consider the "mature" medieval versions of the three images. I thereby will try to discover a missing link which can connect the primitive forms of the three images of Torah within the two traditions, which were dynamically developed during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods, to their full-fledged forms in the medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions through the Middle Ages. I will also elucidate the critical features of the religious phenomena of the three images of Torah as their primitive forms were significantly developed in ancient traditions and later concentrated in rabbinic and late antique Jewish mystical traditions, and finally developed into their full-fledge forms, such as the Active Intellect (in the Jewish philosophical tradition) and sefirot (in the Jewish mystical tradition) in the Middle Ages. This examination will not only corroborates the continuity and development of the three images of Torah, which were dynamically formulated within the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions throughout the history of Jewish thought but also elucidate their phenomenological features in accordance with Idel's panoramic approach based on the two senses of phenomenology of models described in the Introduction.

PART B: Images of Torah from the Second Temple Period to the Middle Ages

The previous examinations regarding the intertextual, philosophical, and theological relationships between the hypostatic notions of Torah demonstrated the existence of the images of Torah (angelic, God-like, and messianic), which existed within the two different traditions (Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered) throughout the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. In this chapter, I will substantiate the continuity of the phenomena of the three images of Torah by showing in detail how the primitive forms of the three images of Torah in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods were developed into their full-fledged forms within the medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions. First, I will analyze the relationship of the Active Intellect to the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, and *memra*, while discovering an angelic image of the Active Intellect as it relates to the concepts and images of Torah. I will then delve into the idea of the Active Intellect, as a representative hypostatic notion of Torah, as it relates to the idea of *devekut*, and idea which prominently appeared in the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition. In so doing, I will analyze the ideas of *devekut* and noetic union (i.e., *unio mystica*) propounded by the medieval Jewish philosophers, such as Maimonides and Gersonides. In order to understand the developmental process of the concept of *devekut,* with respect to the notion of the Active Intellect, I will also investigate the relevant figures who were influenced by Maimonides and the Aristotelian philosophical tradition, such as Gersonides, and some Castilian Kabbalists, who were influenced by the Maimonidean philosophy, such as Abraham Abulafia, R. Isaac of Acre, and R. Joseph Gikatilla.

In addition, I will examine how the primitive forms, such as personified Wisdom and *shekhinah* in the Wisdom-centered tradition, were developed in the medieval kabbalistic tradition in the sefirotic system as an entire matrix of the hypostatic notions of Torah reflected in various sefirot, such as *shekhinah*, *binah*, and *ḥokhmah*. I will also analyze the meaning of the divine unity and divine essence in relation to the sefirotic system, while analyzing the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica*, as they dynamically formulate a God-like image of Torah according to the esoteric meanings of the medieval Jewish mystical tradition. I will further investigate the interpretative and hermeneutical approaches of Jewish mystics, especially the early-thirteenth century Kabbalists: Geronese Kabbalists, such as R. Ezra of Gerona, Nahmanides, R. Azriel, and late-thirteenth century Castilian Kabbalists, such as Abulafia, Moses de Leon, and Joseph Gikatilla.

Through this examination, I will analyze how the angelic, God-like, and messianic images of Torah were dynamically formulated as part of the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah. I will also elucidate how the three (angelic, God-like, and messianic) images of Torah were dynamically formulated in the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, along with the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* as they are manifest in both the medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions. I will further discuss the literary and hermeneutic strategies, which utilize the hypostatic notions of Torah as an allegorical and symbolic apparatus, and thereby formulate the three images of Torah in the operations of *devekut* and *unio mystica*. This study will eventually elucidate not only the continuity and implications of the three images of Torah, within a holistic picture of the religious phenomena throughout the history of Jewish thought, but also the continuous history of the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods though the Middle Ages.

Chapter III: An Angelic Image of Torah in the Medieval Jewish Philosophical Tradition

The Continuity of Angelic Images of Torah: From the Logos to the Active Intellect

Through the examination of the Logos-centered tradition at the basis of the Second-Temple and Rabbinic- period hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, and *memra*, we can infer that there was a substantial preparatory period for formulating a central basis for the further development of the concepts of God and Torah. As emphasized earlier, the centrality of Torah in the intertextual and theological relationships between the hypostatic notions of Torah is evident not only in the nexus between Torah and personified Wisdom, created or begotten from God but also in the relationship between Torah and the Logos-centered hypostatic notions, such as Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, and *memra* in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. As examined earlier, the intertextual and theological relationships between the "son-like (or child-like)" image and activities of personified Wisdom (אָמוֹן) in Prov 8:30 and the Johannine Logos, i.e., Jesus in the Gospels, demonstrates that the angelic image of Torah is a visible mediator intervening between God and human beings. The angelic image of Torah is related not only to biblical concept of a son-like or angelic being but also to the philosophical concept of the Logos and the rabbinical concept of the *memra*. It should be recalled that Philo's ultimate concern was to develop a way of protecting Jewish religiosity while harmonizing Hellenistic ideas with Jewish thought, and that Philo's Logos thereby played a critical role in the formulation of the "son-like" and angelic images of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as the Johannine Logos and *memra*.

In this context, it is noteworthy that Gedaliahu Stroumsa analyzes the manner in which Philo's notion of the Logos, as an anthropomorphic demiurge shifted into the notion of an angelic being in the ancient Jewish mystical and rabbinic traditions and into a mythological and mystical concept of the incarnational Logos in Greek and early Christian traditions.[1] For instance, Justin Martyr, in a manner similar to Philo, identifies the Logos (in its Stoic concept) with the Angel of the Lord, and with many other theophanies of the Hebrew Bible, and eventually with Jesus.[2] This shows that an examination of Philo's Logos clarifies the theological and philosophical influences on the development of the polymorphous features of the concept of Torah and God in Rabbinic sources, and later in the history of medieval Jewish philosophy and mysticism.[3] This also corroborates that the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah manifest in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods have critical implications for the development of the angelic images of Torah in the Jewish philosophical tradition throughout Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages.

As George H. Box and Daniel Boyarin have also discussed, the idea of the Logos as a physical and spiritual potential mediator is related to *memra*, which is a targumic representation of the word of God and later to the angelic being Metatron, who prominently appears in the later rabbinic and late antique Jewish mystical literature (as well as in medieval Jewish mysticism).[4] In addition, Elliot Wolfson notes that the medieval Jewish philosophers (in a manner analogous to Philo's conception of the Logos) conceived of the Active Intellect as "the image of God and in his likeness," which is ontologically different from God, the supreme Intellect.[5] Wolfson's inference provides a critical insight into the relationship between the Active Intellect and the Logos in relation to the conceptions and images of Torah in the Jewish philosophical tradition in the Middle Ages. Alexander Altmann suggests that the medieval Jewish philosophers might have substituted the "materialized intellection," i.e., Active Intellect, for Philo's Logos, as a second hypostasis, a notion which had already appeared in the Logos-centered tradition during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.[6] In this context, Idel traces the intermediate potencies, such as Metatron and Incarnate Logos (i.e., Jesus) in the works of Abulafia, who conceptualized the Active Intellect as a mediator between God and human beings and identified it with Metatron.[7] As Altmann notes, Metatron is considered a hypostatic notion based on a sophisticated hermeneutical combination of rabbinic, Jewish philosophical, and mystical traditions of Talmudic and Enochic literature from Late Antiquity through the Middle Ages.[8] This shows that Metatron functions as a critical link connecting the Logos-centered of Torah from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods to their full-fledged forms in the Middle Ages.

---

[1] Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa, "Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ," *HTR* 76, no. 3 (1983): 277-81.

[2] Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho,* chs. 55-62, 82-96.

[3] Marc Saperstein, *Decoding the Rabbis: A Thirteenth-century Commentary on the Aggadah* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), 219-20.

[4] George H. Box, "The Idea of Intermediation in Jewish Theology: A Note on Memra and Shekinah," *JQR* 23 no. 2 (1932): 106, 115-6; Boyarin, "The Gospel of the Memra," 243-84; idem, *Border Lines,* 89, 92. There was an explicit difference between Christian Logos and Jewish Logos, which reflects a diversity of Logos theology in Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.

[5] Elliot R. Wolfson, *Language, Eros, Being: Kabbalistic Hermeneutics and Poetic Imagination* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2009), 342. Abulafia, in *Ḥayyei ha-Nefesh*, 7-8, 93, connects the two terms "image" and "likeness" with the "intellect" and "imagination," respectively.

In this context, I now discuss Metatron, in detail, a matter I did not discuss earlier when dealing with the hypostatic notions of Torah in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. Late on, I will also examine the relationship of Metatron, as a hypostasis, to Abulafia's idea of the Active Intellect. Indeed, the figure of Metatron appears to not only have been influenced by the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, and *memra*, but also to have interacted with the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions, such as personified Wisdom, and *shekhinah* as found in literature spanning Second Temple period through the Middle Ages.[9]

---

[6] Alexander Altmann, "'Homo Imago Dei' in Jewish and Christian Theology," *The Journal of Religion* 48, no. 3 (1968): 254. Cf.

[7] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 86-87. Peter Schäfer also analyzes the historical and theological interactions between Metatron in 3 *Enoch* and Jesus in the New Testament. See Schäfer, *The Jewish Jesus: How Judaism and Christianity Shaped Each Other* (NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012), 141-49. Later in the study, I will discuss Abulafia's system which encompasses the profound relationships between the Logos, Metatron, and *shekhinah* in the late rabbinic and late antique Jewish mystical traditions, as well as the Active Intellect in the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition.

[8] Altmann, "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *JJS* 28 (1977): 159-60; idem, "3 Enoch and the Talmud," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 18, no. 1 (1987): 40-68; Steven R. Scott, "The Binitarian Nature of the Book of Similitudes," *JSP* 18/1 (2008): 55-78; Boyarin, in "Beyond Judaisms: Metatron and the Divine Polymorphy of Ancient Judaism," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 41, no. 3 (2010): 333, notes that "3 *Enoch* is a late Hebrew mystical apocalypse from the end of late antiquity in the Enoch tradition, roughly contemporaneous with the final production of the Babylonian Talmud itself." Boyarin thereby argues for the notion of "polymorphous Judaism," by showing the genealogy of Rabbinic Judaism. Indeed, we can see that a profound nexus developed between the first-century *Parables of Enoch*, composed in the early Roman period, and the Books of 2 *Enoch* and 3 *Enoch*, composed in Late Antiquity (See ibid., 359-60). In b. Sanḥ. 38b, Rav Idi's direct indication of Metatron in the exposition of the verse in Ex 23:21 shows the identity of Metatron as a semi-divine (i.e., angelic) figure. The relationship of Enoch in 1 *Enoch*, 2 *Enoch* and 3 *Enoch* with the "Son of Man" of Daniel 7 sheds light not only on the profound nexus between earlier Jewish texts and late-antique rabbinic literature but also on the early and late-antique Christian traditions that show the explicit identification between Jesus and the Son of Man (335).

Interestingly, in a manner similar to *memra*, Metatron appears in the Talmudic, Midrashic, and Targumic literature, as well as Hekhalot literature.[10] Metatron, whose story is based on the legend of the biblical Enoch's transformation into an angel, is connected to the images of various angelic beings in the Enochic and Talmudic literature.[11] It is notable that Metatron, as an angel, is profoundly related to Enoch as Metatron in 3 *Enoch* (*The Hebrew Book of Enoch*), which links between the earlier Enoch legend and the later Metatron mysticism.[12] We may infer that the image of Metatron, which is identified with the image of "one like unto a son of man" (כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ) in Dan 7:13, is connected to the son-like images of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos as the "firstborn," and the Johannine Logos, as a "son of God," as well as to Jesus, as the "Son of Man" in the Gospels, as examined earlier.[13] In 3 *Enoch*, Enoch becomes Metatron, an idea that is based on a creative reading of Gen 5:24, and is further connected to images of angelic beings, such as the princes of the seven heavens (e.g., 3 *En.* xvii).[14] In Hekhalot literature (e.g., *Synopse* §§ 107-222), Metatron explicitly appears as the angel known as “the Prince of the Presence” (e.g., 3 *En.* xvii), who has access to the Divine Presence in relation to the *merkavah* imagery and who reveals the secrets of the *merkavah* to R. Ishmael and R. Akiva.[15] In a manner similar to the image of Metatron, the figure of the “Prince of the Torah” (i.e., *Sar Torah*) appears to play a critical role in transmitting the wisdom and secrets of Torah, and in mediating between God and the travelers to the divine throne-room.[16] In relation to *merkavah* mysticism, Metatron appears to be interchangeable with the “Prince of the Torah” and “Prince of Wisdom” in the Enochic, Midrashic, and Hekhalot literature.[17]

---

[9] Stroumsa, "Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ," 269-88.

[10] Segal, *Tow Powers in Heavens*, ix, 62-7. The image of Metatron appears to be directly related to the image of *Two Powers in Heaven* sitting on the throne. The Metatron mysticism mainly appears since the fourth century C.E.

[11] Andrei A. Orlov notes, "The origin of the Metatron tradition is shrouded in mystery. Some scholars trace it back to Enochic lore, noting that in rabbinic and Hekhalot materials many early roles and titles attributed to Enoch in apocalyptic writings have been transferred to Metatron. Metatron's origins, however, cannot be explained solely with reference to Enoch, because Metatron also assumed many of the titles and functions assigned to Michael, Yahoel, Mechizedek, and other exalted angelic figures in early Jewish apocalyptic writings." See Orlov, *Metatron*, in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; 2010), 943. Scholem, *Major Trends*, 67-9. Only three references to Metatron appear in the Babylonian Talmud: b. *Sanḥ*. 38, b. *Ḥag.* 15a and b. *'Abod. Zar*. 3b. The origin of the term Metatron is widely accepted as an abbreviated and transformed from *Metathronios*, i.e., "he who stands beside the God's throne." Cf. Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 125-142. However, its exact derivation is still a disputed issue.

[12] Ibid.

[13] As Philip S. Alexander discussed, Justin Martyr's conception of the Logos as a "second person" or "second God" appears to be related to Metatron as a second God or lesser YHWH noted in b. *Sanḥ*. 38b. See Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch" in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, eds. M. E. Stone, Theodore A. Bergren (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1998), 87-122. See Gruenwald, "'The Visions of Ezekiel': Critical Edition and Commentary," *Termirin* 1 (1972): 128-9 (Hebrew).The "Son of Man" in the *Parables of Enoch* (1 *Enoch* 71) appears to be related to the figure of the "Youth" (נער) while it appears to be opposed to an elder or matured image of the "Ancient of Days" as God is called in Dan 7:13.

[14] Odeberg, *3 Enoch,* PART II, 76-89.

Metatron is involved not only with the heretical idea of *Two Powers in Heaven* (in relation to *memra*) debated by the Rabbis but also with the development of *merkavah* mysticism (especially in Hekhalot literature) from ancient Jewish mystical and later rabbinic traditions to medieval Kabbalah.[18] In Hekhalot literature, the anthropomorphic and mythologized descriptions of the Throne of Glory, which can be seen in *merkavah* visions, are explicitly represented as an angelic image, and are identified with Metatron and *shekhinah*.[19] Metatron as depicted in *merkavah* imagery in the Talmudic passages, such as b. *Sanḥ*. 38, b. *Ḥag.* 15a and b. *ʻAbod. Zar*. 3b, which reflect a somewhat later stage of development than that of 3 *Enoch*, also appears in the Hekhalot and Hasidei Ashkenazi literature and thirteenth century Kabbalistic sources (e.g., Abulafian and Zoharic corpuses).[20] As many scholars, such as Alon and Urbach, agree, the *shekhinah* in the Talmudic, Targumic, and Hasidei Ashkenazi literature appears as a mythic and mythological figure with an anthropomorphic form, although it does not clearly appear as a separate created or angelic being.[21] In this regard, Michael Fishbane notes that the anthropomorphism of Metatron and *shekhinah* (i.e., the divine glory) can be understood as an implicit expression of the hypostatic entities in an esoteric tradition of the notion of *middot*, which means "measures" or "potencies" of God in early Rabbinic Midrashic texts.[22] In all, the anthropomorphic descriptions of Metatron and *shekhinah* are ultimately related to not only the depiction of an angelic or Logos-like manifestation of the divine attributes in various forms but also to the personification and hypostatization of the divine presence.[23]

---

[15] Schäfer, *Synopse,* §§ 206-213.

[16] Swartz, “Ancient Jewish Mysticism,” 40-41.

[17] Odeberg, 3 *Enoch*, iii-xvi, and xlviii; *Num. R*. xii. 15; Schäfer, *Synopse,* §§ 281-294.

[18] The critical features in *3 Enoch,* such as apocalypticism and Gnosticism elucidate the origins and development of the Enoch-Metatron traditions. See Segal, *Tow Powers in Heavens*, ix, 62-7; Alexander “Historical Setting,” 159-60. Andrei A. Orlov, in *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005, 86-303), examines the roles and titles of Enoch-Metatron in *Sefer Hekhalot* and in 2 *Enoch*, while comparing them with the features of Enoch-Metatron in various traditions (e.g., apocalyptic tradition).

[19] Schäfer, *Synopse, in Hekhalot Zutari*, §§ 346-352 (The Journey to the Chariot and the Vision of God); §§ 368-375 (Throne Midrash); *in Markavah Rabba*, §§ 685-704 (*Shiur Qomah*).

[20] In 3 *Enoch*, there are detailed descriptions of *merkavah*: the ascent and descent of the angels over a distance of “myriads of parasangs” (3 *En*. xxii B and C); the winds blowing under the wings of the *kerubim*” (3 *En.* xxiii); “the different chariots of the Holy One, blessed be He” (3 *En*. xxv and xxiv); *ofannim* (3 *En*. xxv). See Odeberg, PART II, 76-89.

Furthermore, it is crucial to note that in a manner that recalls Philo's Logos and Metatron, the Active Intellect became a critical subject of energetic discussion of medieval Jewish philosophers. Specifically, it is first necessary to explain the background of Maimonides' conceptualization of the Active Intellect, and of how Maimonides views the biblical conception of "angel" as an allegorical designator for the Active Intellect. For many scholars, Maimonides' concept of the Active Intellect, which is based on the combination and integration of the Aristotelian and Neoplatonic philosophies and scriptural approaches, was ambivalent and controversial. As Pessin notes, he is ambivalent about the concept of the Active Intellect, since he seems to combine it with the emanation theory of Neoplatonism and the eternity of the universe of Aristotelianism.[24] In this context, it is first necessary to note that ancient and medieval philosophers discussed the theological and philosophical meanings of the Active Intellect and God, as well as biblical subjects, such as creation, divine unity, prophecy, and divine providence. In the Aristotelian system, God is the First Cause, i.e., a Being generating the intelligent spheres, and the Unmoved Mover who operates the circular movement of the spheres in the conceptual frame of the eternity of the universe, as well as the Pure Knower, who is identified with a perfected, fully actualized Intellect and as the repository of all knowledge.[25] The Neoplatonic theory of emanation in *Enneads* by Plotinus, which is based upon a hierarchical system of beings, explains a shifting process from the One to many divine attributes.[26] This scheme involves the emanation from God, who is the One, of the Intellect, and further emanations from the Intellect, which is the first emanation, of the soul and nature, and had a huge impact on the formation of Neoplatonized Aristotelianism that is found in some medieval sources.[27]

---

[21] Alon, 44; Urbach, *The Sages*, 63-67. Scholem is skeptical with the *shekhinah* as a hypostatic entity and a separate entity alongside the Deity in the Talmudic literature and in even Hekhalot literature. For Scholem, the *shekhinah* describes the manifestation of God and is speculation as a created entity is a post-Talmudic development. Scholem later recognizes, in *Midrash Proverbs* 22:29, an exception to this rule, as noted earlier, and sees in this text a new conceptual development of *shekhinah* according to which the *shekhinah* is separate from God. See Scholem, *Zur Kabbala Und Ihrer Symbolik* (Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1960), 48, 58-62, 68, 119. According to the literature of Hasidei Ashkenaz, we can explicitly see these features in the angelic images of a visible *kavod* (i.e., *shekhinah*) which, is created or emanated from an invisible *kavod*. See Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Ḥasidut Ashkenaz* (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1968), 56-57; Schäfer, *Synopse*, §§ 222-228.

[22] Michael Fishbane, "The Measures of God's Glory in the Ancient Midrash," in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser*, ed. Ithamar Grunwald (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 53-74.

[23] Urbach, *The Sages*, 40.

[24] Sarah Pessin, "Jewish Neoplatonism: Being Above Being and Divine Emanation in Solomon Ibn Gabirol and Isaac Israeli," Th*e Cambridge Companion to Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 136. See Stefan Alexandru, *Aristotle's Metaphysics Lambda: Annotated Critical Edition Based upon a Systematic Investigation of Greek, Latin, Arabic and Hebrew Sources* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), (1072a) 24-5, 137-40.

The Jewish Neoplatonic conception of the Active Intellect, which developed from the eclectic Kalamic approach, implicitly can be found in the *Fons Vitae* and the poem *The Kingly Crown* of Solomon Ibn Gabirol (c.1121-1170).[28] For Gabirol, although the One is “Beyond Being,” and is transcendent, ineffable and indescribable, its can be described as the Form of all Forms.[29] Gabirol interpolates the Will as a mediator to allow for creation from the Will of God in order to emanate universal form (סוד) and universal matter (יסוד).[30] In this sense, as Sarah Pessin notes, the first emanation of a repository of the Forms can be identified with the concept of the Active Intellect, which reflects an ultimate character of the One, i.e., God in the Neoplatonized Aristotelian system.[31] In Aristotle's *De Anima* (=*On the Soul*), we can see the concept of a transcendent "active intellect (or power)," which is separable from a "passive intellect," which plays a key role in the process of stimulating and bringing about human intellectual activities.[32] In contrast to the Neoplatonic concept of the Active Intellect, Aristotle fail to sufficiently explain not only the relationship between the active and passive intellects (or powers) but also their relationships with God.

---

[25] Aristotle, *Metaphysics,* vol. 2, trans. Hugh Tredennick and George Cyril Armstrong, LCL 287 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), *Metaphysics XII.* vi, 1072a.

[26] Sarah Pessin, “Jewish Neoplatonism,” 94-100. Plotinus’ *Enneads* had a huge impact on the formation of the Neoplatonized Aristotelian thought. Plotinus presents a unique emanatory scheme, which explains a shifting process from the One to many divine attributes.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibn Gabirol, *The Kingly Crown* (=*Keter Malkhut*), translation, introduction, and notes by Bernard Lewis; additional introduction and commentary by Andrew L. Gluck (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 2003), 1-2, 7-8. *The Kingly Crown* is the greatest Hebrew religious and liturgical poem with philosophic content based on the Neoplatonic doctrines that was dominated by the influences of Hellenistic thought in the Middle Ages.These doctrines were current among Islamic and Jewish thinkers in the Middle Ages. *Fons Vitae* had an exceptional influence on Christian scholasticism, and was the most famous philosophical work of a systematic metaphysics.

[29] Ibn Gabirol, *The Kingly Crown*, 24-7; Gabirol’s concept of God is different from Maimonides’ negative theology. Oneness is not the numerical one. The term “Beyond Being” appears to be used by Islamic philosophers, such as Averroes.

In this context, Maimonides appears to combine the Aristotelian and Neoplatonic conceptions of the Active Intellect and God, while creating an idiosyncratic (Jewish philosophical) position compatible with both the values of the Torah, Aristotelian philosophy, and Neoplatonic ideas.[33] Maimonides thereby develops his philosophical and epistemological positions, which are critical for establishing a Jewish theological and philosophical criterion for numerous philosophical and theological subjects, such as the incorporeality and immutability of God, prophecy, providence, and so forth.[34] Maimonides, however, recognizes the limitation of language, philosophy, and epistemology to express the true reality of the divine realm and God.

For this reason, Maimonides describes the Active Intellect by employing the allegorical hermeneutic, which associates biblical concepts with philosophical concepts.[35] He emphasizes the significance of allegorical interpretation, which allows for intellectual apprehension of the equivocal Biblical terms, such as those that seem to anthropomorphize God with a view to understanding their metaphysical meaning.[36] The reconciliation allows for an intellectual apprehension of the Torah.[37] He is aided in doing so by identifying the ancient biblical and rabbinic Jewish esoteric traditions of *ma'aseh bereshit* (the Account of the Beginning) and *ma'aseh merkavah* (the Account of the Chariot) with physics and metaphysics respectively.[38] In a manner similar to Philo's Logos, Maimonides also explicates the biblical verses: "in the image of God" and "in His likeness" (Gen 1:26-27), through figurative interpretations associating the biblical concepts with the philosophical ones (i.e., "overflow" of the Active Intellect as an angelic agent to the human intellect).[39] For Maimonides, the term "angel" is, thus, associated with the roles and images of the Active Intellect, which conjoins with the human intellect, and conveys the apprehension of the Active Intellect.[40] This shows that, in a manner similar to Philo's Logos and Metatron, the Active Intellect takes on the image of an angelic mediator between God and the human beings, as a full-fledged form of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah as mediators in the Second Temple and later Rabbinic periods. This substantiates that the angelic image of Torah was formulated not only through an exegetically sophisticated combination of the biblical and philosophical hypostatic notions but also through a hermeneutic strategy, which embodies and highlightes the concept of a mediator which intervenes between God and human beings.

---

[30] Sarah Pessin, 97-99. This theory of emanation in relation to the Active Intellect is developed through a natural extension of monism, in a manner that resembles the kabbalistic notion *atziluth* (אצילות). The early Kabbalists understood *Ein Sof*, i.e., who emanates everything, as the Hidden Ancient One and the power behind all the sefirot. However, no human thought is capable of grasping this aspect of the Deity. It also traces back to the divine unity from the plurality describing the divine attributes.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Aristotle, *De Anima* (=On the Soul), trans. Walter. S. Hett, LCL 288 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), *On the Soul* III. v. 430a. This passive intellect is deeply related to the Neoplatonic sense of emanation.

[33] Daniel Frank, "Maimonides and Medieval Jewish Aristotelianism" in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 142-54.

[34] Sarah Stroumsa, "Saadya and Jewish Kalam," in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 75-6.

[35] Moses Maimonides and Shlomo Pines, *The Guide of the Perplexed* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), *Guide* II. 6, pp. 264-65.

---

[36] See Pines, Introduction to *Guide*; Introduction to *Guide* III; *Guide* II. 12, pp. 268, 279; *Guide* I. 4, 23. For instance, "And God saw that it was good" (Gen 1:10), and 'Micaiah' vision, "I saw the Lord" (I Kgs 22:19), do not signify a corporeal or anthropomorphic form of God but denote an intellectual apprehension of God (*Guide* I. 4, p. 27-28). Maimonides also explains the philosophical meaning of other similar instances, such as "And thou shalt see My back" (Ex 33:23) (*Guide* I. 21) and "to stand erect" (*Guide* I. 15). Maimonides establishes a lexicon of equivocal terms in the Bible while trying to discover their allegorical meanings. Maimonides denounces anthropomorphic and corporeal conceptions of God, which are for the masses only relying on the imagination, while explaining their true meanings, which are connected to philosophical contents and require intellectual apprehension. See also Sara K. Braslavy, "Bible Commentary," in *The Cambridge Companion to Maimonides*, ed. Kenneth Seeskin (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 253-4.

[37] Braslavy, "Bible Commentary," 254-5.

[38] Ibid.; Pines, *Guide,* Introduction, 6. Even though Maimonides regards the Bible as an authoritative book, he also regards it as a container of Aristotelian philosophy.

[39] Pines, *Guide* I. 1, p. 23; *Guide* II. 12, pp. 278-80.

[40] Pines, I. 2, p. 24; *Guide* II. 6, p. 261-2. Maimonides explains that *Elohim* means the deity of the angels, which are separate intellects.

Angelic Images of Torah related to the Idea of Devekut to the Logos and Active Intellect

On the basis of the previous examination, I will examine the interactive relationships and development of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah manifest from the Second Temple and classical Rabbinic periods through Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, while analyzing the religious ideas and experience of *devekut,* which dynamically formulated the images of Torah. It is crucial to note that, in this formulative process of the images of Torah, the idea of *devekut* appears not only to play the critical role of bridging the gap between a transcendent God and human beings but also elucidates the relationship between the hypostatic notions of Torah and God Himself. In this context, I will further delve into the the idea of *devekut* to the Logos and Active Intellect and its features and roles in formulating the angelic images of Torah.

In Philonic Thought

The idea of *devekut* first appears in the Torah, where it is referred to in Dt 4:4, וְאַתֶּם הַדְּבֵקִים בַּיהוָה (“you who did cleave unto the LORD your God”) and Dt 13:4, וּבוֹ תִדְבָּקוּן (“cleave unto Him”), among other places.[41] It is crucial to note that, as Adam Afterman analyzes, Philo creates his own theory of the *devekut* of the Deuteronomic commandment by interpreting biblical usages of the root *d-b-q* (דבק), which appear in Dt 4:4, Dt 11:22, and Dt 30:20.[42] As Harry Wolfson explains, Philo develops a new method of scriptural interpretation—philosophical allegory—through a synthesis of Platonic and Jewish thought.[43] As Peter Schäfer discussed, Philo’s conception of God is primarily based on the divine transcendence, which implies the Uncreated and Unknowable One.[44] Within this philosophical framework, Philo elaborates on the idea of *devekut*, which means a spiritual or mystical cleaving to transcendent God, while explaining the relationships between human beings and God.[45] Specifically, as Schäfer expounds, Philo explains the idea of *devekut* through the relationships between the human mind (or soul) and the Logos (*Leg.* III. 72).[46]

---

[41] Adler, *Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft*, http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/online-bibeln/ueber-die-online-bibeln/ accessed by Jan 10, 2020.

[42] Adam Afterman, “From Philo to Plotinus: The Emergence of Mystical Union,” *The Journal of Religion* 93, no. 2 (2013): 181.

[43] Harry Wolfson, *Philo,* 1:57, 115-38. Wolfson notes that Philo’s exegetical comments reflect an eclectic mix of philosophical traditions with particular emphasis on Platonic and Stoic traditions.

For Philo, through the human mind, human beings can comprehend not only "the sense perceptable" world but also participate in "the intelligible world of ideas," which is identified with the (divine) Logos. In order to explain the process of particpating in the Logos, Philo conceptualizes the Image of God as an intelligible cosmos, and a copy of the Image of God as the sense-perceptible cosmos. Philo associates the Image of God with the Logos as a "model," and "archetypal seal."[47] Philo thereby develops a thematic connection between the Logos (or Reason) as a model and the human mind (or soul or intellect), which is created in the image of Logos (or Reason), as noted earlier. This implies that God made not only the Logos as an "instrument," which God used for the creation of the sense-perceptible cosmos, but also used the Logos as a model for the human mind (or soul) or intellect (or rational thought).[48] Philo thereby connects the human mind to a copy (or likeness) of the Image of God (i.e., the Logos of God), assuming that a human being is an image of the Image of God.[49]

Philo further explains the idea of *devekut* through the theory of the Logos, which is the Image of God and "archetype" for creations.[50] Specifically, Philos creates a way of ultimately expressing God by describing a relation between God and the Logos. Expression about the Logos thereby becomes a type of expression about God despite the incomprehensibility and inexpressibility of divine essence.[51] Thus the Logos can explain the divine actions and divine attributes. As Schäfer also notes, Philo conceptualizes the Logos as a reflection of the divine essence and transcendence.[52] As noted earlier, in the larger system of Philonic thought, the Logos plays a critical role as an angelic agent as the representative of God or a divine mediator connecting human beings and God. In this vein, we can infer that like Philo's Logos, the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as the Johannine Logos and *memra*, appear as angelic images of Torah that allow for relationships with God. In addition, the image of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel appears as an angelic image of Torah by allegorically transforming the biblical concepts, such as "the Son of God" (e.g., Jn 11:27, 20:31), and "the Son of Man" (e.g., Jn 12:34) into the images of the Johannine Logos, which eventually conveys the images of God and Torah. This substantiates that the Logos plays a critical role as a mediator, which enables the imaginative faculties in the human mind (or soul or intellect) to connect the Image of God, and to experience God (i.e., *devekut*).[53]

---

[44] Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 155-56. Cf. Philo, *Leg.* III. xxxiii, 100-103.

[45] John M. Dillon, "The Transcendence of God in Philo: Some Possible Sources," *Center for Hermeneutical Studies* 16 (1975): 1-8.

[46] Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 161-2. Afterman, "From Philo to Plotinus," 194. Philo's distinction between body and soul is influenced by the Greek philosophy. For Philo, the human mind is almost synonymously used with the human soul as a more comprehensive term (e.g., *Leg.* III. 72).

[47] Sterling, "Different Traditions or Emphases?" 44, 55.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid., 44.

[50] Wolfson, *Philo*, 1:238-9. Plato uses the term image only "with reference to things in the visible world," while Philo describes the term image," which conveys "pattern" (παραδείγματα) and "archetype" (αρχέτυπος) for the "ideas" as well as the Logos.

Philo appears to describe his experience as the utmost state of the human mind (or soul), which becomes identified with the Logos or the intelligible world of ideas (i.e., Logos and Wisdom) (cf. *Conf.* xx, 95-97).[54] In this context, the Logos appears as a mediator for the *devekut*, i.e., the returning of the human mind to its origin in the Image of God (or Logos). Above all, as examined earlier, the image of the Logos, which is connected with the son-like image of personifed Wisdom in creation and pre-existent Torah (the Word of God), appears as an angelic or visualized mediator as a biblical concept which connects God and human beings in the context of *devekut*. This demonstrates that Philo elaborated the idea of the Logos as an apparatus for explaining the idea of *devekut* and expressing the essence of God, which is, otherwise, beyond human comprehension, while maintaining an apophatic approach to the divine essence. In this scheme, the anthropomorphic expressions in the scriptural texts (*Conf.* viii, 28) are allegorically assigned to the Logos.[55] As Afterman notes, Philo's idea of *devekut*, which was formulated by a synthesis of Platonic and Philonic thought, implicitly appears to have a great impact on rabbinic and late antique Jewish traditions, which were transformed into a broader religious tradition in medieval Jewish philosophy and kabbalah.[56] This also substantiates that Philo's works plays a critical role in discovering a missing link—that is, a unique Jewish exegetical practice related to the concepts of God and Torah—for the centralizing process of Torah from the Second Temple period and Late Antiquity through the Middle Ages.

---

[51] Wolfson, *Philo*, 1:87-163. Philonic allegory as an interpretive method intends to solve the potential conflict between a philosophical meaning and an inner-biblical meaning. As a reminder, the Logos is identified with the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom in Sir 24:23, *Gen. Rab.* i. 1., and Wis 9:1.

[52] Schäfer, *The Origns of Jewish Mysticism*, 162-63. See Philo, *Her.* xlviii. 230-236. "The divine Word separated and apportioned all that is in nature. Our mind deals with all the things material and immaterial which the mental process brings within its grasp, divides them into an infinity of infinities and never ceases to cleave them (235). This is the result of its likeness to the Father and Maker of all. For the Godhead is without mixture or infusion or parts and yet has become to the whole world the cause of mixture, infusion, division and multiplicity of parts." (236). Cf. *Opif.* xxii. 68-69.

[53] Ibid., 160-2. In order to explain the operative process of the imaginative faculties, Philo uses a rare term *apaugasma*, which means "effulgence" or "radiance" which mirrors the active power and image of God (e.g., Wis 7:26).

[54] Ibid., 172-73.

The Idea of Devekut to the Active Intellect in the Thought of Maimonides

Modern Jewish scholars, such as Scholem, Elliot Wolfson, and Yehudah Liebes, suggest a possible nexus between Philo's idea of *devekut* to the Logos and the idea of *devekut* to the Active Intellect in Jewish medieval philosophical and mystical traditions.[57] In this regard, with Philo's idea of *devekut* in mind, I will investigate the development of the biblical idea of *devekut* into the philosophical conception of *devekut*, i.e., the communion or union between the human intellect and the Active Intellect in philosophical discourse.[58] Philo's idea of *devekut* in relation to the Logos gives a critical insight into Maimonides' idea of *devekut* to the Active Intellect. In this context, I first examine Maimonides' philosophical methodology and his idea of the Active Intellect.

---

[55] See *Migr.* xxiv, 132: "Using still loftier language to express the irrepressible craving for moral excellence, he calls on them to cleave to Him. His words are: 'Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and Him shalt thou serve, and to Him shalt thou cleave' (Dt 10:20)." Philo also implies that the manifestations of the Divine Logos (or Divine Thought) designate the angelic beings in the Scripture. See Wolfson, *Philo*, 1:238-9. It is well known that Philo's biblical exegesis is based on the allegorical presupposition of a twofold meaning (i.e., literal and "underlying" or allegorical) of the scriptural texts. Cf. *Fug.* xxxii, 179; Plato, *Republic*, vol. 1, LCL 237, eds. and trans. Chris Emlyn-Jones and William Preddy (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), *Republic* II. 378d.

[56] Afterman, *Devequt: Mystical Intimacy in Medieval Jewish Thought* (Hebrew; Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2011), 13-37, 36-43, 273-85, 340-44. See also Steven Harvey, "Islamic Philosophy and Jewish Philosophy," in *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy*, eds. Peter Adamson and Richard C. Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 349-50.

[57] See Scholem, *Major Trends*, 114-15; Elliot R. Wolfson, "Traces of Philonic Doctrine in Medieval Jewish Mysticism: A Preliminary Note," *Studia Philonica* 8 (1996): 99-106; Yehudah Liebes, "The Work of the Chariot and the Work of Creation as Esoterical Teachings in Philo of Alexandria," in *Scriptural Exegesis: The Shapes of Culture and the Religious Imagination; Essays in Honour of Michael Fishbane*, eds. Deborah A. Green and Laura Suzanne Lieber (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 105-20.

It is notable that Maimonides reconciles metaphysic knowledge and the secrets of the Torah by associating *ma'aseh bereshit* with Aristotle's physics, and *ma'aseh merkavah* with Aristotle's metaphysics.[59] Maimonides explains that the inner meanings of the Torah allegorically reflect the scientific truths of Aristotelian philosophy.[60] This shows that Maimonides justifies not only the necessity of Torah study but also the study of philosophy while trying to eliminate a contradiction between the religious truth of Torah and scientific truths. By reconciling philosophy and Torah, Maimonides mutually approaches each biblical subject through his dialogical and dialectical methodology, i.e., providing both demonstrable proofs and dialectical arguments.[61]

In this context, Maimonides appears to recognize the human epistemological limitation of grasping the true reality of the conception of God and the emanation of an overflow of the Active Intellect to the human soul.[62] On the basis of his epistemology and philosophical methodology, Maimonides theorizes that God is always the Intellect in *actu*. In other words, His essence has absolutely with no potentiality, and He is simultaneously the intellectually cognizing subject, and the intellectually cognized object.[63] In order to explain the Active Intellect as the overflow from God, Maimonides interestingly turn to the biblical verses: "in the image of God" and "in His likeness" (Gen 1:26-27), while explicating a divine link between God and man, which can be formed in the human intellect.[64] This shows that apprehension of the human intellect can be likened unto the apprehension of God through the human intellect's conjunction with the Active Intellect.[65] By this logic, Maimonides allegorically interprets the Active Intellect as an "angel," a religious term for the divine messenger who conveys prophecy and divine knowledge to prophets.[66] This implies that for Maimonides, the Active Intellect, which contains intelligibles, appears to play a critical role for a philosophical understanding and knowledge of the Torah, and thereby appears to be identified with the knowledge of Torah itself. Maimonides's transformation of the biblical and religious conception of "angel" into the the Active Intellect results in the intellectualization of the biblical subjects in the Torah through the concept of the Active Intellect, which is a critical apparatus to provide knowledge for creation, prophecy, and providence.[67] Indeed, on the basis of his methodology of philosophizing the concepts and contents of the Torah, the Active Intellect is not only the intermediary through which prophecy and providence reach the human realm but also a necessary apparatus, from his point of view, to explain the central biblical subjects. This thereby substantiates a conceptual affinity between the Active Intellect and Torah, which was developed into the intellectualized concept of Torah and the angelic and divine-like images of Torah in various forms within the medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions.

---

[58] See Isaiah Tishby and Yeruḥam F. Lachower, *The Wisdom of the Zohar: An Anthology of Texts*, trans. David Goldstein (Oxford; New York: Published for the Littman Library by Oxford University Press, 1989), 3:997-8; 1:235-42.

[59] Maimonides emphasizes the significance of intellectual apprehension in interpreting the metaphysical meaning of equivocal terms regarding God. See also Sara K. Braslavy, "Bible Commentary," 253-4, 268.

[60] Sara K. Braslavy, 254-5. In a manner similar to Philo's allegorical approach, which was described earlier, Maimonides allegorizes certain biblical truths and supernatural phenomena into the scientific and universal truths and principles.

[61] Pines, *Guide* I. 68; *Guide* II. 1-2. Both demonstrations and dialectical arguments are part of Maimonides' logical method for the solution of physical and metaphysical problems. Maimonides regards most contents as demonstration, such as the existence of God, but not all due to the empirical limits of human knowledge. This ambiguous and inconsistent attitude reflects his attempt to synthesize and epitomize the demonstrative and dialectical arguments on this subject.

[62] Joseph Stern, "Maimonides' Epistemology," in *The Cambridge Companion to Maimonides*, ed. Kenneth Seeskin (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 115-19. Warren Z. Harvey, "Maimonides' Critical Epistemology and 'Guide' 2:24," *Aleph* 8 (2008): 213-35.

---

[63] Ibid., Pines, *Guide* I. 68, p. 165.

[64] Pines, *Guide* II. 12, p. 279.

[65] Pines, *Guide* I. 1, p. 23.

[66] Pines, *Guide* I. 1; *Guide* II. 10; *Guide* II. 12, pp. 259-60. He also explains that the term "angel" can be understood by a structure of meaning as "the role of a messenger or someone who carries out an order."

[67] Maimonides elaborates on the discussion of creation by introducing three possible positions (scriptural, Platonic, and Aristotelian). Through the conceptual explanation of the Active Intellect for knowledge of the sublunar realm and its conjunction with the human intellect, Maimonides tries to connect between the scriptural position of God's free will and the Aristotelian position (necessity by a cause), which asserts the eternity of the world. See *Guide* I. 73; *Guide* III. 54. Maimonides assumes that the Active Intellect as a cause of knowledge, which it possesses in actuality, stimulates the material intellect. Maimonides tried to narrow an epistemological and conceptual gap between the philosophical (the Aristotelian and Platonic) positions and the scriptural position through the idea of the Active Intellect. However, Maimonides eventually appears to reject both the Aristotelian theory of the eternity of the universe and the Neoplatonic theory of a preexistent matter before creation and argues, instead, for creation *ex nihilo*. See also Pines, *Guide* II. 21, 25.

Grounding his biblical exegesis on his epistemology and philosophical principles, Maimonides elaborates the idea of *devekut* to the Active Intellect, which was a core and generative idea in his investigation. In accordance with Maimonides' philosophical system, the Active Intellect, which principally governs the sublunar world, also plays a critical role as a divine intermediary in a natural cosmic mechanism from which the ultimate source from God overflows to human knowledge, illuminating the human intellect and causing it to pass from potentiality to actuality.[68] Maimonides, basing his theory on the intellectualization of the biblical concepts and subjects of the Torah (e.g., creation, prophecy, and providence) through the concept of the Active Intellect, also moves forward with his ultimate subject: the true human intellectual perfection.

It is notable that Maimonides prioritizes human intellectual perfection for the individual ultimate perfection over either actions or moral qualities.[69] Daniel Rynhold explains in his article, *Good and Evil, Truth and Falsity*, that the fall of Adam caused the denigration of an exalted cognitive state in which humans could perceive the difference between truth and falsity. This state was a reflection of humans being created in the image of God and in His likeness, i.e., a complete intellectual perfection in which the first human was identical with the Active Intellect.[70] As a result of the sin, human beings not only entered a lesser cognitive state, in which good and evil, rather than just truth and falsity, became concerns of the human intellect, but also lost the links between the commandments of the Torah and its ultimate intellectual meanings. By this logic, Maimonides necessitates the idea of *devekut* (i.e., conjunction with the Active Intellect) for the human intellect to recover the intellectual apprehension of the Torah, which was planned by God for the ideal state of intellectual perfection.

---

[68] Pines, *Guide* II. 38, p. 377.

[69] Pines, *Guide* III. 54, p. 635; *Guide* III. 2, p. 511.

[70] Daniel Rynhold, "Good and Evil, Truth and Falsity: Maimonides and Moral Cognitivism," *Trumah* 12 (2002): 163-64, 178-80.

Maimonides further elaborates on human intellectual perfection through the explanation of the degrees of prophecy and providence, which are proportionately interrelated to strengthening and empowering the attachment to the Active Intellect. As noted earlier, Maimonides' epistemology recognizes the limits of the human knowledge and its linguistic expressions concerning metaphysics and cosmology.[71] In this context, Maimonides necessitates the Active Intellect, described as an angel, as the messenger of prophecy, while emphasizing its significant role for the perfected human intellectual state. Maimonides notes, "Know that the true reality and quiddity of prophecy consists in its being an overflow overflowing from God, may He be cherished and honored, through the intermediation of the active intellect."[72] This implies that the true reality of prophecy represents a mechanical system through the Active intellect, i.e., the different levels of prophecy and human intellectual perfection results in accordance with the levels of conjunction to the Active Intellect.[73]

Like prophecy, the Active Intellect plays a crucial role in providence. For Maimonides providence is that God is constantly watching over those who have obtained the overflow from God.[74] For Maimonides, the Active Intellect, which is the cosmic intermediary of the intellectual overflow, underpins the mechanics of divine providence in accord with the bond (attachment) between human intellect and God, i.e., the degree of the *devekut*. Maimonides asserts that providence is the effect of the "divine overflow" on the rational and/or imaginative faculties through the Active Intellect.[75]

---

[71] Pines, *Guide* I. 32; *Guide* II. 19; III. 51; 54. See also Pines, "Maimonides on Metaphysical Knowledge," in *Maimonidean Studies* 3 (1992–1993): 49-103; David Blumenthal, "Maimonides' Intellectualist Mysticism and the Superiority of the Prophecy of Moses," *Studies in Medieval Culture* 10 (1981): 51-67.
[72] Pines, *Guide* II. 36, p. 369.
[73] *Guide* II. 36, 37; 38. It is notable that his conception of the Active Intellect appears to be based on that of al-Farabi according to whom there are different levels of intellects, and different natural dispositions of imaginative and rational faculties. See Shlomo Pines, "The Limitations of Human Knowledge: According to Al-Farabi, ibn Bajja, and Maimonides," in *Studies in Medieval Jewish History and Literature* 1, ed. Isadore Twersky (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), 90. Maimonides also exemplifies the difference between Moses and other the prophets in order to show the different levels of prophecy. For Maimonides, being a philosopher is a prerequisite for being a prophet, and the highest degree of prophecy is profoundly related to the ultimate human perfection. Cf. Warren Z. Harvey, "A Third Approach to Maimonides' Cosmogony-Prophetology Puzzle," *HTR* 74, no.3 (1981): 297-98; Lawrence J. Kaplan, "Maimonides on the Miraculous Element in Prophecy," *HTR*, no. 3/4 (1977): 240, 247-48.
[74] Through the discussion of providence of Job's friends and the philosophical opinions concerning providence, Maimonides emphasizes that the nature of Active Intellect is key to human knowledge: "the nature of that which exists in the divine overflow coming toward us, through which we have intellectual cognition…" (Pines, *Guide* III. 51, p. 621). See also ibid., 624-5.

In explaining the development of human knowledge, Maimonides conceptualizes the ability to reach theoretical (intellectual) wisdom as "a pure function of the ability of the human intellect," as something that can be achieved through its conjunction with the Active Intellect. Someone who has achieved conjunction can reach a state of individual immortality.[76] The important point in this argument is the ultimate difference in the knowledge of God and human intellect. This proves that the degrees of prophecy and providence are fundamentally limited by Maimonides' epistemology: its impossibility of the human intellect reaching perfect knowledge of cosmology and metaphysics and of, thereby, achieving the complete union with the Active Intellect.[77] Consequently, Maimonides implies that the degrees of prophecy and providence are proportional to the degree of the attachment to the Active Intellect and the intellectual apprehension concentrated on knowledge of God.[78] In other words, the degree of prophecy and providence are proportionately interrelated to strengthening and empowering the attachment to the Active Intellect. In this sense, for Maimonides, the human intellect, through the intermediation of the Active Intellect, requires the contemplative life for the intellectual perfection, which culminates with knowledge of metaphysics in order to recover the original state, which can distinguish between "truth and falsity," as noted earlier. In Maimonides' system, the contemplative life aiming for the intellectual perfection involves the attachment to the study of Torah and prayers through the lens of philosophy, which can also bring forth the moral perfection of the practical realm as a teleological consequence, and thereby results in the attachment to the Active Intellect.[79] In all, this examination shows that the concept of Torah, related to the angelic images of the Active intellect, plays a critical role in illustrating a holistic and teleological process for achieving the human intellectual perfection through its relationship with Active Intellect, and the idea of *devekut* to the Active Intellect.

---

[75] Pines, *Guide* I. 73; II. 36; III. 2.

[76] Pines, *Guide* III. 51, p. 624.

[77] Maimonides, in Pines, *Guide* III.51, p. 624, notes, "providence watches over everyone endowed with intellect proportionately to the measure of his intellect."

[78] Pines, *Guide* I. 72; *Guide* II. 4, 7, 45. The highest level of prophecy leads to the highest level of providence.

[79] See Pines, *Guide* III. 51; III. 54, 632-38. Maimonides, by this logic, appears to necessitate the need for human affects (i.e., advancing towards the worship to God with passionate love) and moral and rational virtues for promoting intellectual apprehension and achieving the ultimate human perfection.

The Idea of Noetic Union: Maimonides, Gersonides, and Islamic Philosophers

In order to better understand the philosophical background of Maimonides's ideas of *devekut* and a noetic union to the Active Intellect and the relationship of these ideas to the formulation of the images of Torah, it is necessary to further examine the thought of Aristotle and the Ancient Greek commentators, as well as some medieval Islamic and Jewish philosophers. It is evident that Neoplatonized Aristotelian ideas and methodologies appear to play a significant role in Maimonides' establishing a Jewish theological and philosophical criterion regarding the idea of *devekut*, i.e., the human intellect's conjunction with the Active Intellect.[80] Several Greek philosophers, such as Alexander of Aphrodiasis and Themistius commented upon Aristotle's obscure remarks about the active power and the activities of the human soul.[81] Alexander, who was a prominent Ancient Greek commentator around the third century C.E. comments in detail that the Active Intellect is a "separately existing substance," radically different from the human intellect and its capacity while the material (i.e., human) intellect has a natural capacity and potentiality.[82] Themistius (317-390), another Greek commentator, also mentions that the Active Intellect is not only "an incorporeal substance" having a separate and independent existence, but also is "an immanent and inherent power" of human cognition.[83] Maimonides accepts the Aristotelian distinction, as explained by Alexander, between the

---

[80] Herbert A. Davidson, *Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Averroes on Intellect: Their Cosmologies, Theories of the Active Intellect, and Theories of Human Intellect* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 134-36. Maimonides elaborates the conception of the Active Intellect acting in union with the primary intelligence, while assigning it as the tenth order of incorporeal intelligences emanated from the First Cause.

[81] Aristotle assumes the existence of the entity as an "active intellect," which is related to all human thoughts and intellections, in a similar manner in which Maimonides names the "tenth intelligence."

[82] Seymour Feldman, *Gersonides: Judaism within the Limits of Reason* (Oxford; Portland, OR: *Littman Library of Jewish Civilization*, 2010), 101. It seems that Alexander was the first to refer to the active powers as 'the Agent, or Active Intellect,' and passive or potential intellect as the material intellect.

[83] Feldman, 108.

Active Intellect and the passive or potential (material) intellect, which is a part of the individual human soul.[84] Gersonides (1288-1344) also postulates a sharp distinction between the passive or potential (material) intellect, which is a part of the individual human soul, and the Active Intellect.[85] Like Maimonides, Gersonides starts with the philosophical principles of creation and the eternity of the universe, while reconciling traditional Jewish beliefs with Aristotelian and Neoplatonic thought.[86] Gersonides follows the Aristotelian principle that the First Cause, who possesses Will, controls the universe and brings the primary incorporeal intelligences into existence.[87] The First Cause then forms the celestial spheres, which are governed by the incorporeal intelligences, out of the eternal and preexistent matter.[88] In this sense, for Gersonides, the Active Intellect, which emanates from "pure thought" of God (i.e., the First Cause), operates and supervises the sublunar world.[89] However, since creation *ex nihilo* is incompatible with physical reality, Gersonides chooses to explain the concept of the Active Intellect in accordance with the Platonic and Neoplatonic systems.[90] The Active Intellect exemplifies an incorporeal form in "a de-particularized and dematerialized manner," in a Platonic sense.[91] However, in Gersonides' theory, Plato's doctrine gradually appears to be diminished by the influence of the Neoplatonic (i.e., emanative) concept of the Active Intellect.[92] For this reason, Gersonides' Active Intellect is not only an incorporeal, transcendent, intellectual substance, but also a derivative of God, which plays a critical role in creating the sublunar world out of the preexistent matters.[93] Gersonides' notion of the Active Intellect appears to follow the Arabic and Jewish Aristotelian consensus, i.e., the assignment of the Active Intellect to "tenth order of incorporeal intelligences."[94] In all, for Gersonides, the Active Intellect is not only the source of the natural or astrological order from "the most general form of the constellations to their last specification, which in turn contains all of the conditions of occurrence of a particular event," but also the cause of prophecy, providence, and miracles.[95] It also possesses comprehensive and systematic knowledge as an essential potentiality bringing about the transformation and embodiment of the material intellect.[96]

---

[84] *Guide* I. 69, pp. 168, 219; *Guide* II. 11, p. 275. Like Aristotle, for Alexander, our human beings have a potential intellect (an active and passive intellect) that actualizes through God and communicates with God, which is identical with the Active Intellect.

[85] Davidson, *Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Averroes on Intellect*, 219.

[86] Jacob J. Staub (trans.), *The Creation of the World According to Gersonides* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), treatise VI, part ii, chapters 1-8. Gersonides deals with the critical questions of the eternity of creation, the immortality of human soul, the nature of prophecy, God's knowledge of particulars, divine providence of individuals, the nature of astronomical bodies and so forth.

[87] Davidson, *Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Averroes on Intellect*, 263. This echoes a Neoplatonic influence on Gersonides' philosophical methodology.

[88] Ibid. For Gersonides, who adopts a model drawn from Plato's *Timaeus* (e.g., *Timaeus* 41-42), the world was created outside of time, through a freely willing Agent (i.e., the Active Intellect). The incorporeal divine unity seems to be incompatible with the idea of Active Intellect, which seems closer to a Neoplatonic (emanatory) tool derived from divine unity. Maimonides appears to solve this incompatibility by arguing for the creation *ex nihilo*.

[89] Davidson, *Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Averroes on Intellect*, 134-36, 263; idem, "Gersonides on the Material and Active Intellects," *Studies on Gersonides* (1992): 231-34; Feldman, *Gersonide*s, 101, 120. Gersonides appears to adopt Aristotelian conception of cognition according to which knowledge is essentially a passive function in which the human mind receives its contents from external sources. This conception distinguishes two aspects in the activity of intellection or knowing: one active, the other passive. See *De Anima* 3.5.

[90] Feldman, *Gersonides*, 120. Nevertheless, Gersonides does not dismiss a profound nexus between them.

[91] Ibid., 117-8.

In this discussion, it is instructive to note that the Islamic philosophical atmosphere, based as it was on Greek philosophy, greatly influenced the flourishing of Jewish philosophy in the Middle Ages.[97] The thought of medieval Islamic philosophers regarding the Active Intellect and its conjunction with the human intellect appears crucial to understanding the thought of Maimonides, Gersonides, and medieval Jewish philosophy more broadly. First of all, Maimonides' epistemology concerning the Active Intellect appears to be similar to that of al-Farabi and Avicenna's ideas. Al-Farabi (872-951), a renowned Islamic philosopher, elaborated on the idea of God's unique ontological status and explained that the First Existent is the First Cause of the existence of all the other existences and is also the Intellect.[98] For al-Farabi, the Active Intellect, which is subordinate to the First Principle, i.e., God, illuminates a form which prepares the human mind (or intellect) for abstract ideas from the outside world and transforms every intelligible conception into action.[99] In actualizing the human intellect, al-Farabi follows Aristotle's view of the necessity of the Active Intellect in transitioning the human intellect from potentiality to actuality.[100] Unlike al-Farabi, for Avicenna (980-1037), the Active Intellect, as the Giver of Form, bestows a form of things, and overflows, in a Neoplatonic sense, with the intelligible forms themselves.[101] In this similar sense, Maimonides also does not reject the Neoplatonic idea of a cosmic overflow (i.e., emanation) from God as part of the creative activities.[102] For Avicenna, the cosmic and emanative overflow not only represents a series of ten emanating separate intellects, each of which is linked to its own celestial sphere, but also eventually leads to the emergence of the Active Intellect as the lowest of the separate intellects through a chain process. Despite the difference between al-Farabi and Avicenna, they agree that the

---

[92] Ibid. Gersonides later uses emanatory terminologies in order to explain the roles and functions of the Active Intellect, which consists of pure thought, and is an integrated concept of the prototype that models the sublunar world.

[93] Davidson, "Gersonides on the Material and Active Intellects," 234, 264; Feldman, *Gersonides*, 116, 120. It is the source of truth and being to which the Active Intellect is subordinate, i.e., the First Intellect or God.

[94] Davidson, 231-34. Gersonides examines the ultimate functions of creation and astronomy in order to understand the nature of divine unity with a broader knowledge and appreciation of God.

[95] Julius Guttmann, *Philosophies of Judaism: The History of Jewish Philosophy from Biblical Times to Franz Rosenzweig* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1964), 217. The terrestrial world is governed by the Active Intellect, and receives its forms. This shows a definite distinction between the creative act of God and the causality of those essences that are produced by God. For Gersonides, miracles are not the direct result of God's act, but are produced by the Active Intellect.

[96] Davidson, "Gersonides on the Material and Active Intellects," 263. The Active Intellect's role in human thought is reduced by its cosmic role. For Aristotle one and the same entity cannot be both in potentiality and actuality with respect to the same activity. The basic metaphysical notion of Aristotle is the distinction between actuality and potentiality.

[97] In the Geonic period, Muslim and Christian systematic philosophies were developed on the basis of Greek philosophy. See Joel L. Kraemer, "The Islamic Context of Medieval Jewish Philosophy," *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Jewish Philosophy*, eds. Daniel H. Frank and Oliver Leaman (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 40-43.

---

[98] Al Farabi, *Political Regime* (*Kitāb al-siyāsa al-madaniyya*) or *The Treatise on the Principles of Beings*, ed. F. M. Najjar (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1964), 32; Al Farabi, *On the Perfect State* (*Mabadi Ara Ahl Al-Madinat Al-Fadilah*), ed. Richard Walzer (Great Books of the Islamic World; Chicago, IL: Distributed by KAZI Publications, 1998), 56; Pines, *Guide*, II.11, 275. Maimonides describes the cosmic and divine overflow from God to the intellects, and to the bodies of the spheres, and eventually to the human intellect and to the body, which is subject to generation and corruption. This implies that the Aristotelian conception of First Cause [i.e., God] and efficient causes appears to be related to the emanative theory in Platonic thought.

[99] Al-Farabi, "The Letter Concerning the Intellect," in *Philosophy in the Middle Ages: The Christian, Islamic, and Jewish Traditions*, trans. Arthur Hyman (Indianapolis: Hackett Pub., 2010), 215-21; Al-Farabi, "On the Intellect," in *Classical Arabic Philosophy: An Anthology of Sources*, trans. Jon McGinnis, and David C. Reisman (Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Company, 2007), 68-78.

[100] Al-Farabi, in "On the Intellect," 68, understands that the Active Intellect is "a purely universal and immaterial principle of intellection" and is clearly "distinguishable from the First Principle or Unmoved Mover."

[101] Majid Fakhry, *Al-Fārābi: Founder of Islamic Neoplatonism: His Life, Works and Influence* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2002), 74-5; Davidson, *Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Averroes on Intellect*, 74-80. For Avicenna, the ideas contained within the Active Intellect are the source for the human intellect's own ideas.

[102] Pines, *Guide* II. 11, p. 275. Maimonides seems to combine Aristotelian ideas about cosmic separate intellects (in *De Anima* 3.5 and *Metaphysics*) with Neoplatonic ideas (e.g., in *Theology of Aristotle*).

Active Intellect is not only a separate reality outside of God and of the human mind but also plays a critical role in the forming of human knowledge.

Interestingly, Averroes (=Ibn Rushd, 1126-1198), who was highly influential on medieval Jewish philosophy, rejects al-Farabi and Avicenna's Neoplatonic descriptions of the Active Intellect, while focusing on the Active Intellect as a "form for us," which is both immanent and transcendent. [103] Averroes presupposes a two-fold existence of the Active Intellect: self-existence and embodiment in individual human beings through cooperation with the intellectual activities of the material intellect.[104] He concludes that the Active Intellect radically denotes "the substantiality of the material intellect."[105] This substantiates the implicit identification between the material intellect and the Active Intellect already suggested by Themistius, the Greek commentator.[106] Themistius also interprets the Active Intellect as not only an incorporeal substance having separate and independent existence but also as an immanent and inherent power of human cognition. The Active Intellect is unaffected, immortal, and eternal. It also replicates a substance of the material intellect. This implies that the survival of the material intellect and true human perfection could only be possible by virtue of cooperation, conjunction, and union with the Active Intellect.[107] The conclusion of the theory of Themistian-Averroistic conjunction was that the material intellect becomes ontologically identical to the Active Intellect.[108] While Themistius implicitly identifies them, Averroes does so explicitly.

---

[103] See Richard C. Taylor, "The Agent Intellect as 'form for us' and Averroes's Critique of Al-Farabi," *Tópicos* (*México*) 29, no.1 (2005): 29-51. The explanation of "form for us" stems from the actuality and potentiality of intellect in relation to object of thought. See also Aristotle, *De Anima* III. 4 (430a), 203-4. For Averroes, the Active Intellect is analogous to a Platonic Form and provides an explanation for the possible diversification of the material intellect. The Active Intellect as the object of the thought of the human intellect can be conjoined by giving up the personality of the human intellect.

[104] Feldman, 115-20. The Active Intellect, which is embodied in individual humans, conveys the sense not only that it is materialized in a body but also that objects of knowledge are instantiated in and derived from bodies.

[105] Ibid.

[106] Ibid, 108.

[107] Ibid. The particular function and operation of the Active Intellect is to stimulate and bring about human intellectual activities. It is also the source of the forms that lead to the generation of substances.

[108] Ibid., 115. The Active Intellect is a source and cause of knowledge because it possesses the knowledge in actuality, which stimulates the material intellect.

However, Maimonides and Gersonides did not agree with the assertion of the Themistian-Averroistic theory. Both concretized and elaborated their epistemology under the influnce of the Islamic Neoplatonized Aristotelian theories concerning the Active Intellect. The first problem for them was a fundamental metaphysical and epistemological difficulty in the Platonic metaphysics found in Averroes' opinion that the Active Intellect as a Form is believed both to be a unitary thing and at the same time, to be demonstrated in many particular objects. The controversial issue, from a metaphysical perspective, was how to individuate the Active Intellect when it is demonstrated in many individuals.[109] For this issue, Averroes postulates that the Active Intellect can be analogous to a Platonic Form, which can preserve both its unity and simplicity, while emphasizing the possibility of the diverse forms of the material intellect diversified from the Active Intellect, which serves as their Form.[110] For Averroes, the human intellect can possess the Active Intellect as the object of its thought by conjoining with it in a manner that abandons the human intellect's personality.[111] In this sense, the human mind (or intellect) eventually appears as a material body through diversification in the "non-personal material conditions," rather than as an "incorporeal substance," as a separable intellect. In contrast, Avicenna, following the Aristotelian concept of the intellect, maintains that each human soul is not merely the human intellect, but is "an incorporeal substance," which is brought into existence together with the generation of a given human body.[112] Averroes' theory, however, asserts that the Active Intellect and material intellects could be numerically and substantially one, and this also necessitates that they could be ontologically one.[113]

---

[109] Gersonides, *The Wars of the Lord,* V. I. 1, trans. Seymour Feldman (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1984), V. I. 4, p. 79.

[110] Feldman, 120.

[111] Ibid. According to Averroes, the human mind signifies a complex of sense-images encompassed in the imagination and the material intellect which contains in the forms of the Active Intellect.

[112] Davidson, *Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Averroes on Intellect,* 134-36.

[113] Feldman, *Gersonides*, 115. The Active Intellect, as a source and cause of knowledge in actuality, stimulates the material intellect. This idea also explicitly appears in Abulafia's conception of *unio mystica* to the Active Intellect, i.e., the unity of intellect (*sekhel*), the one who intellectualizes (*maskil*), and the he/that is who/which is intellectualized (*muskal*). See *Sefer Sitrei Torah* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001), 134b.

Here, another fundamental metaphysical difficulty in the approaches of Avicenna and Averroes triggers the epistemological problem in terms of whether or not the human intellect can be logically and empirically non-personal (or non-individual) if immortality is construed as the survival of the human (material) intellect by means of conjunction with the Active Intellect.[114] In this context, from an epistemological and theological perspective, it was necessary to provide thorough answers about how the doctrine of unity of the Intellect as a Being can be compatible with the concept of personal immortality of the human intellect (or soul) and how the human intellect can participate in the Active Intellect's eternality, as well as how the human intellect, by virtue of the Active Intellect, can be an eternal incorporeal intelligence.[115] Regarding this problem, Alexander implies that the human intellect, which can apprehend these eternal forms of the Active Intellect, will acquire its incorruptibility as "acquired intellect."[116] The consequential form of conjunction (i.e., *devekut*) between acquired intellects and the Active Intellect results in immortality.[117]

However, Gersonides rejects Alexander and Themistian-Averroistic notions of immortality. Gersonides' ultimate goal was neither a human perfection nor a metaphysical and epistemological identification of the material intellect with the Active, which would blur the separation between God and the world.[118] Gersonides elaborates on the philosophical explanation of a personal immortality of the human intellect as an eternal incorporeal intelligence through the Active Intellect while adjusting it with Jewish traditional strands. Gersonides primarily rejects the "eternal procession" or "continual emanation" from God, while supporting a conception of creation "by a virtue of any particular determination."[119] This distinctive conception appears in his conception of knowledge.[120] Gersonides makes a distinction between the general and the particular of divine knowledge, while trying to solve the dilemma of the relationship between divine omniscience and human freedom.[121] For this reason, the direct activity of God is limited even in the creation of world, and God and even the Active Intellect have no knowledge of the particulars.[122] As noted earlier, Gersonides's conception of the Active Intellect as a substance which leads the potential intellect to the actuality of knowledge, is grounded in the Aristotelian concept of the immortality of the human soul.[123] By this logic, Gersonides discusses the "acquired intellect," which can be achieved when the material intellect acquires knowledge of the Active Intellect.[124] Like Alexander, he seemingly recognizes an "isomorphism" between the incorporeal Forms in the Active Intellect and the material forms exhibited in physical substances.[125] However, for Gersonides, the knowledge of human beings is eventually not comparable to that of the Active Intellect, which can comprehend "all the internal relations among natural phenomena." Instead, Gersonides assumes that true human perfection merely means reaching the highest level of the human perfection through the Active Intellect, while rejecting the notion that the material intellect can be ontologically identical to the Active Intellect.[126] In all,

---

[114] Feldman, *Gersonides*, 115-20. As noted earlier, the Active Intellect, which can be embodied in individual humans, can be materialized in a body, and can acquire objects of knowledge that are instantiated in and derived from bodies.

[115] Gersonides, *The Wars of the Lord*, V. I. 4, p. 79. In relation to the Aristotelian view, Avicenna preempts the issue by describing the human intellect as an incorporeal substance brought into existence together with the generation of a given human body.

[116] Feldman, *Gersonides*, 117. Alexander's version of conjunction is then a synthesis of both Platonic and Aristotelian elements.

[117] The concept of immortality is conceptually interlocked with the idea of *unio mystica*, which I will turn to in my discussion of the Jewish mystical tradition.

[118] Feldman, *Gersonides*, 250.

---

[119] As Julius Guttmann, in *Philosophies of Judaism: The History of Jewish Philosophy from Biblical Times to Franz Rosenzweig* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1964), 213, notes, for Aristotle, the "structure of the world" is transferred to the "generation of the world as a whole" in terms of the "eternal procession" of the universe. Maimonides refuses theologically the eternity of the universe in order to save the concept of creation *ex nihilo*.

[120] Ibid., 213. Gersonides's theory of knowledge is based on the Aristotelian conception of cognition in *De Anima* III. 5, according to which knowledge is essentially a passive function in which the human mind receives its contents from external sources, on the basis of the distinction of two aspects of the intellect: active and passive.

[121] Ibid., 215.

[122] Guttmann, 216-7.

[123] In principle, Gersonides' conception of immortality of the human soul is based on the Aristotelian conception that the human soul has the potential and actual continuity with a natural body. See also Aristotle, *De Anima* II. 2, pp. 156-8.

[124] Gersonides, *The Wars of the Lord*, V. I. 8, pp. 170-71. Gersonides (170) notes, "They [the followers of Alexander] maintain that the material intellect is capable of immortality and subsistence when it reaches that level of perfection where the objects of knowledge that it apprehends are themselves intellects, in particular the Active Intellect…[material intellect] is immortal when it is united with the Active Intellect."

[125] Guttman, 217-8.

[126] Feldman, *Gersonides*, 117-8; Daniel Rynhold, *An Introduction to Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2009), 181.

Gersonides' conception of knowledge implies an impossibility of attaining true human intellectual perfection. Such perfection would have to involve a perfect apprehension and union with the Active Intellect, but it is impossible due to an ultimate deficit and failure of human intellectual capacity to acquire cognitive operations and achievements like the Active Intellect.

Like Gersonides, Maimonides also rejects the Themistian-Averroistic notion of immortality, while elaborating the concept of an "acquired intellect," named by Alexander as the human intellect which achieves immortality. However, Maimonides' understanding of the *devekut* and noetic union (i.e., *unio mystica*) actually appears to be ambiguous due to his use of the concepts of gradations and differentiations of human apprehension, which determines their degree of attaining human intellectual perfection.[127] On the one hand, Maimonides remarks that the inevitable limitation of the human intellect appears to hinder the achievement of the true human intellectual perfection.[128] The absence of the fully actualized and perfected intellect of human beings results in the failure of maintaining the conjunction with the Active Intellect. On the other hand, Maimonides elaborates on human intellectual perfection and its ultimate term and meanings by explaining "the intermediation of the Active Intellect" toward first the "imaginative faculty," and thereafter "the rational faculty."[129] In this context, as noted earlier, on the basis of his theory of the Active Intellect, i.e., that God is always the Intellect in *actu*, which is His essence and that human knowledge-formation relies on the activities of the Active Intellect, Maimonides principally follows the Aristotelian logic and postulation that the human soul has potentially eternal life, i.e., immortality.[130] Despite his ambiguous attitude toward human intellectual perfection, it is evident that Maimonides maintains the concept of immortality that the human soul has potentially eternal life in accodance with the Aristotelian logic, and thereby substantiates the ideal of *devekut*, i.e., *unio mystica* (i.e., noetic union) to the Active Intellect.[131]

---

[127] Pines, *Guide* II. 51, 618-28; *Guide* I. 31, pp. 65-67; Cf. *Guide* I. 34, pp. 72-79. Aristotle, *De Anima*, Introduction, 69-70.

[128] Ibid.

[129] Pines, *Guide* II. 36, pp. 369-73.

[130] Pines, *Guide* I. 68, p. 165.

[131] Davidson, "Gersonides on the Material and Active Intellects," 205-6.

Through this long discussion of Maimonides' idea of *devekut* to the Active Intellect, we have seen that Maimonides' identification between the philosophical concept of the Active Intellect and the biblical concept of "angel" implies not only a conceptual change (i.e. intellectualization) of the contents of the Torah but also the conceptual affinity between the Active Intellect and Torah. In addition, Maimonides' idea of *devekut* implies the human intellect's religious experience of God through the angelic image of the Active Intellect. In Maimonides' system, Maimonides's idea of *devekut* necessitates the philosophical medium of the Active Intellect, which is profoundly related to the concept of Torah as a mediator that connects God and human beings. In this sense, the image of Torah implicitly appears in the concept, role, and image of the Active Intellect as an angelic and visible mediator, which fills the gap between the human intellect and God while maintaining God as a transcendent and non-integrated being. Above all, Maimonides' idea of *devekut* to the Active Intellect provides critical insight into the development of the idea of noetic union (i.e., *unio mystica*) in the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions.

In the Thought of Abulafia and Gikatilla based on Maimonides

On the basis of Maimonides's conception of the Active Intellect and its relationship to the ideas of *devekut* and noetic union, I now delve into how he, as well as Abraham Abulafia (1240-1291) and the young Joseph Gikatilla (1248-1305)—two Kabbalists who were mainly influenced by the Maimonidean philosophy—understood the idea of noetic union as uniting with the Active Intellect. Before diving into the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* of medieval Kabbalists, it is necessary to further analyze Maimonides' idea of noetic union, which provides critical insight into the development of the idea of *union mystica* and the formulation of the images of Torah in the history of Jewish mysticism. In this context, it is crucial to examine the Jewish philosophical characteristics of Maimonides in relation to the concepts of *devekut* and a noetic union as he articulated it in *The Guide of the Perplexed*. It is first instructive to note that a similar kind of noetic union in Neo-Aristotelian language appears in the account of the view of the philosopher as presented by Judah Halevi (1075-

1141) in *Kuzari*, an apologetic work completed in 1140, which presents the views of a philosopher, Christian, Muslim, and Jew.[132] According to the philosopher's position, which Halevi rejects, the person of perfection recognizes the Active Intellect himself, and they become One.[133] This unitive language alludes to the ideal of metaphysical union of the Neo-Aristotelian system.[134] Likewise, Maimonides' conception of *devekut*, as Adam Afterman analyzed, appears as a form of "integrative union" into a universal entity i.e., a kind of eschatological noetic union, which was supported by a Neo-Aristotelian structure.[135] This implies that, for Maimonides, the concept of communion in the Jewish Neo-Aristotelian tradition plays a role in fulfilling the process of union, i.e., allowing the human realized intellect to integrate into the divine intellect.[136]

Maimonides elaborates the philosophical concepts of *devekut* in connection with the Active Intellect and human intellectual perfection, which can be found in the explanations for the human intellect's communion and union with the Active Intellect in *Guide* III. 51. Specifically, in the explanation of Moses's highest rank of prophecy in *Guide* III. 51, Maimonides elaborates the features of the noetic union by employing "a set of terms, including *ittihad*," to explain the relationship with the divine and the metaphysical realms.[137] In this context, Afterman finds a major gap between the "early" and the "later" Maimonides, i.e., a contrast between Neo-Aristotelian union and Neoplatonic mystical union in the spectrum of his philosophical system.[138] This shows that the significant difference between the "early" and "later" Maimonides appears to depend on the transition from material existence to noetic existence.[139]

---

[132] Unlike Maimonides' *Guide*, which shows an organized argumentation, Halevi composed the five parts of *The Kuzari* as a series of discussions and arguments with a free-flowing style.

[133] Afterman, *And They Shall Be One Flesh: On the Language of Mystical Union in Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 104-5.

[134] Ibid., 108.

[135] Ibid., 103. As noted earlier, in Maimonides' thought, there are ambiguities aspects in the meanings of *devekut* in relation to the conception of the Active Intellect since Maimonides draws on both the Aristotelian and Neoplatonic systems.

[136] Ibid., 104.

[137] Ibid., 109.

[138] Ibid., 108-9. See also Aviezer Ravitzky, "The Secrets of the Guide to the Perplexed: Between the Thirteenth and Twentieth centuries," in *Studies in Maimonides*, ed. Isadore Twersky (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press: 1990), 165-67.

The "early" Maimonides presupposes that the concept of the Active Intellect is part of a hierarchical system, which can allow a form of communion or union with God according to the level of participation in the divine knowledge.[140] The "early" Maimonides demonstrates a noetic union that leads to becoming an angelic being—or in other terms to the union of the human intellect and the Active Intellect. This can only be reached in death when fully separated from corporeality. For the "early" Maimonides, the idea of union initiates the transformative process into a next stage of existence, i.e., afterlife, but does not mean a complete union with God while alive and even in the afterlife. This implies that union with the metaphysical noetic realm is only possible postmortem.[141] Before death, the human intellect gradually cleaves to the Active Intellect according to the level of its knowledge of intelligibles but does not achieve complete union. The "early" Maimonides, therefore, has a conservative attitude towards the ideal of *devekut*, i.e., a unitive (absorptive) experience, while alive in the world.[142]

By contrast, the "later" Maimonides alludes to a possibility of the noetic union while alive and at the moment of death.[143] He elaborates the dynamics of noetic union with the Active Intellect at the moment of death in a Neoplatonic sense.[144] In the "early" Maimonides, the noetic union can be achieved as a result of conjunction with the Active Intellect in the afterlife, while, according to the

---

[139] Ibid., 109.
[140] Ibid., 116.
[141] Ibid., 108-9.
[142] David R. Blumenthal, "Maimonides' Philosophic Mysticism," *Da'at: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy & Kabbalah* 64/66 (2009): 123. Maimonides, in a sense, might not have been greatly interested in the topic of the human intellect's becoming one with the Divine Intellect by uniting with the Active Intellect. Blumenthal notes that despite his conservative attitude, Maimonides' unitive experience is ultimately directed to a mystical union.
[143] Elliot R. Wolfson, "Via Negativa in Maimonides and Its Impact on Thirteenth-Century Kabbalah," in *Maimonidean Studies*, vol. 5., eds. Arthur Hyman, Alfred L. Ivry, and James Diamond (New York: The Michael Scharf Publication Trust of Yeshiva University Press, 1990-2008), 421. Wolfson explains how Maimonides' unitive terminologies actually have been reinforced through his students and some translators, such as Samuel ibn Tibbon, and how Maimonides came to allow for the possibility of union in the case of the ultimate act of worship and in the highest level of prophecy, i.e., Mosaic prophecy.
[144] Ibid.

"later" Maimonides, a union with the Active Intellect itself is possible "either while barely in the body or at the moment of death or the afterlife."[145] This philosophical reasoning develops the human intellect's conjunction with Active Intellect into a possibility of transforming the human intellect into an angelic being (i.e., a metaphysical entity) that fully identified and united with the Active Intellect at the moment of death or even while alive.[146] As Afterman points out, for Maimonides, the Active Intellect is "an abstract category of angels, not a personal or a specific angel."[147] By this logic, the perfected human being, when united with the Active Intellect, radically transforms into an angelic being. This is a transformation that goes beyond just a correlation or an engagement with an angelic being. On the basis of this theory, Maimonides' noetic union means that the unitive character allows not only for the possibility of transforming the human (material) intellect into a being who fully contemplates noetic metaphysical ideas, but also for possibility of becoming a kind of metaphysical entity, i.e., an angelic being, when the human intellect fully unites with the Active Intellect.[148] Following this reasoning, Maimonides implicitly gives the transformation of the human agent into an angel eschatological significance.[149] In the "later" Maimonides, this union is possible not only as an eschatological noetic union of the afterlife but also while still alive and at the moment of death as in the rare cases of the apotheosis of Enoch and Elijah.[150]

Specifically, it is notable that Maimonides' schema of eschatological noetic union had a very critical impact on the development of radical ideas of *devekut* in early Kabbalah.[151] Among the early

---

[145] Afterman, 107.
[146] See Pines, *Guide* II. 6, pp. 264-65.
[147] Afterman, 125.
[148] Ibid., 103.
[149] Ibid., 119.
[150] Ibid., 119. Afterman also notes, "the pre-medieval notion of transformation through ascension to a higher plane of existence was interpreted as a mystical process, in which the human (as a spiritual entity) unites with the angelic being, associated usually with metaphysical entities, such as the 'active intellect,' '*Nous*,' or a divine grade (*sefirah*), thus transforming the human into that entity" (126). Maimonides describes the union of Moses and the Patriarchs with the Active Intellect as "a kiss of death." See Pines, *Guide* III. 51, pp. 623-28. This also implies that Mosaic prophecy eventually appears as a particular form of *unio mystica*, which operates along with a divine-like image of the Active Intellect as a hidden mediator or even without a mediation of the Active Intellect and thereby formulates a God-like image of Torah.
[151] See Yossef Swartz, "Magic, Philosophy and Kabbalah: The Mystical and Magical Interpretation of Maimonides in the Later Middle Ages," *Da'at: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy and Kabbalah 64-66* (2009):

Jewish mystics and Kabbalists, Abulafia sophisticatedly incorporated Maimonides' theory into his own idea of *devekut* with the Active Intellect. Abulafia's conception of the Active Intellect and Torah and his attendant theory of *devekut* is grounded in Maimonides' eschatological noetic union which, as we have seen, is itself based on Neoplatonic and Neo-Aristotelian philosophies and theologies.[152] In addition, Maimonides's explanation of Moses's highest rank of prophecy in *The Guide of the Perplexed* III. 51, which was examined earlier, is profoundly related to Abulafia's idea of *devekut*.[153] Like Maimonides, Abulafia believes that prophecy can be attained only when one is in a state of conjunction with the Active Intellect.[154] The Active Intellect can lead the human soul from potentiality to actuality through the prophecy, which is generated from the intellectual (rational) and imaginative faculties of the human soul in its two main modes: dream or vision (מארה).[155] For both Maimonides and Abulafia, prophecy is related to the conception of *shefa* (influx), which is emanated from the supernal realms in line with a Neoplatonic thought.[156] The prophetic revelation comes through the intermediation of the Active Intellect, that is, it is the result of a divine overflow, or emanation, upon the rational and imaginative faculties.[157] Maimonides is skeptical about the possibility of perfect prophecy while awake or asleep—something that could only occur through the perfection of the rational and imaginative faculties. According to Maimonides the only exception is

---

99-132 (Hebrew). It can be inferred that the thirteenth century Jewish philosophers and Kabbalists generally recognized the idea of the conjunction between the human soul and the metaphysical realms as reflecting closeness with God.

[152] Ibid.; Idel, *Abraham Abulafia: An Ecstatic Kabbalist* (Lancaster, CA: Labyrinthos, 2002), 145, 149. As noted earlier, Maimonides' schema of eschatological noetic union was essential to the development of key ideas and practices of the early Kabbalists, including Abulafia. Abulafia's views on prophecy and *unio mystica*, were, in turn, influential on the later Kabbalists. His conception of God is not the Neoplatonic God but is close to the Aristotelian God.

[153] Idel, *Abraham Abulafia*, 148-58; Pines, *Guide* III. 51.

[154] Idel, *Abraham Abulafia*, 159. In a manner similar to Maimonides, for Abulafia, prophecy is an emanation entered into human's rational and imaginative faculties by the Divine Being through the medium of the Active Intellect. See Maimonides, *Guide*, II. 36; Isaiah Tishby, *Mishnat ha-Zohar* II (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1957-61), 280-306.

[155] Pines, *Guide* II. 36, 39; II. 44, pp. 394-95. For Maimonides, a vision and a dream are different degrees of prophecy.

[156] Idel, *Abraham Abulafia*, 145, 149; Afterman, *And They Shall Be One Flesh*, 156; Scholem, *Major Trends*, 131-4.

[157] Ibid., *Guide* II. 37, p. 367.

Moses.[158] A critical point that distinguishes Abulafia from the approach of Maimonides is that Abulafia does not accept the superiority of Moses' prophecy. Rather, he develops the concept of prophecy into "the supreme realization of the [intellectual] capacities of human consciousness" in terms of intensifying his personal perception of the mystical experiences.[159] Following this logic, Abulafia notably expresses the resemblance of his prophetic experience to that of the Biblical prophets and even the superiority of his own prophecy to that of Moses, while at the same time identifying himself as the "prophet-messenger" of a higher type than is possible for a "merely" mystical-contemplative person who receives the influx (*shefa*) of wisdom.[160] In other words, for Abulafia, the ideal of *devekut* is to reach the highest level of prophecy through conjunction with the Active Intellect. More importantly, on the basis of the Maimonidean theory that utilizes a philosophical allegory, as noted earlier, Abulafia establishes the "path of the [divine] names" (השמות דרך) in the Torah as references to special forms of the human intellect and separate intellects, including the Active Intellect, which I will further discuss later in this study.[161] Through this theory, for Abulafia, the ideal of *devekut* is to reach the highest level of prophecy through conjunction with the Active Intellect, which is identified with the Torah and the Divine Name in the Torah.[162] In *Sefer 'Or ha-Sekhel* and *Ḥayye ha-'Olam Ha-Ba'*, Abulafia associates the letters of the divine names in the Torah with the Active Intellect as the tenth sphere which "controls all the higher and lower realms," and which is the apparatus for the creation of the world.[163] By this logic, Abulafia uniquely tries to advance his mystical experiences and visions into a unique case, i.e., an integrative union that surpasses the rationalization process of Maimonides' eschatological noetic union.[164] In this sense, Abulafia's strong desire for the *devekut*, i.e., union with the Active Intellect appears to be similar to the paradigm deriving from the radical positions of Islamic philosophers (e.g., Averroes). Abulafia' conception of a state of ecstasy and *unio mystica* means overcoming the boundaries between the human intellect and the Active Intellect, and even God. Therefore, Abulafia's creative and radical approach explicitly contradicts a non-negotiable doctrine of Maimonides, e.g., the ultimate impossibility of the unity of the human intellect and God. Furthermore, Abulafia tries to further conceptualize his own ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* by combining the Jewish mystical ideas, in a larger kabbalistic standpoint, with the philosophical components (Aristotelian and Neoplatonic).

---

[158] Ibid., *Guide*, II. 44, p. 402. Maimonides particularly tried to establish a theoretical principle for prophecy that presupposed the idea of *devekut* and the superiority of Moses's prophecy. Regarding Moses, Maimonides says, "For a prophet can hear only in a dream of prophecy that God has spoken to him. Moses our Master, on the other hand, heard Him from above the ark-cover, from between the two cherubim." See *Guide* II. 45, pp. 395-403.

[159] Abulafia, *Ḥayyei ha-Nefesh* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2011), 63.

[160] Ibid., 150-2. Cf. Abulafia, *Sefer Haftarah* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001), 34, 38. In the introduction, the process of composition of *Sefer ha-Geulah* is described as a similar act to that of the prophets. See Abulafia, *Sefer ha-Geulah* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001), 73b.

[161] Like Maimonides, Abulafia allegorically connects the particular biblical terms (angels and divine names) to the intellect as a universal character. In particular, for Abulafia, the Tetragrammaton appears to designate the Agent Intellect. See *Mafteaḥ ha-Ḥokhmot* (Jerusalem: A. Gros), fols. 23b-24a. The conception of the Torah as a continuum of divine names can be significantly found in Nahmanides' *Commentary on the Torah,* ed. Charles B. Chavel (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1959), vol. 1, 7. Nahmanides also notes that there are the two paths of reading the Torah: the path of the [divine] names and the path of the commandments.

[162] Idel, *Language, Torah and Hermeneutics in Abraham Abulafia* (New York: SUNY Press, 1989), 111.

In this vein, it is crucial to note that in order to explain his conception of *unio mystica* over Maimonides' noetic union, Abulafia strategically combines the Active Intellect and other hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Metatron and *shekhinah*, which are found in the Jewish mystical traditions, and are significantly based on the late antique and medieval Jewish mystical (e.g., the Enochic, Hekhalot, and Hasidei Ashkenazi) traditions. Indeed, he conglomerates the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions manifest from Late Antiquity through the Middle Ages.[165] As noted earlier, we can see a gradual change in the relationship between Metatron and the conception and images of the *shekhinah* in the Enochic, Midrashic, and Hekhalot literature. In this literature, the *shekhinah* appears as an angelic image of Torah which is also identified with Metatron and *Sar Torah*.[166] It is notable that the heritage of *merkavah* mysticism, as it relates to the image of *shekhinah* found in the Talmudic, Enochic, and Hekhalot literature, reappears in the images of *kavod* in the literature of Hasidei Ashkenaz. As Schäfer notes, the speculation of the dimensions of the body of God in *Shiur Qomah* is connected to the descriptions of the angelic beings, such as Metatron and *shekhinah* in *merkavah* (Enochic) literature.[167] As noted earlier, a dual conception of *shekhinah* (i.e., visual *kavod* above invisible *kavod*) allows for a new conception of God and Torah that operates in a combined framework of divine immanence and divine transcendence.[168] In addition, the angelic image of *shekhinah* of *merkavah* mysticism is explicitly identified in *Sefer Hasidim* with the *kavod* understood as a visible glory and as a radiance of the *ḥashmal*.[169] The anthropomorphic and mythologized descriptions of *shekhinah* as a visible *kavod* are a symbolic manifestation of His presence in the world rather than an expression of the divine essence.[170] As Wolfson notes, the speculations about the *shekhinah* in the literature of Hasidei Ashkenaz represent it as an angelic image of a created glory, i.e., *kavod*, rather than of God Himself.[171]

---

[163] Ibid., 38. See Abulafia, *Sefer 'Or ha-Sekhel* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 1998), 46. The Active Intellect, which is the tenth sphere, i.e., the sphere [or wheel] of the letters (הוא גלגל עשירי ר"ל גלגל האותיות), and which is "the most sublime of all the spheres of existence," is identified with the sphere of the Torah which controls the supernal and lower orders. Refer to the English translation in Idel, *Language, Torah and Hermeneutics in Abraham Abulafia*, 38. In addition, Abulafia, in *Ḥayye ha-ʻOlam Ha-Ba* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001), 9, explicitly identifies Torah with the Active Intellect. For Abulafia, the numerical value of the Tree of Life (עץ החיים) is identified with the numerical value of Israel and it secret implies the secret of Israel (סוד ישרא"ל) and of the Active Intellect (שכ"ל הפוע"ל).

[164] Abulafia, *Sefer ha-Geulah* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001), 73b. Hans Jonas, in "Myth and Mysticism: A Study of Objectification and Interiorization in Religious Thought," *Journal of Religion*, 49 (1969): 328, remarks, "having an objective theory, the mystic goes beyond theory."

[165] See Urbach, "The Traditions about Merkabah Mysticism in the Tannaitic Period," in *Studies in Mysticism and Religion Presented to Gershom G. Scholem on His Seventieth Birthday by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends* 1 (1967): 1-28. The angelic descriptions of Metatron (e.g., as the Prince of the Divine Presence, and as a heavenly voice came out from the presence of the *shekhinah*) of *3 Enoch* appear to be dependent on the Talmudic sources. See also Philip S. Alexander, "3 Enoch and the Talmud," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 18, no. 1 (1987): 40-68.

In all, the above analysis demonstrates that the images of the *shekhinah* and Metatron that are part of the *merkavah* vision and are described as a created angelic agent of God or a hypostatic being emanated from God. The angelic images of Metatron and *shekhinah* as a visible *kavod* in relation to the *merkavah* vision corroborate the continuity of the angelic images of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah as a visualized and created mediator, such as Philo's Logos in the Second Temple and early Rabbinic periods. The particular literary and exegetic strategies, which formulate both the angelic images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, explicitly appear throughout the Rabbinic, late antique, and medieval Jewish mystical (Enochic, Hekhalot, and Hasdei Ashkenazi) literature. It is important to recall that the images of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos, as an angelic mediator has a connection to the angelic images of Metatron and *shekhinah* in the Enochic, Rabbinic, Hekhalot and Ashkenazi literature. Furthermore, these continuities and connections between the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah substantially reemerge in the images of the hypostatic notions of the sefirotic system found within the kabbalistic (mainly Abulafian, Gikatillan, and Zoharic) traditions, including, among others, those of Abulafia, Gikatilla, and Zoharic literature.

---

[166] See Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, xvii; xlv; Schäfer, *Synopse*, §§ 235-238.

[167] See Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 306-15.

[168] Ibid. A *kavod* above the *kavod* indicates dualistic conception of *shekhinah*, which appears parallel to the dualistic conception of *ḥokhmah*, i.e., upper *ḥokhmah* and lower *ḥokhmah*.

[169] Scholem, *Major Trends*, 110-15.

[170] See Schäfer, §§ 695-704.

[171] Elliot R. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 13-51. It is evident that the epiphany of God in Ex 24:9-11, Isa 6:1, and Ezek 1 are the most foundational sources for the early Jewish visionary tradition that flourished in post biblical Jewish tradition in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.

I will turn to kabbalistic traditions shortly, but prior to doing so, I would first note that this function and image of *shekhinah* as a created *kavod* also appears in works as disparate as those of Saadia Gaon, Maimonides, Yehuda Halevi, and the Bahir.[172] Saadia Gaon's doctrine of the first-created glory (*kavod*, i.e., *shekhinah*) is identified with both the two forms (inner and outer) of glory, as a created entity, which mainly appear in the Hasidei Ashkenazi literature.[173] As Scholem notes, in the Ashkenazi literature, the image of *shekhinah*, as a created entity separate from God, is related not only to the angelic image of “His Throne of Glory” but also symbolically to the image of personified Wisdom (Prov 8:22), which convey an angelic image of Torah.[174] These angelic images of Metatron and *shekhinah* as created entities explicitly appear in Abulafia’s works, such as *Sefer Sitrei Torah* and *’Oẓar ‘Eden Ganuz*, which demonstrate the identification of various hypostatic notions of Torah with the Active Intellect.[175]

---

[172] Saadia Gaon, *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, trans. Samuel Rosenblatt (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), *Treatise II*. chapter x, 99 (p. 121). Halevi, *Kuzari* 4:3; Pines, *Guide* I. 64, and 76. The conception of a created *kavod* can be originally be found in the work of Saadia. See Scholem, *Major Trends*, 111-13. Scholem, in *Origins of Kabbalah*, 165, also discusses the origin of the "shekhinah as an autonomous entity" by showing the difference between the Talmudic source, *Sanḥ.* 104b, and the late *Midrash Mishle*, 47a. He (165) notes that "it became possible only after unknown aggadists of a later period hypostatized the s*hekhinah* into a divine quality distinct from God himself and capable of engaging in dialogue *with him*." He (167) also notes that, "the fragments of the oldest stratum of the Bahir, whose gnostic character we analyzed earlier, seem to argue in favor of the first hypostasis. Essential for the kabbalistic symbolism was the manner in which the gnostic motif the daughter of light and the aggadic motif of the ecclesia of Israel coalesced in the new conception of the *shekhinah*" as a hypostatized entity. See secs. 43, 45, 52, 98 of the Bahir.

[173] Scholem, *Major Trends*, 110-15. Scholem (111) analyzes that the *kavod*, which conveys the images of a separate entity or a hypostatic creator, firstly appears in Saadia's doctrines. As Scholem notes,that the *shekhinah* as daughter is symbolically related to the tenth sefiah, *malkhut* of God in the Bahiric sources. See also Dan, *Torat ha-Sod shel Ḥasidut Ashkenaz* (Hebrew; Jerusalem: Mosad Bialek, 1968), 119-129, and n. 206 in Scholem, *Origins*, 184.

Furthermore, Abulafia, who interprets the Maimonidean thought along kabbalistic lines, focuses on the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* to the Active Intellect, which he identifies with hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Metatron, Yaho’el, and *shekhinah.*[176] As noted ealier, for Abulafia, the prophetic speech appears not only as the flow received by the power of the imagination as is also the case in medieval Aristotelian epistemology, but also as the flow of the Divine Torah intrinsic in the Active Intellect. The source of true prophecy, therefore, is derived from the Active Intellect, which Abulafia also identifies with the *shekhinah*. Abulafia, in *Sefer Sitrei Torah*, further identifies the Torah, described as a “garment” for the light and glory of God (i.e., *shekhinah*), with the Active Intellect, which contains “the forms of all existence.”[177] In *Sefer Mafteaḥ ha-Ḥokhmot*, he describes the activities of the Active Intellect, understood as the *shekhinah*, of bringing a prophetic speech from *potentia* to actuality.[178] As such, the activities of the Active Intellect are similar to the roles and functions of Torah, and the Active Intellect functions as a perfect mediator between human beings and God. Abulafia eventually concretizes the similarity between the *shekhinah* and Torah in the noetic system of the Active Intellect.[179] By this logic, Abulafia exegetically combines the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as the Active Intellect, Metatron, and *shekhinah* and thereby formulates the images of Torah, especially an angelic image of Torah in a philosophic ethos.

---

[174] Scholem (164) notes that “the Throne of the *shekhinah* [is] substituted for the Throne of Glory” in the Enochic and Ashkenazi literature. See Scholem, *Origins*, 184-6, 178-80; Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, ch. vii, 22-33. Dan, *Torat ha-Sod*, 55-58, also notes that the main interest of the authors of the Hasidei Ashkenazi literature was the relationship of the dualistic doctrines *of kavod* in relation to the secret of prayers to the secret and images of Torah.

[175] Abulafia, *Sefer Sitrei Torah*,132b; idem, *’Oẓar ‘Eden Ganuz* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 760, 2000; 2004/5), 12a. Interestingly, Abulafia conceptualizes prophecy or mystical experience as a dialogue between a human being and his inner essence, i.e., the intellect.

[176] Abulafia, *Sefer Sitrei Torah*, 132b; Lachter, “Kabbalah, Philosophy, and the Jewish-Christian Debate,” 35-36.

[177] *Sefer Sitrei Torah*, 124a; *Sefer ha-Zohar*, ed. Reuven Margaliot (Jerusalem, 1964), *Zohar* I. 34b. See Tishby, *Mishnat ha-Zohar* II (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1971), 369. For Abulafia, in a manner similar to the Active Intellect, the roles and functions of Torah control all deeds and activities of both human beings and celestial spheres.

[178] Abulafia, *Sefer Mafteaḥ ha-Ḥokhmot* (Jerusalem: A. Gros), fols. 23a-b; Idel, *Language, Torah, and Hermeneutics in Abraham Abulafia* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1989), 22, 36-37.

Interestingly, Abulafia's methodology appears to have been deepened and complicated by Joseph Gikatilla, who was a thirteenth-Century Castilian Kabbalist, and studied with Abulafia.[180] Despite his rejection of the general approach of the philosophers, Gikatilla's early seminal work, *Ginnat* ʾ*Egoz,* displays Abulafia's methodology, which combines the philosophical concepts, such as the Active Intellect, with the kabbalistic concepts, such as the *shekhinah*, one of the sefirotic entities.[181] Like Abulafia's linguistic-ecstatic Kabbala, Gikatilla associates the concept of Active Intellect with a theory of mystical transformation originating in *Sefer Yetsirah*.[182] Shlomo Blickstein points out that in Gikatilla's *Ginnat* ʾ*Egoz,* which can be considered a commentary on *Sefer Yetsirah,* there appear many philosophical terms related to a theory of cosmological emanation, which combines Maimonidean and Neoplatonic metaphysics.[183] In this sense, we can detect in *Ginnat* ʾ*Egoz* a strong influence of Abulafia's interpretation of *Sefer Yetsirah*, an interpretation which combines a philosophical and kabbalistic conception of Torah. In this regard, Yehuda Liebes places *Ginnat* ʾ*Egoz* within the history of ancient Jewish traditions related to the commentaries on *Sefer Yetsirah*, while situating it between Abulafia's ecstatic Kabbalah and the Zoharic Kabbalah.[184] Ephraim Gottlieb clarifies that Gikatilla's works were composed in three phases: halakhic (or theurgical) writings, works about letter permutation (*tzerufei otiyyot*) as reflected in *Ginnat ʼEgoz,* and the theosophic works, which include, among others, *Shaʻarei Orah* and *Shaʻare ha-Niqqud*.[185] Gikatilla, in *Ginnat ʼEgoz*, recognizes that philosophers are limited due to "the absence of the knowledge of the foundation of the Torah which is the source of all true science."[186] Despite his rejection of the general approach of the philosophers, Gikatilla's innovative approach in *Ginnat ʼEgoz* is found in his use of linguistic techniques (e.g., letter combination and permutation), which resonates with Abulafia's method of combining the philosophical and ecstatic kabbalistic concepts. As noted earlier, Abulafia's linguistic technique, which is called "path of (divine) names," also appears in Gikatilla's *Ginat ʼEgoz*, which deals with the science of letter-combination (חכמת הצירוף) of the divine names.[187] Abulafia's conception of the Active Intellect has a critical implication for the thought of Gikatilla insofar as it explains the idea of *devekut* and the cosmological system at the basis of the *maʻaseh merkavah.* Gikatilla develops the idea of *devekut* through the angelic images of the Active Intellect relating to *merkavah* imagery, which are conceptual mediators between God and human beings. This shows that Abulafia's correlation between the Hebrew letters and *merkavah* imagery appears to be deepened and made more sophisticated in Gikatilla's methodology, which uses the linguistic techniques and symbolism in formulating the images of Torah.[188] Gikatilla further appears to combine philosophical concepts, such as the Active Intellect, with the *shekhinah,* the lowest level of the sefirotic system.[189]

---

[179] Abulafia, *Ḥayye ha-ʿOlam Ha-Ba*, 41. Herbert A. Davidson, "Alfararbi and Avicenna on Active Intellect," *Viator* 3 (1972): 126-27.

[180] Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," in *Studies in the Literature of Jewish Thought Presented to Rabbi Dr. Alexander Safran*, eds. M. Hallamish and Alei Shefer (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan, 1990), 205. The connection between letter symbolism and *merkavah* imagery can be found in Gikatilla's *Ginnat* ʾ*Egoz* and de Leon's early work.

[181] Cf. Joseph ben Abraham Gikatilla, *Ginnat* ʾ*Egoz* (Hanau: n.p., 1615), 315, 330-38.

[182] Afterman, *And They Shall Be One Flesh*, 172; Idel, *Abraham Abulafia*, 145, 149. Idel notes that Abulafia's prophetic or linguistic-ecstatic Kabbalah is primarily based on the book of creation (*Sefer Yetsirah*) and its Ashkenazi interpretations. In addition, Abulafia's theory of mystical transformation, which is based on Maimonides' Neo-Aristotelian theology, is ultimately aimed at achieving the identification of the human soul (or intellect) with the Divine Name. See Idel, "Reification of Language in Jewish Mysticism," 42-79.

[183] Shlomo Blickstein, "Between Philosophy and Mysticism," 120.

[184] See Liebes, *Ars Poetica in Sefer Yetsira* (Tel Aviv: Schocken, 2000), 174; idem, "How the Zohar was written," *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 8 (1989): 20-25 (Hebrew).

It is notable that, as Wolfson points out, the images of Torah in Gikatilla's writings are intertwined with the sefirotic system through a linguistic symbolism, which appears throughout the classical and late antique texts of *merkavah* mysticism.[190] *Ginnat ʼEgoz* synthetically transforms the secrets of the *maʻaseh mmerkavah* of Ezekiel through the letter-combination of the divine names into the philosophical (Aristotelian and Neoplatonic) concepts, in a manner similar to Abulafia's linguistic techniques.[191] He deals with the mysteries of the letters of the Torah by delineating a semantic and thematic connection between *merkavah* speculation and letter symbolism.[192] Furthermore, in *Ginnat ʼEgoz* (as well as *Shaʻare ha-Niqqud*), the idea of *devekut* appears to play a critical role in connecting the mystery of *merkavah* imagery to the inner entities of the letters of the divine names that appear in the Torah.[193] The connection of *merkavah* imagery to the images of angelic beings can be inferred from Maimonides' interpretation of *maʻaseh merkavah* in *Guide* III. 1-7 and Abulafian theory of *maʻaseh markavah*.[194] By this logic, the divine names in the letters of the Torah appear as angelic powers or celestial beings in a linguistic and mystical relationship with the *merkavah* imagery.[195] This shows that Gikatilla establishes his idea of *devekut* on the basis of Abulafian and Maimonidean schema of eschatological noetic union.

---

[185] Ephraim Gottlieb, *Studies in the Kabbalistic Literature,* ed. Joseph Hacker (Hebrew;Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, 1976), 263; Azzan Yadin, "Theosophy and Kabbalistic Writing," *Pe'amim* 104 (2005): 41-42.

[186] Gikatilla, *Ginnat ʼEgoz,* 106; Scholem, *Major Trends,* 80, 173.

[187] Idel, *KNP*, 97-103.

[188] Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 205.

[189] Gikatilla, *Sha'ar ha-Niqqud*, printed in *Sefer ʻArzei Levanon* (Venice: Giovanni di Gara, 1601), fol. 38a (Appendix, 6), 39b. Cf. Afterman, *And They Shall Be One Flesh,* 221.

Interestingly, Scholem and Asi Farber-Ginat note the resemblance of Moses de Leon's *Or Zaruʻa* to *Ginnat ʼEgoz*.[196] Farber-Ginat shows that, from a text in *Sod Darke ha-ʼOtiyot*, a text that is considered as a source for *ʼOr Zaruʿa*, a combination of the philosophic and mythic features is included. As such, this text embraces both Maimonidean and theosophic approaches.[197] Tishby and Liebes also analyze the mixture of philosophical speculation and linguistic (or mystical) mysticism in *'Or Zaruʿa* through a presentation of de Leon's intellectual development, while showing the relationship between *'Or Zaruʿa* and Gikatilla's *Ginnat 'Egoz*.[198] The relationship specifically appears in the explanations regarding the nexus, found in texts, between angelic beings and the *merkavah* imagery. In de Leon's *'Or Zaruʿa* we find the following expressions of this nexus: "1) the four bearers of the chariot, i.e., the four archangels: Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Nuriel; 2) the supernal chariot, i.e., Metatron or the first intellect which derives from God; 3) the three worlds, i.e., the world of separate intellects, the world of celestial spheres and the world of terrestrial matter; 4) the four corners of the lower world."[199] Likewise, Gikatilla also articulates the nexus between angelic beings and *merkavah* imagery by classifying them as three groups: *ḥashmal, ḥayyot,* and *'ofanim,* which reflect three parts of the medieval Aristotelian (and Maimonidean) classification of the cosmos: the separate intellects, the celestial spheres, and the terrestrial elements.[200]

---

[190] Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 205. See also Elke Morlok, *Rabbi Joseph Gikatilla's Hermeneutics* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 73.
[191] Idel, *KNP*, 97-103; Idel, *Abraham Abulafia*, 195-200.
[192] Morlok, 209.
[193] Idel, *Hasidism: Between Ecstasy and Magic*, SUNY Series in Judaica (New York: SUNY Press, 1994), 59, 278; Afterman, *And They Shall Be One Flesh,* 221; Lachter, "Kabbalah, Philosophy, and the Jewish-Christian Debate," 33.
[194] Pines, *Guide* I. 70-71, pp. 171-75; II. 10, pp. 271-73; III. 7, p. 430. These passages show not only that various aspects of the chariot correspond to different cosmological parts but also that the charioteer corresponds to the transcendent divine being.
[195] Morlok, 47. This angelic being can be approachable only in "the atoms of language" which can create the *merkavah* for the divine.
[196] Scholem, "Eine unbekannte mystische Schrift des Mose de Leon," *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 3/4 (1927): 121, n. 3.; Asi Farber-Ginat, "On the Sources of Rabbi Moses de Leon's Early Kabbalistic System," *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 3 (1983): 67-96 (Hebrew). Scholem and Farber-Ginat regard *ʼOr Zaruʿa* as non-theosophic. Through two newly identified fragments, Bar-Asher shows new evidence about the original structure of *ʼOr Zaruʿa*, and about its relationship with *Sefer ha-Neʼelam*. See Avishai Bar-Asher, "New Fragments from 'Sefer ʼOr Zaruʿa' and 'Sefer Ha-Neʿlam' *Tarbiz* 83, no. 4 (2015):635-642 (Hebrew).

Employing a linguistic symbolism, Gikatilla identifies the three groups with the twenty-two letters of the Torah: 1) *ḥashmal*: "those [letters] which move [others] with an intelligible movement"; 2) *ḥayyot*: "those [letters] with an intelligible movement"; 3) *'ofanim*: "those [letters] which are moved.[201] Through this schema, Gikatilla explicates a profound relationship between the linguistic divisions and arrangements and the cosmological structure.[202] By expliciating the connection between the linguistic features and cosmological structure, he involves the three groups of letters with the *merkavah* imagery.[203] Gikatilla specifically connects *ḥashmal* to the four letters of the Tetragrammaton in relation to *ma'aseh merkavah*.[204] For Gikatilla, the letter combination of the Tetragrammaton in connection with *ma'aseh merkavah* implies a mystical and hermeneutical mechanism for revealing the secret of the *merkavah* imagery and decoding its cosmological functions.[205] Gikatilla, in *Ginnat 'Egoz*, further tries to associate the meanings of the cosmic orders, i.e., the features of *ha-teva* (Nature), with the name *Elohim* and *kisse* (Throne).[206] This association is based on the thought of Abulafia and Maimonides. As previously noted, for Abulafia, basing himself on the thought of Maimonides, the Active Intellect, which is identifed as an angelic being and functions as an intermediary between God and humans, is connected to metaphysical or linguistic entities of the divine realms.[207] Abulafia's identification of *Elohim* and *ha-teva* is suppplemented by means of his interpretation of Metatron as an angelic intermediary (i.e., Metatron or *angelus interpres*).[208] Abulafia conceptually identifies *Elohim* with Metatron, which is identified with the Active Intellect, and thereby denotes the content and its interpretations of the divine names of

---

[197] Ibid.; Asi Farber-Ginat, "A New Passage from Rabbi Joseph Gikatilla's Introduction to Ginat Egoz," *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* I (1981): 159-60 (Hebrew); Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers: Myth and Philosophy in Early Kabbalah* (PhD Diss.; New York University, 2004), 314-15. In *Sod Darke ha-'Otiyot,* the Active Intellect is not the same as the tenth intellect of the medieval Aristotelian tradition but appears to be related to the highest intellect or *ḥokhmah*, which is translated as *nous* (i.e., the Neoplatonic hypostasis) in its closest proximity to God. I will discuss this in detail later in this study.

[198] De Leon, *'Or Zaruʿa*, 251, 283, 285; Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 1:95-6; Liebes, *Studies in the Zohar*, trans. Arnold Schwartz, Stephanie Nakache, and Penina Peli (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1993), 87; Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers*, 318-25.

[199] Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 203; Altmann, "Moses de Leon's *Sefer 'Or Zaruʿa*: Introduction, Critical Text, and Notes," *Qovetz al Yad* 9 (1980): 282-3, 288-90 (Hebrew). In *'Or Zaruʿa*, which contains a classification similar to that in *Sha'ar ha-Niqqud*, de Leon identifies *alef*-Michael, *bet*-Raphael, *gimmel*-Gabriel, *dalet*-Nuriel, which are identified as the "secret of the chariot" (*sod ha-merkavah*), and which are also referred to as the first four letters, אבגד.

[200] Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 203-5.

[201] Morlok, 210; Gikatilla, *Sha'ar ha-Niqqud*, fols. 33a-38b.

---

[202] Gikatilla, *Sha'ar ha-Niqqud*, fols. 36-38b.

[203] Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 210; *Sha'ar ha-Niqqud*, fols. 33a, 33b, 36-38b. The identification visions of celestial beings of *merkavah* imagery (i.e., *ḥayyot*) with the letters also appears in *Tiqqunei Zohar*.

[204] Gikatilla, *Sha'ar ha-Niqqud*, 37b; Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 210-11.

[205] Idel, *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1988), 30-37, 100-105; Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 339; Idel, *KNP*, 97-103; Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 212.

[206] Gikatilla, *Ginnat 'Egoz*, fols. 5c, 5d, 12d, 13a, 13b. The *gematria* of *Elohim* (=*Ha-Kisse*), which already appeared in the works of Abulafia, recurs in Gikatilla's work several times. Unlike Nature, there is an explanation of *Elohim* as a created hypostatic entity, which emerged with the creation of the world.

[207] Afterman, *And They Shall Be One Flesh*, 126, 152; Idel, *KNP*, 243-44; idem, "Defining Kabbalah," 97-122; idem, *Studies in Ecstatic Kabbalah*, 5-7. As we have examined for Maimonides (*Guide* II. 36, 37), through the medium of the Active Intellect, prophecy is an emanation into the human's rational and imaginative faculties. Abulafia incorporates this theory of prophecy into his own idea of *devekut* and *unio mystica* to the Active Intellect. This logic indicates that both the Active Intellect and a being united with the Active Intellect can be angelic beings.

[208] Afterman, 186; Idel, *Studies in Ecstatic Kabbalah*, 6.

Torah.[209] By this logic, Abulafia creates his own ideas of *devekut* and noetic union to the hypostatic notions in relation to the divine names of Torah by merging the languages of Neo-Aristotelianism and Neoplatonism with the rabbinic and kabbalistic concepts, such as Metatron and *shekhinah*.[210] On the basis of Abulafia's theory, Gikatilla further elaborates on the relationship between *Elohim* and the Tetragrammaton.[211] *Elohim,* in *Ginnat 'Egoz,* stands not only for an angelic being (i.e., Metatron or a mediator created by *Ein Sof* through *ḥokhmah*), but also for the separate intellects, especially the Active Intellect as the tenth intellect, which is eventually identified with Torah.[212] This implies that both Abulafia and Gikatilla create an angelic image of Torah as a visible mediator in the images of the hypostatic notions in the *merkavah* imagery in relation to the divine names, which combine philosophic, rabbinic, and kabbalistic concepts, in order to express the mystic experiences of *devekut*.

In summary, this examination shows not only how the Active Intellect is conceptually related to other hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos, Metatron, *shekhinah*, and the divine names, but also how the *devekut* to the Active Intellect was developed into the idea of noetic union or *unio mystica* in the medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions. In the thought of Maimonides, Abulafia, and Gikatilla, the idea of *devekut* to the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Active Intellect and Metatron in relation to the divine names, implies the human soul (or intellect)'s mystical experience of God through the Active Intellect as an angelic and visible mediator. In this sense, this idea of *devekut* necessitates an angelic image of the (Logos-centered) hypostatic notions of Torah as a visible mediator between God and human beings. This substantiates that the angelic image of Torah, which mainly appears in the images of the Active Intellect, is more concretely revealed in the context of *devekut*, which bridges the gap between the human intellect and transcendent and non-integrated God. As examined earlier, Maimonides' conception of the Active Intellect, which is mainly identified with the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos, was predominantly transferred into Abulafia's conceptions of the Active Intellect in regard to the idea of *devekut*. Maimonides provides Abulafia with critical philosophical and hermeneutical principles for understanding the idea of *devekut* in relation to the Active Intellect. Abulafia develops Maimonides' theory of prophecy while following Maimonides' theological and philosophical positions regarding the Active Intellect. In comparison to Maimonides, Abulafia radically extends the meaning of *devekut* to union with the Active Intellect. Unlike Maimonides, Abulafia, like the Islamic philosophers, boldly appears to cross the boundaries of the separation between the human intellect and the Active Intellect. For Maimonides and Gersonides, the idea of the human intellect's communion, or even union, with the Active Intellect supposes a non-negotiable border between God and human beings, which allowed them to preserve divine simplicity. By contrast, Abulafia develops Maimonides' idea of *devekut* into a new theory of the *devekut* by combining and reconceptualizing kabbalistic and philosophical (Aristotelian and Neoplatonic) terminologies rather than just relying on a specific philosophical tradition. In comparison to Maimonides, Abulafia actively uses Neoplatonic philosophy (i.e., the emanation theory) for the concept of *devekut* to the Active Intellect to enhance the position of the mystical and kabbalistic traditions. Abulafia, in the process of integrating the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions, appears to focus on the *devekut* to the Active Intellect, which is identified with both the sefirah of *shekhinah* (in the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions) and Metatron (in the Logos-centered hypostatic notions). This shows that Abulafia elaborated not only a way of expressing the mystical experiences of divine realms explainable and understandable using a philosophical logic but also thereby a method of achieving the *devekut* and *unio mystica* through the linguistic technique of letter combination and permutation of the Tetragrammaton.

---

[209] Idel, *Abraham Abulafia,* 16-50, 240-7, 293-7. The shared identity of the Active Intellect and the Torah is related to their similar roles of ordering all phenomena of the material world. The Tetragrammaton stands for the divine Being when standing by Himself, while *Elohim* is identified with "the divine anthropomorphic structure," as in *Shiur Qomah,* and is the first created entity.

[210] Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," 234-7. As Afterman, in *And They Shall Be One Flesh,* 186, notes, the human soul's conjunction and union with or, in other terms, absorptive transformation into the Active Intellect can also be found in the works of R. Isaac of Acre, such as *Sefer Me'irat 'Einayim*.

[211] Gikatilla, *Ginnat 'Egoz,* 22a.

[212] In a manner similar to Maimonides and Abulafia, for Gikatilla, the identification of the Active Intellect with the Torah is related to their similar characters ordering all phenomena of the material world. Cf. Shlomo Pines, *Scholasticism after Thomas Aquinas and the Teachings of Hasdai Crescas and his Predecessors* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1967), 4-5 (Hebrew).

Principally based on Abulafia's theory and linguistic system, Gikatilla's *Ginnat 'Egoz* also formulates an angelic image of Torah, which is identified with *shekhinah* or the Active Intellect, and is accessible for the *devekut* of the human soul (or intellect). Both the Abulafian and Gikatillian traditions combine the philosophic, rabbinic, and kabbalistic ideas in the hypostatic notions, such as Metatron, *shekhinah*, and the Active Intellect, in relation to *merkavah* imagery. Like Abulafia, in order to explain the reality of *devekut*, Gikatilla associates the image of Torah with an angelic, hypostatic, and visualized mediator, which is further identified with philosophic, rabbinic, and kabbalistic concepts of the hypostatic notions in *merkavah* imagery. As noted earlier, in *Ginnat 'Egoz*, we can also see the Maimonidean and Abulafian influences, such as the use of the philosophical concepts (i.e., the Active Intellect), which are identified with the sefirotic entities, like *shekhinah* and *hohkmah*. Using linguistic techniques, like Abulafia, Gikatilla identifies the various hypostatic notions of Torah, such as the Active Intellect, Metatron, and *shekhinah*, and reconfigures them against the backdrop of the *merkavah* imagery.[213] This shows that the linguistic techniques also connect the *merkavah* imagery, such as angelic entities, to the divine names in the letters of the Torah.[214] Gikatilla's innovative approach in *Ginnat 'Egoz* includes the use of linguistic techniques, such as letter combination, on the basis of Abulafia's philosophical influences. Taken together, my analysis of the thought of Abulafia and Gikatilla corroborates that an angelic image of Torah appears in the letters of the divine names of the Torah, especially in the Divine Name (i.e., the Tetragrammaton) in relation to the *merkavah* imagery. We can also see that an angelic image of Torah appears as a visualized mediator, which fills a gap between God and human beings through the idea of *devekut*. This further substantiates that the thought of Maimonides, Abulafia, and Gikatilla's early works presupposes an ontological gap between God and human beings within a philosophical framework based on the divine transcendence which necessitates the active operation of *devekut*.

---

[213] Scholem, *Major Trends*, 80, 173; Gikatilla, *Ginnat 'Egoz*, 106. Abulafia distinguishes between the logic of Aristotle and the inner logic of Kabbalah.
[214] Gikatilla, *Ginnat 'Egoz*, 280-81.

Chapter IV: A God-like Image of Torah in the Medieval Jewish Mystical Tradition

The Continuity of God-like Images of Torah in the Sefirot

Now I will examine details regarding the dynamic interactions and continuities between the primitive forms of the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah in the Second Temple period and their transitional or full-fledged forms of the hypostatic notions of Torah in the late antique and medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions. It is first beneficial to recall that the intertextual and theological relationships between the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, which were manifest in the Wisdom-centered tradition in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods, substantiate the God-like image of Torah. For instance, we have seen various examples of the God images of Torah: in the activities and images of the personified Wisdom figures as a sage or master in the works of the Wisdom-centered tradition, including Proverbs, *Sirach*, *Wisdom of Solomon*, and the Qumran texts, as well as in the images and activities of Jesus as a sage or teacher possessing profound wisdom of the Torah in the Synoptic Gospels. It is notable that the hypostatic notions of Torah in the Wisdom-centered tradition functions as a non-visualized mediator, rather than as a visualized mediator, as found in the Logos-centered tradition. Furthermore, as examined above, the angelic images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos, Metatron and *shekhinah*, as they relate to *merkavah* imagery as understood in philosophically inclined sources, also convey God-like images of Torah, which were dynamically formulated and developed in the late antique Jewish mystical and kabbalistic traditions.

Specifically, the images of Metatron and *shekhinah* convey not only an angelic image of Torah, as depicted in the *merkavah* imagery, but also a God-like image of Torah symbolized as a dwelling place for the hidden presence of God. Their images appear to be involved with an anthropomorphic and mythic strategy, which expresses the divine presence throughout the Rabbinic and late antique Jewish mystical (Enochic, Hekhalot, and Hasidei Ashkenazi) literature. It is notable that the images of *Sar Torah* in the Enochic and Hekhalot literature, which convey an angelic image of Torah identical to Metatron as "a Second Divine Manifestation," also illuminate a God-like image of Torah in which the roles and functions of *Sar Torah* reveal the secrets of the Torah as in the activities and images of transcendent and personified Wisdom.[1] Indeed, the images of *Sar Torah* are expressed by the anthropomorphic images of Metatron as a "father" or "sage" who instructs children in the wisdom of Torah, as attested to in the Talmudic and Rabbinic literature (e.g., b. *Avod. Zar*. 3b, *Num. Rab*. xii, 15) and in 3 *Enoch* (e.g., 3 *En.* xlviii, C:12).[2] The anthropomorphic "father" or "sage" images are reminiscent of the God-like images of personified Wisdom and Jesus in the Gospels, which appear as a God-like image of Torah.[3] Odeberg also notes that the images of Metatron (and *shekhinah*) in the Hekhalot texts known as 3 *Enoch*, convey both an angelic image of Metatron as "Youth" (*na*'*ar*) and a God-like image as a "lesser YHWH," bearing the Divine Name in the Enochic and Hekhalotic literature.[4] Martin Cohen also explains that in section D in the *Shiur Qomah*—a text closely related to Hekhalot literature—R. Ishmael, who plays a key role in the narration of the *Hekhalot Rabbati*, recounts Metatron's explanation of the measurements of the body of God.[5] These descriptions of Metatron imply that, in addition to an angelic image of Torah on the figure of Metatron, we can see the God-like image of Metatron as a divine agent who rules and supervises all the angels as כלים (*hayyot, ofnanim, kerubim, serafim*) in the context of the *merkavah* imagery. Furthermore, the God-like image of Metatron is primarily based upon Metatron's relationship with the Tetragrammaton, insofar as Metatron is referred to as "lesser YHWH" bearing the Divine Name and is applied to the verse "My Name is in Him" (Ex 23:21).[6]

---

[1] Scholem, *Majors Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 77-78; Schäfer, *Synopse*, §§ 281-294; 3 *En.* iii-xvi, and xlviii. Metatron in 3 *Enoch* functions not only as an angelic intermediary of "the Prince of the Presence," but also as a second manifestation of the Deity. Cf. Schäfer, *Synopse*, §§ 206-213. This implies that the image of *Sar Torah* as Metatron is related to the images of personified Wisdom.

[2] Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God," 105. Metatron appears in a "sage" like image in rabbinic sources, including in passages from b. '*Abod. Zar*. 3b, *Num. R*. xii. 15, and elsewhere, whereas in the Enoch-Metatron material in *Synopse* §78-80 (*3 Enoch* xlviii. D:6-10) we find an angelic image of *Sar Torah*, as we also find in various other Hekhalot writings, including *Merkavah Rabbah* and *Ma'aseh Merkavah*.

[3] Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God," 105; cf. b. *Avod. Zar*. 3b, *Num. R*. xii. 15; 3 *En.* xlviii. C:12.

[4] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, PART II, 6-7. In 3 *En.* iii, we read, "In that hour, I asked Metatron, the angel, the Prince of the Presence: What is thy name?" He answered me: "I have seventy names, corresponding to the seventy tongues of the world and all of them are based upon the name Metatron, angel of the Presence; but my King calls me 'Youth.'" In 3 *En.* (e.g., v-vii; xi-xii, xviii; xix-xxvi; xlviii), the Divine Name of "the lesser YHWH" (Ex 23: 21) is given to Metatron. This substantiates a God-like image of Metatron.

[5] Martin S. Cohen, *The Shiur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983), 197-214.

As noted above, the God-like image of Metatron can be observed in the activities and images of *shekhinah* as presented in Hekhalot literature. The dualistic conception of the angelic and God-like images of *Sar Torah* and Metatron also reemerges in the dualistic conception of the angelic and God-like images of *shekhinah*. As Hugo Odeberg notes, the images of *shekhinah* as part of the dualistic conception of the throne of glory in the *merkavah* visions is connected to the God-like image of *shekhinah* in the Enochic and Hakhalot literature.[7] As examined earlier, in the Mishnaic and Talmudic literature, the *shekhinah* appears as a direct expression of God Himself, insofar as God is present in a specific place or event. This shows that the image of *shekhinah* is symbolically depicted as God-like in mythic and anthropomorphic imageries that are open to human comprehension.[8] As it also does in the Talmudic, Midrashic, and Hekhalot literature, in the literature of Hasidei Ashkenaz, we can also find a God-like image of *shekhinah* in the descriptions of an inner glory (*kavod penimi*) and invisible *kavod* (i.e., *shekhinah*), which is both a symbolic manifestation of His presence in the world, and a God-like image identified with His holiness and God Himself.[9] This shows that in contrast to the angelic image of *shekhinah* as a created and visible glory, which appears on the throne of the *merkavah*, the image of the *shekhinah* takes on God-like characteristics in the image of an invisible glory emanated from God.[10] The image of *shekhinah* as God-like is invisible, only accessible in this world through symbolism rather than directly, and not more fully accessible until the eschatological period. This substantiates that the God-like images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Metatron and *shekhinah,* are dynamically formulated by a hermeneutic strategy of employing mythic and anthropomorphic imagery to express the divine presence, which is manifest throughout Rabbinic and late antique and medieval Jewish mystical (Enochic, Hekhalot, and Hasidei Ashkenazi) literature. In all, this examination shows that the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Metatron and *shekhinah*, are grounded in the combination of the rabbinic, philosophical, and Jewish mystical concepts of Torah and theological concepts of God, as examined earlier. This demonstrates that the images of Metatron and *shekhinah* convey both an angelic image and a God-like image of Torah as in the dualistic conception of the hypostatic notions of Torah in late Rabbinic and late antique Jewish mystical literature.

---

[6] See 3 *En.* v-vii; xi-xii, xviii; xix-xxvi; xlviii. These passages explain "the seventy names of the Most High" and the Divine Name of "the lesser YHWH." This shows that the divine names are primarily based upon the Tetragrammaton, in relation to the verse "My Name is in Him" (Ex 23:21).

[7] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, PART II, 76-89. In 3 *Enoch*, there are detailed descriptions of *merkavah*: the ascent and descent of the angels between the distance of "12 myriads of parasangs" (3 *En.* xxii); the winds blowing under the wings of the *kerubim*" (3 *En.* xxiii); "the different chariots of the Holy One, blessed be He" (3 *En.* xxv and xxiv), *ofannim* (3 *En.* xxv). These Talmudic passages reflect a somewhat later stage of development than that of 3 *Enoch*. The images of Metatron appear as an angelic and anthropomorphic image in the Talmudic literature, such as b. *Ḥag.* 15a; b. *Sanḥ.* 38b.

[8] Cohen, *The Shiur Qomah: Texts and Recensions* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983), 51-76, 134-47.

[9] Scholem, *Major Trends*, 105-16. Scholem also discusses the dualistic conception of *kavod* as "holiness" and "greatness" in Hasidei Ashkenazi literature. The "holiness" alludes to the formless glory (*kavod*) of the divine attributes, while the "greatness" indicates the kingdom (*malkhut*) ministered by the angelic beings (*cherub*) on the throne of the *merkavah* imagery. Cf. Odeberg, 3 *Enoch*, xlviii, 174, Introduction, 189. I will discuss later in

In this context, I will delve into how these hypostatic notions were developed, transformed, and formulated into the God like image of Torah as they were conceptually joined with the sefirotic system throughout thirteenth century Kabbalah. I will also try to prove the continuities, interactions, and relationships of the primitive forms of the hypostatic notions of Torah in the Second Temple period with their transitional or full-fledged forms, such as the Metatron and the Active Intellect, and *shekhinah* and sefirot in the late antique and medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions. As Joseph Dan notes, it is evident that the sefirotic system is related to the hypostatic notions such as Metatron and *shekhinah* in early Jewish mystical texts (e.g., *merkavah* mysticism in the Talmudic and Hekhalot literature, as well as the Bahir)- that is, to the history of ancient Jewish mysticism- despite

---

detail the development of these features and images of *shekhinah* and Metatron in *merkavah* mysticism as they permeated into the Abulafian and Gikatillian traditions in connection with the other hypostatic notions.

[10] In the dual conception of the images of Metatron, the God-like image of Metatron also appears as a hidden mediator who bridges the gap between God and human beings.

the ambiguousness of the precise historical relationships.[11] Wolfson demonstrates that the distinction between God and the *shekhinah* and Metatron as angelic mediators, which is found in the Talmudic and late antique Jewish mystical literature, is gradually blurred in the literature of Hasidei Ashkenaz.[12] He also shows that, in Nahmanides' system, there is a continuity between God and angelic beings in a sense of the divine immanence that blurs the distinction between the hypostatic notions of Torah and God.[13] This implies that the hypostatic notions of Torah eventually appear to be symbolically identified and absorbed within the sefirotic system in the Kabbalistic texts. It is also notable that the dualistic conception of the images of *shekhinah*, as reflected in Metatron, appears to be dynamically developed into the images of the ten hypostatic powers known as sefirot in the early and thirteenth century kabbalistic traditions. It is also notable that, as Shlomo Pines explains, Nahmanides views the *shekhinah* as not separate from God, as opposed to the conception of *shekhinah* as a created being, which is found in Justin Martyr's dialogue with Trypho the Jew, Saadia's theology, and Maimonides' thought.[14] Nahmanides's assertion, as Scholem and Mopsik explained, is related to the interpretation of the rabbinic dictum of "the cutting of the shoots." This rabbinic dictum means an isolation of the idea of Logos or Metatron as a hypostasis, or a disconnection of the Logos named Metatron from God since this idea is a transgression of the commandments.[15] This shows that the controversial issues regarding the understanding of the sefirot as hypostatic entities and the inclusion or exclusion of the hypostatic notions of Torah within the Godhead are explicitly related to the conceptualization of the sefirot in the early kabbalistic traditions.

---

[11] Joseph Dan, "Three phases of the History of the Sefer Yezira," *Frankfurter Judaistiche Beitrage* 21 (1994): 7-29;

[12] E. Wolfson, "Metatron and Shi'ur Qomah in the Writings of Haside Ashkenaz," in *Mysticism, Magic and Kabbalah in Ashkenazi Judaism*, eds. Karl E. Grözinger, and Joseph Dan (Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2012), 60-92.

[13] E. Wolfson, "The Secret of the Garment in Nahmanides," *Da'at* 24 (1990): xxv-xlix.

[14] Pines, "God, the Divine Glory and the Angels according to a 2nd Century Theology," *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought,* 6:3-4 (1987): 1-14 (Hebrew). Above, we have examined the identification between the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah as angelic mediators, e.g., *shekhinah* (or divine glory), and the Word of God (or the Logos or *memra*), all terms used to describe the presence of God in the world. This identification is found, for instance in Justin Martyr's s dialogue with Trypho.

[15] Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition*, 2nd ed. (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965), 16.

In order to understand the formative development of the sefirot in relation to various hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Metatron, *shekhinah*, and *ḥokhmah*, which were manifest from Late Antiquity through the Middle Ages, it is first necessary to look into *Sefer Yetsirah* (i.e., the Book of Creation) and *Sefer ha-Bahir*. *Sefer Yetsirah,* which deals with the subjects of cosmology and cosmogony, particularly contains the concept of the sefirot (as ten mathematical principles) through which God formed the universe.[16] This idea of the sefirot also concerns the inner dynamics of the divine and the symbolic contemplation of the divine nature and attributes.[17] In Kabbalistic literature, God as Infinite is referred to as *Ein Sof* prior to the emanation of the ten sefirot. On the one hand, the sefirotic system also is depicted in mythic and anthropomorphic terms, often drawn from Biblical and Rabbinic literature. On the other hand, they express metaphysical, mathematical, and linguistic components and their permutations, in terms taken from philosophical sources. This allows the sefirot to allude to the totality of the hypostatic notions of Torah, insofar as they holistically combine the biblical, philosophical, rabbinic, and mystical concepts of Torah. The first sefirah, *keter* is identified with the all-transcending glory or divine will (i.e., inner or invisible *kavod*) of God. This is understood by Kabbalists as the totality of the Written and Oral Torahs. The second sefirah, *ḥokhmah*

---

[16] It is evident that the concept of the sefirot in *Sefer Yetsirah* is fundamentally related to the core ideas regarding the hypostatic notions of Torah, which mainly originated in the Biblical, Rabbinic and Second Temple and late antique Jewish mystical sources. Steven Wasserstrom argues that the concept of the sefirot was greatly influenced by interactions with Greek, Gnostic, and Islamic mystical traditions in the 8th and 9th centuries. In his view, the work also shows the influences of Greek esoteric cosmological ideas. See Wasserstrom, "Sefer Yesira and Early Islam: A Reappraisal," *The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 3, no. 1 (1994): 1-30. By contrast, Peter Hayman detects the influence of Valentinian Gnosticism, Pseudo-Clementine, and similar writings. Accordingly, he sees a late-second or early-third-century Syrian origin of *Sefer Yetsirah*. See Hayman, "The Temple at the Center of the Universe: Some Observations on Sefer Yetsirah," *Journal of Jewish Studies* (1984): 176-82. Most recently, Tzahi Weiss has argued that *Sefer Yetsirah* is "a rare surviving Jewish treatise written and edited around the seventh It also shows the influences of Greek esoteric cosmological ideas on its origin and formative process of the *Sefer Yetsirah*. By contrast, Tzahi Weiss claims that *Sefer Yetsirah* is "a rare surviving Jewish treatise written and edited around the seventh century by Jews who were familiar with Syriac Christianity and were far from the main circles of rabbinic learning" (2). See Weiss, *Sefer Yetsirah and Its Contexts: Other Jewish Voices* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018), 2-5.

[17] Shlomo Pines, "Points of Similarity between the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Sefirot in the Sefer Yezira and a Text of the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies: The Implications of This Resemblance," *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 7, no. 3 (1989): 66-74. Saadia Gaon wrote commentaries on the book. Kabbalists took the text as foundational, adopting the term sefirah and changing its meaning to refer to the attributes of God.

(i.e., Wisdom), is identified with preexistent Torah. The third sefirah, *binah* (i.e., Logos) is identified as the vessel in which God shaped all the letters of the Torah, and the tenth sefirah, *shekhinah*, alludes to not only the created and visible glory but also the divine presence. This shows that the earlier hypostatic notions of Torah, such as *shekhinah* and Metatron in relation to *merkavah* imagery in the Second Temple, Rabbinic, and late antique Jewish mystical literature, as well as the literature of Hasdei Ashkenazi literature, were developed into the full-fledged forms and theosophic ideas of the sefirotic system of the early and thirteenth century Kabbalah.

In all, this substantiates that the primitive forms of the hypostatic notions of Torah in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods were dynamically developed, through the philosophical and theological interactions between the biblical**,** philosophical, rabbinic, and Jewish mystical concepts of Torah into the sefirotic system as an entire matrix of the full-fledge forms of the hypostatic notions of Torah in the Middle Ages. It is also conceivable that the characteristics of the innovative rabbinic approaches (i.e., literary, exegetical and rhetorical) which show Hellenistic influences, had a significant impact on the dynamic change and development of the concepts and images of Torah, and on the hypostatic notions of Torah, which were intertextually and theologically interconnected during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.

In this context, I will further elucidate how the various concepts and images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, which were dynamically developed during the Second Temple and later Rabbinic periods, contributed to the emergence and development of Kabbalah, which flourished in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in Provence and Spain. I will delve into the bahiric and early kabbalistic understanding of the sefirot in relation to the concepts of God and the images Torah. I will also eludicate how the sefirotic system is related to the conceptions of the divine unity and divine essence and thereby how these formulate a God-like image of Torah. It is first notable that Scholem notes that the kabbalistic approaches to the concepts of God are distinctive from the philosophical approaches. It is evident that the concept of the divine unity defined as absence of composition, based on the Neoplatonic system, was eventually developed into apophatic theology, which was the core of

Maimonidean thought.[18] By contrast, Kabbalah, which contains a mythic and anthropomorphic depiction God, appears to be different from the Neoplatonic conception of God. In order to explain the difference between the philosophic and mythic conceptions of God, Scholem points out, kabbalistic symbolism is incompatible with philosophical allegory on the basis of the antinomy between myth and philosophy.[19] This means that philosophical allegory has "its own meaningful context" at first, but "its own meaning" is lost and becomes a vehicle for an other something.[20] By contrast, the symbolism alludes to the immediacy and vitality, which intuitively projects a "momentary totality" of an inexpressible something.[21] As Ernst Cassirer describes, the discursive nature of philosophic thought that values a philosophic system of meanings and relationships is different from the intuitive nature of symbolic thought that values instinctual implications in the mystical experience.[22] In this sense, philosophical allegory is linear, logical, abstract, and discursive, while kabbalistic symbolism is circular, immediate, concrete, and intuitive. As noted earlier in Philo's idea of *unio mystica*, symbolism conveys an "intuitive illumination" of thought like a "beam of light" that arises from "existence and cognition," which abruptly provokes and penetrates something.[23] As Scholem and Wolfson discussed it distinguishes the concept of the purity of God on the basis of philosophical allegory, which highlights divine simplicity and transcendence, from the mythic concept of God on the basis of kabbalistic symbolism.[24] The kabbalistic concept is nourished by a dynamic conception of "living God": revealed (known) and concealed (unknown), which is described using a mythic discourse.[25] In other words, for the Kabbalists, the living God is not only a purer theological concept, one cannot be negated by apophatic theology, but also a dynamic entity, which can be expressed by mythic and kabbalistic symbolism that creates various concepts of God and the images of Torah. Liebes, in a manner different from Scholem's approach, entrenched as it is in the contrast between and the mythic aspect of Kabbalah and philosophy, tries to discover the significance of a mythic thinking, which was already indigenous and inherent in the history of Jewish mystical tradition.[26] Liebes thus considers the continuity between an ancient Jewish and rabbinic myth and the kabbalistic myth by examining a mythic "continuum extending from the biblical to the kabbalistic conception of divinity."[27] Wolfson also understands the mythic aspects of the Kabbalistic sources as a continuous culmination of ancient Jewish mystical and rabbinic traditions, while nevertheless comparing them to their philosophical themes in the Maimonidean thought.[28] It is crucial to note that as Frank Talmage notes, there are profound interactions between the allegorical and symbolic interpretations of aggadic sources in ancient and late antique rabbinic traditions.[29] Talmage discusses the intertwined features of *remez* (philosophical allegory) and *sod* (kabbalistic symbolism) in Rabbinic literature.[30] As Scholem notes, the medieval Kabbalists regarded Rabbinic midrash as repositories of mystical traditions, and specifically, like Maimonides, interpreted the esoteric subjects of *aggadot* regarding *ma'aseh bereshit* and *ma'aseh merkavah*.[31] Like Maimonides, they appear to understand that the linguistic techniques, which are based on allegory and symbolism, can protect the esoteric meanings in the Torah.[32] In particular, they discussed, in accordance with the two intents of Proverbs, the two levels of wisdom: an exoteric level, which conveys practical wisdom, and an esoteric (philosophical or symbolical) level, which derived from an inner or hidden wisdom, i.e., personified Wisdom as a hypostatic notion, which is identified with primordial Torah.[33] As Dauber notes, some medieval Kabbalists, such as R. Ezra and Azriel of Gerona, regardless of their kabbalistic beliefs, considered the allegorical (i.e., esoteric) interpretations of *aggadot* as the method legitimatizing a literary authority for the antiquity of the Kabbalah.[34] By contrast, some Kabbalists, such as Nahmanides, criticized their *allegoresis* of the *aggadot* in a philosophical ethos. In principle, the esoteric motivations of the kabbalistic symbolism appear to be similar to that of the philosophical allegory.[35] However, as Talmage analyzes, the strong line of differentiation between philosophical allegory and kabbalistic symbolism appears in their esoteric interpretations regarding the issue of *taamei ha mizvat* (reason for the commandments).[36] In all, this examination shows that the rabbinic

---

[18] Plotinus shows that the One is simple, independent, self-existent, free of composition, and conceptually unknowable: "But if this product is all things, that Principle is beyond all things: therefore 'beyond being'; and if the product is all things but the One is before all things and not on an equality with all things, in this way too it must be 'beyond being.' That is, also beyond Intellect; there is, then, something beyond Intellect." See Plotinus, *Enneads,* trans. A. H. Armstrong, LCL 440-445 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015). Cf. *Enneads* V.4. 1-2, pp. 1-45.

[19] Scholem, *Major Trends*, 10-14, 25-28.

[20] Ibid., 26.

[21] Ibid, 27; Friedrich Creuzer, *Symbolik Und Mythologie Der Alten Völker, Besonders Der Griechen: In Vorträgen Und Entwurfen,* 2nd ed. Franz J. Mone (Leipzig: Heyer Und Leske, 1816), PART I, 70.

[22] Ernst Cassirer, *The Myth of the State* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), 25-37;

[23] Scholem, *Major Trends*, 27.

[24] Ibid., 10-14.

---

[25] Ibid.; E. Wolfson, *Circle in the Square: Studies in the Use of Gender in Kabbalistic Symbolism* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1995), 12.

[26] Liebes, "De Natura Dei: On the Development of the Jewish Myth," in *Studies in Jewish Myth and Jewish Messianism*, trans. Batya Stein (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1993), 2-3.

[27] Ibid, 2.

[28] E. Wolfson, "Hebraic and Hellenic Conceptions of Wisdom in Sefer ha-Bahir," *Poetics Today* (1998): 147-76, 170-71. Wolfson notes that in a manner similar to the Bahir, Judah Halevi, who was a medieval Jewish philosopher and a great Hebrew poet, values the superiority of a symbolic and mythopoetic (or Hebraic) approach to the Biblical and Rabbinic (i.e., *aggadic*) sources over the *allegoresis.* On the basis of the distinction between philosophical allegory and kabbalistic myth, Liebes clarifies the term and definition of "mythic" language as "a direct relationship to the divine," which "characterizes primitive religions, including the ancient Greeks" (213). He emphasizes that unlike the conventional conception of a symbolic language by scholars of Jewish mysticism, a "mythic" language is "available on the same plane of awareness and meaning as are all other observable phenomena" (213). See Liebes, "Myth vs. Symbol in the Zohar and in Lurianic Kabbalah," in *Essential Papers on Kabbalah,* ed. Find Lawrence (New York University Press, 1995), 212-42.

[29] Frank E. Talmage, "Apples of Gold: The Inner Meaning of Sacred Texts in Medieval Judaism," *Jewish Spirituality* 1 (1986): 314-21.

[30] Ibid. Difficult scriptural passages, such as those contain anthropomorphic or anthropopathic descriptions of God, are taken as allegories and metaphors in Rabbinic literature. Even if the *aggadic allegoresis* does not explicitly appear in Rabbinic midrash, it implicitly can be gleaned from the allegorical interpretations of the aggadic sources. For instance, Judah Halevi, in *the Kuzari*, 3:67-73, allegorically interprets the aggadic passages from "*b Pes. 54b and b Ned. 39b"* (67):

> "Seven things were created prior to the world: Paradise, the Torah, the Just, Israel, the Throne of Glory, Jerusalem, and the Messiah, the son of David." This is similar to the sayings of some philosophers: 'The primary thought includes the final deed." It was the object of divine wisdom in the creation of the world to create the Torah, which was the essence of wisdom, and who's bearers are the just, among whom stands the throne of glory and the truly righteous, who are the most select, viz. Israel, and the proper place for them was Jerusalem, and only the best of men, viz. the Messiah, son of David, could be associated with them, and they all entered Paradise. Figuratively speaking, one must assume that they were created prior to the world. (*Kuzari* 3:67-73)

See Judah Halevi, *The Kuzari: An Argument for the Faith of Israel*, trans. Hartwig Hirschfeld (New York: Schoken Books, 1968), 192-96.

[31] Scholem, *Major Trends*, 32; Pines, *Guide*, Introduction, 6.

[32] Talmage, 328-33.

[33] Talmage, 116; Scholem, "The Meaning of the Torah in Jewish Mysticism" in *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism* (New Yok: Schocken Books, 1965), 41.

[34] Dauber, "Competing Approaches to Maimonides in Early Kabbalah," in *The Cultures of Maimonideanism: New Approaches to the History of Jewish Thought*, Supplements to The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy 9, ed. James T. Robinson (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 225-32.

[35] Talmage, 331-37; Scholem, "The Meaning of the Torah in Jewish Mysticism," 52-53, 83-86. Both intend to uncover an inner and concealed meaning of the Torah, which is hidden and abstract and part of a very complex system of truth.

[36] Talmage, 342-45. Unlike philosophical allegory, kabbalistic symbolism retains the integrity of both values, i.e. the actual observance of the commandments (original form) and their symbolic meanings (its context). See

tradition, which implicitly utilizes both allegory and symbolism, despite these incompatible features, offers critical evidence and insight into the continuity and development of the philosophical and mystical concepts and images of Torah from the ancient (Second Temple) and rabbinic mysticism through the medieval kabbalistic tradition.[37]

On the basis of this theory, Wolfson argues that early Kabbalists created the sefirotic system of the theosophic Kabbalah through the combination of philosophical rationalism and Jewish esotericism. For Wolfson, the sefirotic system is based on the combination between Jewish esotericism, which represents the internal, native, and mythopoetic, and philosophical rationalism, which represents the external, intrusive, and logocentric.[38] This implies that the thirteenth century Kabbalists also expanded these potential aspects of ancient Jewish mystical and Rabbinic literature, which already contained mystical and philosophical features, into the kabbalistic contexts. Wolfson further elucidates the critical functions of kabbalistic symbolism by explaining the theory of language, and thereby the interactions between the mythic and philosophic depictions in the kabbalistic texts that underlie them.[39] In contrast to the conventional conception of language grounded in the Aristotelian and Maimonidean views, the linguistic theory of Kabbalah posits an intrinsic connection between the word or letters of Torah and God, and thus recognizes the possibility of expressing, if only symbolically, the divine essence in language.[40] Even if the early Kabbalists did not regard language as capable of expressing directly and essentially the divine essence or the three highest sefirot, they tried to express indirectly the secret of the sefirot through a “mythic” language and its system of symbols.

Tishby, *Mishnat ha-Zohar* II, 364-65. The kabbalistic symbolism does not annul the literal meanings of the *mitẓvot* themselves while the philosophical allegory does.

[37] Saperstein, *Decoding the Rabbis*, 219-20.

[38] E. Wolfson, “Hebraic and Hellenic conceptions of wisdom in Sefer ha-Bahir,” 152; Idel, *KNP*, 252-53.

[39] Wolfson, “Hebraic and Hellenic conceptions of wisdom in Sefer ha-Bahir,” 147-76.

[40] Scholem, “The Name of God and the Linguistic Theory of the Kabbalah,” *Diogenes* 79 (1972): 59-80; 80 (1972): 164-94; Pines, *Guide*, I. 6; I. 61; II. 30; Bernard Septimus, “Maimonides on Language,” *The Culture of Spanish Jewry: Proceedings of the First International Congress*, ed. Aviva Doron (Israel: Levinsky College of Education Publishing House, 1994), 44-46.

In this context, Liebes offers a defintion of “mythic language” as expressing “a direct relationship to the divine entity itself,” which can be applied for “all other observable phenomena,” in contrast to the conventional conception of a “symbolic language” defined by scholars of Jewish mysticism.[41] Dauber also characterizes the feature of “mythic language” as “the displacement of signification” of the sefirot in the “symbolic chains” as the matrix of myth, on the basis of Ferdinand de Saussure’s semiotics, i.e., the signs (the signifier and the signified) have their own meanings with a “pure difference” in relation to other signs.[42] This implies that the “mythic language” in the sefirotic system displaces and redirects a dynamic immediacy of the divine (i.e., the upper three sefirot) into their gendered and anthropomorphic depictions of the lower seven sefirot.[43] In this vein, Dauber emphasizes the role of myth as an intuitive “tool,” which already existed in the self-awareness of the Kabbalists, for expressing implicitly the divine essence in the sefirotic system.[44] Wolfson also points out that the early Kabbalists utilized “imagination” as an intermediating “tool” in transforming the ontological abstractions contained in the upper three sefirot (i.e., *keter*, *ḥokhmah*, and *binah*) into the mythic and anthropomorphic depictions of the seven lower sefirot, such as *hesed*, *din*, and *tiferet* while narrowing the radical gap between them.[45] This implies that the mythic depictions of the divine realms are based on the assumption of the impossibility of participating in the “immediacy” of the divine essence.[46] Yet, this does not mean that experience of the divine essence is impossible.

On the basis of this conceptual backdrop of the mythic and linguistic aspects of the sefirot, Dauber primarily analyzes the philosophic and theosophic influences of bar Hiyya on the conception of the cosmology and understanding of divine unity in the Bahir and early and thirteenth-century

---

[41] Liebes, “De Natura Dei,” 2-3.
[42] Jonathan Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers*, 131, 133-38. Cf. Ferdinand de Sassure, *Course in General Linguistics*, trans. Roy Harris (La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1983).
[43] Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers*, 477-80.
[44] Ibid., 300.
[45] Wolfson, *Through a Sspeculum That Shines*, 304.
[46] Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers*, 240.

Kabbalists.[47] Dauber elucidates that the meanings of "pure wisdom," "pure thought," and the Logos in bar Hiyya's system, and their intimate interactions technically correspond—at least in the eyes of the first Kabbalists—to "intra-divine cognitive faculties," i.e. the upper three sefirot (*keter*, *ḥokhmah*, and *binah*) in the Godhead in the sefirotic system.[48] Scholem and Isaiah Tishby also analyze the affinity of early Kabbalists to bar Hiyya's system by showing the terminological and ideational relationship, as related to divine unity, between bar Hiyya and early Kabbalists, such as R. Ezra and Azriel of Gerona.[49] Bar Hiyya, in *Megillat ha-Megalle*, further explains that "pure wisdom" is the embodiment of the written and oral Torahs.[50] Interestingly, Hiyya's conception of "pure wisdom" in the beginning of creation is connected to personified Wisdom (Prov 8:30) in creation, which is identified with preexistent Torah, as discussed in *Gen. Rab.* i. 1.[51]

As Haviva Pedaya discussed, "pure (or divine) thought" in sec. 48 (in an early redactional layer) of the Bahir appears to symbolically identify with ear, *alef*, and Tetragrammaton (יהו״ה), the first sefirah *keter*, as well as *Ein Sof*.[52] In secs. 43 and 53 (presumably a later redactional layer) of the Bahir, the divine will (*ratson*) is designated by the *alef* as a reference to the first sefirah.[53] In sec. 32 of the Bahir, "pure thought" is identified as the second sefirah, *ḥokhmah* (i.e., *yod*), and the Logos is subsequently identified with the third sefirah, *binah*.[54] In the secs. 22, 87, and 94 of the Bahir, just as the first sefirah, "pure wisdom," emanates the remaining nine sefirot, the first Logos emanates the remaining nine *logoi* (nine cosmic entities or intellects) in the ten *logoi* (which are identical with the Ten Commandments, known as the "Torah of truth").[55] R. Asher, instead of the "pure thought," places the divine will on the first sefirah, which is designated by the *alef* and is the closest to or even identical with *Ein-Sof*.[56] In the system of R. Asher ben David, who was a Provençal Kabbalist, "pure thought" is downgraded as the second sefirah, which is identified with "pure wisdom" (i.e., *ḥokhmah*), whereas the divine (or pure) will is the first sefirah, or even an identical entity to *Ein-Sof*.[57] By this logic, "pure thought," which is identical to the second sefirah, *ḥokhmah* (i.e., *yod*), plays a role in creating the world and emanating all the sefirot (i.e., separate intellects).[58]

---

[47] Dauber, "'Pure Thought' in R. Abraham Bar Hiyya and Early Kabbalah," *JJS 60*, no. 2 (Jan. 1, 2009): 185-201.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid. Azriel, *Commentary on the Talmudic Aggadoth*, ed. Isaiah Tishby (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1982), 145, 151, 154, n. 6 and n. 7; Scholem, "Traces of Gabirol in the Kabbalah," in *Studies in Kabbalah* I, eds. J. Ben-Shlomo and Moshe Idel (Hebrew; Tel Aviv: *'Am 'Oved*, 1998), 39-66.

[50] Abraham bar Hiyya, *Sefer Megillat ha-Megalle*, ed. Adolf Poznanski, annotated and expanded by Julius Guttmann (Berlin: Verein Mekize Nirdamim, 1924), xiii, 27; idem, *Hegyon ha-Nefesch ha-Atzuvah*, 39, 46, 55 and 126. For bar Hiyya, in *Sefer Megillat ha-Megalle* 5, 10, and 52, and *Hegyon ha-Nefesch ha-Atzuvah* 41, the actions of the "pure thought" (מחשבה הטהורה) and the pure will (or the Logos) appear to be parallel to a "matter and form" in potential, which is identified as *tohu* and *bohu* respectively in Gen 1:2. Cf. Dauber, "Pure Thought' in R. Abraham Bar Hiyya and Early Kabbalah," 190-201; Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 62-63.

[51] This substantiates the importance of "pure wisdom," which is identical to preexistent Torah, in bar Hiyya's system. See also Wolfson, *Philo*, 1:243.

[52] Pedaya, "The Provencal Stratum in the Redaction of Sefer ha-Bahir," *Shlomo Pines Jubilee Volume* (= *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought*), vol. 9, ed. Warren Z. Harvey (Jerusalem: Hamakor Press 2, 1990), 151-53; Pedaya, *Name and Sanctuary in the Teaching of R. Isaac the Blind: A Comparative Study in the Writings of Earliest Kabbalist* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2001), 78-85. See Abrams, ed., *The Book Bahir*, sec. 48.

[53] Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers*, 149-50; Pedaya, "The Provencal Stratum in the Redaction of Sefer ha-Bahir," 149-55.

Through this examination, we can see the dynamical relationships and interactions between the concepts of "intra-divine cognitive faculties" (i.e., "pure thought" and "pure wisdom" and the Logos) in bar Hiyya's system and the upper three sefirot (*keter*, *ḥokhmah*, and *binah*) within the sefirotic system in the Bahir. This also corroborates not only the dynamical relationships between the three highest sefirot and "pure thought" which encompasses the first sefirah, *keter* and *Ein Sof*, but also the significance of the second sefirah, *ḥokhmah*, which interacts with the concepts of "pure thought" and "pure wisdom." Specifically, "pure thought" plays a critical role in connecting the *keter* and *Ein Sof* with the *ḥokhmah* and the remaining sefirot, and in creating and highlighting a divine-like image of *ḥokhmah*, which interacts with the concept and image of Torah. The God-like image of *ḥokhmah*, which appears closer to God and virtually unknowable, and as prior to and superior over the images of *binah* and the other lower sefirot, substantiates a God-like image of Torah.

---

[54] See the English translations in Dauber, *Standing*, 147.

> "Another explanation: In order that world should not say, since they are ten sayings for ten kings perhaps they could not have been spoken by one? It is written [therefore] in it [i.e. the Ten Commandments] "I" (*'anokhi*), and it included all of them. And what are the ten angels? Seven sounds and three logi (*'amarim*). And what are logi? As it is written, "And the Lord has affirmed (*he-'amirkha*) this day" (Deut. 26:18). And what are the three? As it is written, "The beginning of wisdom (*ḥokhmah*) is—acquire wisdom (*ḥokhmah*), with all your acquisitions acquire understanding (*binah*)" (Prov. 4:7). As it is written, "the soul of Shaddai that gives them understanding (*tavinem*)" (Job 32:8): The soul of Shaddai, she will understand them. The third, what is it? As a certain elder said to a certain boy, "what is more wondrous than you, do not inquire; what is hidden from you, do not investigate" (Sir 3:21-22). Peer at what is permitted to you, and you have no dealings in the hidden things."

[55] Idel "The Sefirot Above the Sefirot," *Tarbiz* 51 (1981-82): 271-77 (Hebrew); The concept of the *logi* appears in *Enneads* V; IX. 5, where the Intellect is described as the "primal law-giver to being." The thirteenth century Geronese Kabbalist, R. Azriel also appears to identify the first Logos (which is identified with the Active Intellect or the Universal Intellect) with "Torah of truth" (Mal 2:6), while emphasizing the transcendence of the *Ein Sof*. See Azriel, *Kabbalistic Works of R. Azriel of Girona*, ed. Oded Porat (Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2019), (fols. 90-98), 21; (fols. 262-265), 26.

[56] Altmann, "Problems of Research in Jewish Neoplatonism," 503-4. This may show the influence of the system of Solomon ibn Gabirol, who was, in turn, influenced by the *Theology of Aristotle*. For Gabirol, the divine will is interposed between the One and the Universal Intellect.

[57] Asher ben David, "*Sefer ha-Yihud*," in *His Complete Works and Studies in His Kabbalistic Thought,* 105-6.

[58] Idel, "Kabbalistic Prayer in Provence," 283.

Specifically, it is crucial to note that Dauber analyzes, in the context of the Maimonidean controversy, R. Ezra and R. Azriel of Gerona's conception of divine unity based on the second sefirah, *ḥokhmah*.[59] R. Ezra of Gerona, in the *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, describes the *ḥokhmah* as profoundly related to the divine unity and the conception of Torah as the divine names.[60] R. Azriel, in the *Commentary on the Talmudic Aggadoth*, defines the divine unity through the *ḥohkmah* as "united in holiness" and an all-encompassing whole, while the first sefirah, *keter*, actually encompasses all the lower sefirot in terms of differentiation and particularization.[61] R. Ezra and R. Azriel develop a specific tradition, which is related to the sefirah of *ḥokhmah* through the *mashal* of *ḥokhmah*. Both R. Azriel and R. Ezra explicitly connects the term אמן (or אמון) in Prov 8:30 to the second sefirah, *ḥokhmah*, which is derived from *Ein-Sof* and conjoins and unifies the ten sefirot, as the basis of divine unity.[62] By this logic, they associate the second sefirah *ḥokhmah*, with the concept of the Torah i.e., the primordial Torah, which is identified with personified Wisdom.[63]

---

[59] Dauber, "Competing Approaches to Maimonides in Early Kabbalah," 73-75.
[60] Ezra of Gerona, "Commentary on the Song of Songs," in *Kitvei ha-Ramban: A Collection of Nahmanides' Speculative Treatises*, vol. 2, ed. Charles B. Chavel (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1964), 1:2 (p. 485); 3:9 (pp. 493-94). See also Scholem, "The Meaning of the Torah in Jewish Mysticism," 45, 50.
[61] Azriel of Gerona, *Commentary on the Talmudic Aggadoth*, 81-88.
[62] Ibid., 81-82.
[63] Scholem, "The Meaning of the Torah in Jewish Mysticism," 42, 78.

Furthermore, for them, the *ḥokhmah* becomes the symbol for the Torah that is the explication of the Divine Name, i.e., the Tetragammaton.[64]

As Dauber also explains, R. Asher identifies the Tetragrammaton (of the third name) as (divine) essence (*ʻetsem*), which unifies the three higher sefirot, *keter*, *ḥokhmah,* and *binah*, in the ascending order in *shemaʻ* prayer.[65] This implies that the divine essence which is identified with the Tetragrammaton and eventually with *Ein-Sof*, is separate from the lower sefirot, which, as a result of their more mythic nature, are not part of the divine essence. For R. Azriel, who is the thirteenth century Geronese Kabbalist, the Tetragammaton not only functions as a critical apparatus for mapping out the divine unity and unifying the sefirot in a matrix of mythic symbols, but also designates the divine essence in the three highest sefirot as an indirect explanation of *Ein Sof.*[66] R. Azriel, due to the impossibility of positive knowledge of God, transforms the exoteric descriptions into an esoteric knowledge through a matrix of mythic symbols in the sefirotic system. In this context, he also describes the divine unity of the sefirot as divine attributes, which are made for examining the limitlessness of *Ein-Sof* as an ontic source, while implicitly emphasizing the transcendence, simplicity, and uniqueness of *Ein Sof.*[67] This eventually substantiates that the secret of the Tetragammaton as divine essence appears to be revealed by the symbolic imageries of the lower sefirot in a mythic and linguistic symbolism.

Interestingly, despite the influence of Maimonides, who focused on the divine attributes, on Abulafia's thought, Abulafia's distinctive emphasis is on the sefirot and the divine names. Abulafia identifies the sefirot not only as the “attributes of God,” but also as the “channels” which facilitate the intellectual overflow of the *devekut* to the divine names and the Tetragrammaton.[68] While categorically rejecting the theosophic conception of the sefirot as the hypostatic notions in the Geronese tradition, he also understands the ten sefirot as separate intellects that function within the divine unity. For Abulafia, the sefirot are separate from God, but esoterically are contained within the divine unity in a manner similar to the bahiric and early kabbalistic traditions. As Wolfson notes, Abulafia, in order to explain the features of the Tetragrammaton as divine essence, primarily elucidates the relationship between the ten sefirot and the letters of the Torah.[69] This shows that in Abulafia’s system, unlike the angelic images of Torah, which mainly appear in the images of the hypostatic notions, such as the Active Intellect, Metatron, *shekhinah* in relation to *merkavah* imagery in the operation of *devekut,* the God-like image of Torah is implicitly formulated in the images of the letters of the Tetragrammaton as divine essence.

---

[64] Like R. Ezra, R. Azriel of Gerona, in *Commentary on the Talmudic Aggadoth,* 37, also emphasizes that the Torah is the Name of God and that it is a living body with a soul. See Dauber, "Competing Approaches to Maimonides in Early Kabbalah," 73-75.

[65] Dauber, "Competing Approaches to Maimonides in Early Kabbalah," 73-75.

[66] Azriel, *Kabbalistic Works of R. Azriel of Girona,* 1:4-5. R. Azriel also describes the details of the Tetagrammaton in relation to the divine essence and divine unity regarding the proper intention of *shemaʻ* prayer in the ascending order. See Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers*, 19-21; Roland Goetschel, "'Ehyeh Asher Ehyeh' in The Works of the Gerona Kabbalists," *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 6 (1987): 293-96 (Hebrew).

[67] R. Azriel, *Kabbalistic Works,* 20-21 (שער השואל, fols. 45-89). This reflects a seemingly contradictory position of R. Azriel, who argues for both the possibility and impossibility of knowledge of the highest sefirot and divine essence. See idem, *Kabbalistic Works of R. Azriel of Girona,* 21 (fols., 94-99).

Abulafia’s system regarding the sefirot and the letters of the Tetragrammaton, also appears in de Leon’s ’*Or Zaruʿa*. Tishby and Liebes analyze the four stages of de Leon’s intellectual development: 1) philosophical works based on Maimonidean thought; 2) *Midrash ha-Ne’elam* based on mythical-theosophic speculation and allegorical-linguistic mysticism; 3) Hebrew writings, such as ’*Or Zaruʿa* with a form, which combines mythic-theosophic and philosophic speculation; 4) the Zohar with its fully mythic thought.[70] Altmann notes that ’*Or Zaru‘a* endorses divine unity, understood in Neoplatonic terms as simplicity free of composition and excluding a theosophic presentation of the divine as composed of a multiplicity of the sefirot.[71] In this sense, Altmann emphasizes a distinction between the view of the divine in *Or Zaru'a* and a theosophic view of de Leon's later works. Yet despite the strong philosophic leaning in *'Or Zaru'a*, Asi Farber-Ginat, on the basis of a text in *Sod Darke ha-'Otiyot*, which is considered a source for *'Or Zaru'a*, proves that *'Or Zaru'a* includes two accounts of divine unity: as a simplicity and as the coming together of multiple divine unities.[72] This represents the combination of the mythic and philosophic features. It is notable that, in the opening of Part One of *'Or Zaru'a*, de Leon defines the divine unity as the divine uniqueness, while in the body of Part Six, he elaborates on the separateness of the Tetragrammaton from *Elohim*, a divine name that is used in the same manner that the *yod* is employed (i.e., *ḥokhmah*) in *Sod Darke ha-'Otiyot*.[73] De Leon thereby claims the uniqueness and transcendence of the Tetragrammaton, such that it is not combined with divine names, like *Elohim*.[74] In addition, for de Leon, *Elohim* indicates highest (or the first) intellect, which appears close to the concept of demiurge, who is the locus of all existences in *potentia*, in the closest proximity to God. *Elohim*, to put it in terms of the sefirot, is similar to *ḥokhmah*, which is translated as Nous (i.e., the Neoplatonic hypostasis).[75] This shows that *Elohim* is separate from the Tetragrammaton and the One who is beyond any multiplicity (e.g., Dt 6:4), and is also not the same as the Active Intellect (which is the tenth intellect) of the medieval Aristotelian tradition and the *shekhinah* in the Abulafian tradition. In this context, Dauber shows the evidence of the mythic features of an erotic union between the Tetragrammaton as a stamp and *Elohim* as a seal in *’Or Zaru’a*.[76] The erotic union between the Tetragrammaton and *Elohim* is described in a mythic and gendered sense of the hypostasized notions in relation to *merkavah* imagery.[77] This shows that de Leon systematizes that within *Elohim*, i.e., the highest intellect or sefirah, the ten sefirot are present in a potential form in an esoteric sense.[78] In all, de Leon’s elaboration on *Elohim* appears to be connected to Abulafia’s works on the *mervakvah* imagery which is interpreted by the linguistic techniques for revealing the secrets of the Tetragrammaton, as noted earlier. This examination shows that in Abulafia’s system and de Leon’s *’Or Zaru’a*, a God-like image of Torah is implicitly formulated in the letters of the Tetragrammaton, which appears to be identified with the divine essence in relation to the sefirot and *merkavah* imagery.

---

[68] Wolfson, *Abraham Abulafia - Kabbalist and Prophet: Hermeneutics, Theosophy, and Theurgy*, Vol. 7 (Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2000), 5-8. Wolfson implies that Abulafia’s conception of the intellectual overflow of the Active Intellect is related to the secrets of the relationship between the sefirot as “channels” and the Tetragrammaton as divine essence (6). However, Idel disagrees with Wolfson’s position. For Idel, Abulafia’s conception of the sefirot is based on a clear distinction between the sefirot and God as Intellect in lieu of the Maimonidean theology. As Idel, in *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia,* 8, argued, it also seems to be clear that Abulafia has a little sense of the sefirotic system in relation to the *shekhinah*.

[69] Wolfson, *Abraham Abulafia,* 5-8.

[70] Liebes, *Studies in the Zohar*, 87; Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 1:95-6. Tishby and Liebes point out the distinction between allegorical features of the *Midrash ha-Ne’elam* in the sections of the Zohar and the symbolic features of the main body of the Zohar.

---

[71] Altmann, "Sefer Or Zar'ua le-R. Moshe de Leon: Mavo text criti ve-he'arot," *Kovetz al Yad* 9 (1980): 235-40. For Altmann, de Leon composed *Or Zaru'a* before composing *Midrash ha-Ne'elam*. Accordingly, regarding the dating of de Leon's *Or Zaru'a*, Altmann disagrees with Scholem's and Tishby's approach based on the linear presentation of de Leon's intellectual development.

[72] Farber-Ginat, "On the Sources of Rabbi Moses de Leon's Early Kabbalistic System," 70-82 (Hebrew). This work, which is pseudo-epigraphically attributed to Abraham b. David, opens with the words *sod darke ha-'otiyot* (secret of the paths of the letters) in two of its manuscripts, MSS Vatican and MSS Paris. Despite the similarities of their concepts and methodologies, for Farber-Ginat, *Or Zaru'a* is more related to other texts of linguistic mysticism, such as *sod darkei ha-otiyot* than it is to *Ginat Egoz*. See Scholem, "Eine unbekannte mystische Schrift des Mose de Leon," 121, n. 3.

[73] De Leon, '*Or Zaru'a*, 251, 283, 285; Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers*, 318-25.;

[74] *De Leon*, '*Or Zaru'a*, 251. "Do not think in your mind that the appellative which is *Elokeynu* [or *Elohim*] is his unique name, heaven forbid (*halilah*); rather 'The Lord (YHVH) is one.'"

[75] Farber-Ginat, 77-82. The sefirah, *ḥokhmah* is related to the concept of demiurge who is the locus of all existences in *potentia*, but not the One who is beyond any multiplicity.

Like Abulafia and de Leon, Gikatilla also expounds the secret of the Tetragrammaton, which denotes the mysteries of the letters of the Torah in relation to the *merkavah* imagery.[79] It is first crucial to note that Gikatilla primarily conceptualizes the mystical meaning of the Torah. For Gikatilla, the Torah itself appears not only as a symbolic map that allows for the navigation of the entire spectrum of the secret and hidden meanings of the texts in the Torah, but also as an immense system of the sefirotic symbols reflecting the inner-workings of the divine and the world. The whole Torah, which is “a fabric of appellatives” woven from the epithets of God, not only appears as the mystical body of the sefirotic system, but is also implicitly connected with the Divine Name, i.e., the

---

[76] Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers*, 320-25.

[77] De Leon, ’*Or Zaruʿa*, 260, 271, 283, 286. De Leon also explains the relationship of the Tetragrammaton and *Elohim* by explicating the secret of the divine unity, such as the plurality of God in Gen 1:26 and the meaning of the Divine Name in Ex 23:21. De Leon, ’*Or Zaruʿa*, 283: “I already informed you above of a great and wondrous secret regarding the issue of the extension of the light of the tenth sphere (i.e., *Elohim*) that is moved by the will of the Lord, may He be blessed, when He emanates the light of his radiance in him (i.e. *Elohim*), because when the stamp of the king is in his innards (*be-kirbo*) in the secret of the Blessed, then he moves the rest and places his emanation in them.” The English translations is from Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers*, 319-21.

[78] Idel, “The Sefirot above the Sefirot,” 239-80.

[79] Afterman, *And They Shall Be One Flesh*, 109; Gikatilla, *Ginnat* ’*Egoz*, 22a, 23b, 65a, 65b. Gikatilla asserts that the essence of the divine names is not holistically contained in the physical form of letters, but the letters are vessels that contain the divine metaphorically. Divine unity thereby alludes to the secret of *ma’aseh merkavah* and involves letter permutation and transposition of the divine names.

Tetragrammaton.[80] By this logic, Gikatilla claims that the Torah as the Name of God expresses God Himself.[81] The Torah plays a critical role, not only in connecting the finite human soul to the infinite of the living God, but also, implicitly in creating a God-like image of the sefirot as comprised of the hypostatic notions of Torah through the creative power of these linguistic techniques.

Through the various linguistic techniques and symbolism (e.g., transposition and permutation) of the letters in the Torah, Gikatilla identifies the implications of the Tetragrammaton for elucidating *ma'aseh merkavah*. Like Abulafia's radical conception of the letters of the Tetragrammaton based on Maimonides' theory,[82] Gikatilla pursues a mystical mechanism for revealing the secret and decoding the cosmological functions of the chariot.[83] In *Ginnat 'Egoz*, Gikatilla explains the relationship of the letters in the Tetragrammaton with the mystery of four prime letters (א״ב ג״ד), which is the secret of the *merkavah* imagery.[84] The four prime letters (א״ב ג״ד) correspond to the four archangels, which are called the "lower chariot," while the letter *yod* symbolizes the second sefirah, *ḥokhmah*, merging all the letters, and is called the "upper chariot."[85] Gikatilla particularly makes the connection of *ḥashmal*- an element of Ezekiel's *merkavah* vision- to the four letters of the Tetragrammaton, i.e., the mystery of the highest internal letters for the account of the chariot.[86] This corroborates a conceptual and literary nexus between the *merkavah* imagery and the Tetragrammaton.[87] Gikatilla explicates the divine name, הו, which makes up half of the Tetragrammaton, as referring to a charioteer, who transcends the cosmic structure, and the four prime letters as referring to the chariot, which is identical to the cosmological structure as the spheres.[88] In explaining the *merkavah* imagery of the charioteer and chariot, Gikatilla postulates the symbolic resemblance between the cosmological structure, which includes intellects and spheres, and the linguistic structure, which includes the vowels and consonants. The cosmic relationship between the charioteer, as the mover, and chariot, as the moved, is elaborated in terms of the linguistic relation between vowels (separate intellects) and consonants (the spheres of the world).[89] The images and activities of *ḥashmal* in *merkavah* imagery resembles those of vowels moving the consonants of the Tetragrammaton and changing the meanings in accordance with the various types of vocalization (*ha-niqqud*).[90] More strikingly in *Ginnat ʾEgoz*, Gikatilla, through the *gematria*, explains that the chariot is identical with the cosmological structure (=10), and He who rides the chariot is a transcendent divine being (=11) which implies the mystery of יא (=11).[91] Gikatilla, for the most part, follows Abulafia's linguistic techniques of letter combination and *gematriot* regarding the divine names as sefirotic symbols that are related to the mysteries of the

---

[80] Joseph ben Abraham Gikatilla, *Sha'arei 'Orah*, 2 vols., ed. Joseph ben-Shlomo (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1970), 2.

[81] Scholem, "The Meaning of the Torah in Jewish Mysticism," 42-43; Michael T. Miller, *The Metaphysical Meaning of the Name of God in Jewish Thought: A Philosophical Analysis of Historical Traditions from Late Antiquity into the Middle Ages*, PhD Diss. (UK: University of Nottingham, 2014), 179-80. The *ma'aseh merkavah* in Hekhalot literature includes lists of descriptions or attributes of God, which are repeated and inverted, often including reference. This corroborates the identification between God and the Divine Name in the letters of the Torah.

[82] Pines, *Guide* I. 61: Maimonides regards the Tetragrammaton as "the proper name" of God, which is different from all the names of God deriving from His actions

[83] Idel, *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia*, 30-37, 100-105; Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 339. Idel, in *KNP*, 97-103, notes that Abulafia's techniques relate to an ecstatic practice that began with the *merkavah* texts of late antiquity and continued in Hasidei Ashkenaz. It involves the letter combination of divine names.

[84] Gikatilla, *Ginnat 'Egoz*, 22a-23c. In *Sha'arei Ẓedek* and *Sha'arei 'Orah*, Gikatilla returns to this correlation of *merkavah* imagery and letter symbolism, which also can be found in a much older tradition attested in the writings of several of his predecessors, such as Eleazer of Worms. See Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 212; Afterman, *And they Shall be One Flesh*, 159.

[85] Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 204-5.

[86] Gikatilla, *Ginnat 'Egoz*, fols. 5c, 5d, 12d, 13a, 13b, 37b; Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 210-11.

---

[87] Scholem, *Major Trends*, 194; Shlomo Blickstein, *Between Philosophy and Mysticism: A Study of the Philosophical-Qabbalistic Writings of Joseph Gikatilla* (Ph.D, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1983), 115-23; Idel, *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia*, 30-37; idem, *Language, Torah and Hermeneutics in Abraham Abulafia*, 40-41, 109.

[88] Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 226-7. In terms of the equivalence of numerical values, the letters יהו״ה are alphabetically contiguous to כוזו.

[89] Pines, *Guide* II. 10, 271-73; *Guide* I. 71, 174-7; Isaiah Tishby, *Mishnat Ha-Zohar* I, 3rd ed. (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1971), 416; Asi Farber-Ginat, "On the Sources of Rabbi Moses de Leon's Early Kabbalistic System," *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 1/2 (1983): 80.

[90] Gikatilla, *Ginnat ʾEgoz*, 36a: "Know that the vowels and the consonants instruct us about the form of the entire world, the mystery of all the properties, and the order of the chariots."; Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 210-12. Gikatilla emphasizes that the whole cosmological structure as one unified organism is comprised of intellects as the vowels, which are the efficient cause, and spheres as the consonants that correspond to the cosmos.

[91] Gikatilla, *Ginnat ʾEgoz*, 22a, 23b, 65a, 65b; Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 205-13. Besides, Gikatilla explicates that the mystery of כוזו is represented by the name כוזו במוכסז כוזו which represents the Tetragrammaton by means of the ancient techniques of letter permutation. The term אבגד as the secret of *ma'aseh merkavah* is mentioned in *Ginnat ʾEgoz* and Gikatilla's untitled commentary on the Torah. Gikatilla also exemplifies five pairs of the first ten letters: אט בח גז דו הה, while identifying these five pairs as the mystery of the relationship of the letter *yod* and the *merkavah* imagery. The letter *yod*, as the "mystery of the knot," holds five letter pairs in the chariot together and sustains them.

merkavah imagery. In addition, in a similar sense to the sefirotic symbolism in the Zoharic sources, the second sefirah, *ḥokhmah* (*yod*) appears as a nut (אגוז) which is a concealed chariot, whereas the third sefirah, *binah* (*heh*), appears as a nut which is a revealed chariot.[92]

Furthermore, Gikatilla, in his later work, *Sha'arei Orah*, delves into the secrets of the letters of the Torah which denote the mysteries and structure of the entire creation of the world. As Idel analyzes, the hermeneutical system of *Sha'arei Orah* allows readers to access to the secret of the letters of the Torah on a deeper level of symbolic interpretations of the sefirotic system and *merkavah* imagery.[93] In this sense, Idel further investigates the relationships between language and ontology, and between the divine names and the letters of the Torah in *Sha'arei Orah* and *Sha'arei ha-Niqqud*.[94] As Wolfson notes, Gikatilla describes the images of the sefirot and God as a divine reality in the mythic and anthropomorphic descriptions on the basis of the semiotic nature and "tonality of the textual body" of the Torah through the lens of sefirotic symbolism.[95] Specifically, as Lachter notes, in *Sha'arei Orah*, the conception of the Tetragrammaton in relation to the *merkavah* imagery alludes to a relationship between the ten sefirot and *Ein Sof* as the divine essence, which operates the ten sefirot beyond their boundaries and constraints.[96] This shows that, in Gikatilla's system, the features of the letters of the Torah, especially the four letters of the Tetragrammaton, symbolize the entire spectrum of creation and are eventually woven into the Torah.[97] By this logic, Gikatilla creates a God-like image of Torah, which implicitly appears in the mythic and anthropomorphic descriptions of the *merkavah* imagery in relation to the sefirotic system corresponding to the source of all created things through a linguistic and sefirotic symbolism.

---

[92] Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 213-15.

[93] Idel, *KNP*, 211.

[94] Gikatilla, *Sha'ar ha-Niqqud*, fol. 39b. See also Idel, *Absorbing Perfections*, 29-30, 296-304, idem, *Language, Torah and Hermeneutics in Abraham Abulafia* (New York: SUNY Series in Judaica, SUNY Press, 1989), 109.

[95] Wolfson, "Mirror of Nature Reflected in the Symbolism of Medieval Kabbalah" in *Judaism and Ecology: Created World and Revealed Word*, ed. Hava Tirosh-Samuelson (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 317.

[96] Lachter, "Kabbalah, Philosophy, and the Jewish-Christian Debate," 35-40.

[97] Wolfson, "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar," 213-15. For Gikatilla, the Torah is woven from appellatives derived from the Tetragrammaton. Cf. Boaz Huss, "Rabbi Joseph Gikatilla's Definition of Symbolism and it Influence on Kabbalistic Literature," *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 12 (1996): 157-76 (Hebrew).

God-like Image of Torah related to the Idea of Unio Mystica to the Sefirot

On the basis of the previous examination of the continuity and development of the God-like images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Metatron, and the sefirot of *shekhinah* and *hohkmah,* I now will delve into the idea of *unio mystica*, which significantly operates in the formulative process of the God-like images of Torah, and thereby will corroborate the continuity of the idea of *unio mystia* from ancient Jewish roots to the kabbalistic thought. Scholem points out that the idea of *devekut* was "a widespread tendency in Kabbalah," although he believed that the the idea of *unio mystica,* i.e., the complete union with God, did not accord with the essence of Kabbalah and Jewish mysticism.[98] In contrast to the idea of *devekut*, the idea of *unio mystica* is defined as a complete unification of the human soul and the divine, which eliminates the distance between them. For this reason, this idea of the existence of *unio mystica* in Kabbalah has been consistently rejected by leading scholars, such as Scholom, who all emphasize the ontological and epistemological separations between God and human beings in the history of Jewish mysticism.[99] This echoes the direction of the traditional Jewish philosophical mainstreams which maintained the divide between the physical, human realms, and the spiritual, divine realms against the backdrop of a transcendent concept of God.[100] Nevertheless, the idea of *unio mystica* appears in various literary and symbolic expressions in numerous Jewish mystical and kabbalistic sources. In this context, several scholars have tried to reassess Scholem's dominant view, while proposing an alternative view on the place of

---

[98] Scholem, "Devekut or Communion with God," in *The Messianic Idea in Judaism: And Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York: Schocken, 1971), 203-4; idem, *Major Trends,* 55-66.
[99] Ibid.
[100] Scholem, "Mysticism and Society," *Diogenes* 58 (1967): 16. Cf. Katz, "Language, Epistemology, and Mysticism," in *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 35-36.

unio mystica in Kabbalah.[101] Idel notes cases of Islamic rationalistic theology and Christian doctrinal and intellectual theology that produced extreme assertions of the mystical union with God. Since both of these faiths subscribe to a transcendent notion of God, a transcendent theology cannot be the reason for the suppression of unitive experience and imagery.[102] In this sense, Idel states that despite the belief in divine transcendence and the "reticence" of scholars regarding the idea of *unio mysica* in Jewish mysticism, the idea of *unio mystica* was a recurring theme in the Jewish mystical writings.[103]

In the Philonic Tradition

Prior to diving into the investigation of the idea of *unio mystica* in relation to the sefirotic system in kabbalistic tradition, I will first discuss Philo's idea of *unio mystica*, which can be considered a primitive form of the later *unio mystica*, and provides a critical insight into its development into a full-fledged form throughout the history of Jewish thought. As noted earlier, Philo mainly takes an apophatic approach to the essence of God, while utilizing the idea of the Logos as an allegorical apparatus for analyzing the divine essence, divine transcendence, and the idea of *devekut*. Specifically, it is notable that, as Harry Wolfson points out, Philo uses the term Wisdom as a substitute for the terms Logos and Nous in the sense of the human mind.[104] For Philo, Wisdom as a hypostatic notion can also be used as the equivalent of Logos (*Leg.* I. xix, 65), which is not only identified with the revealed Law, but also with the Word of God.[105] Philo's concept of Wisdom appears not only as “the totality of the powers” prior to the creation of the world but also as “a property of God” (i.e., His own wisdom, *Leg.* II. xxii, 87), which is identical with His essence and eternality.[106] Wolfson notes that the term Wisdom is taken as a property of God, while the term Logos stems from Wisdom. In this regard, Philo allegorically interprets the verse “A river goes out of Eden to water the garden: thence it separates into four heads” (Gen 2:10).[107] For Philo, Eden means “the Wisdom of the Existent,” and “the divine Logos” descends from the fountain of Wisdom like a river. This implies the priority of Wisdom over Logos, as Wolfson notes.[108] As noted earlier, in the Septuagint קָנָנִי (Prov 8:22) in *Ebr.* viii, 31, a term used in reference to Wisdom appears to be translated as “not-created” or “acquired (or obtained),” as opposed to the concept of Logos being described as “created.” Wolfson further discusses the instrumentality of the Logos and Wisdom, which are related to the Law of Moses, i.e., the Torah (*Leg.* III, xv, 46; *Cher.* xxxv, 125-127).[109] In accordance with dualistic conception of the “image” of God connected to Philo’s Logos, the concept of Wisdom appears close to a God-like image of Torah as an “invisible” mediator, while the concept of revealed and immanent Logos appears close to the angelic image of Torah as a “visible” mediator.[110] In this sense, as examined earlier, an angelic image of Torah appears in the angelic image of immanent Logos as an allegorical mediator along with Philo’s idea of *devekut*. By contrast, a God-like image of Torah appears in the God-like image of transcendent Wisdom as a hypostatic or divine light, which is an invisible and hidden mediator, along with Philo’s idea of *unio mystica*.[111]

---

[101] Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 2:288-90; Efraim Gottlieb, *Studies in the Kabbalah Literature*, ed. J. Hacker (Hebrew; Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 1976), 237-38; Mordechai Pachter, "The Concept of Devekut in the Homiletical Ethical Writings of 16th Century Safed," in *Studies in Medieval Jewish History and Literature* 2, ed. Isadore Twersky (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), 224-5; Steven T. Katz, "Language, Epistemology, and Mysticism," 69.

[102] Idel, *KNP*, 59.

[103] Ibid.

[104] H. Wolfson, *Philo*, 1:254-56. The personification of wisdom in the Wisdom literature and Greek mythology appears in the senses of Nous and the mind of wisdom. Philo uses the Logos as a substitute for the Platonic term Nous. The term Nous is used as a designation of rational faculty in Aristotle. See Hermann Bonitz, *Index to Aristoteles* (Berolini: G. Reimer, 1831), 159. For the Stoics, the term Logos appears in the sense of a corporeal being, while for Philo, it is the totality of the ideas in the sense of an incorporeal being or divine mind created by God. See also Wolfson, *Philo*, 1:230-31.

[105] Ibid.

In this context, Afterman traces the evidence of the continuity of the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* along with the dual conception of Philo’s Logos, which are related to other hypostatic notions of Torah, and which dynamically developed from ancient Jewish roots to medieval Jewish mystical thought.[112] Afterman analyzes a striking example of the distinctive aspects of Philo's idea of *unio mystica*, one seemingly without a mediator (i.e., religious emotions of love and intimacy with the God of Israel), as seen in Dt 30:20 in *Post.* iv, 12-13 and *Gig*. xiii, 58-64.[113] Interestingly, Afterman analyzes two forms of capacity for the *unio mystica* in Philo's allegorical commentaries on the Mosaic Law: *visio dei* (i.e., contemplative vision of God) and *unio mystica* itself. The first is a capacity for *visio dei*, which means a "direct mystical vision" of God, without the Logos as a mediator; the second is capacity as an "intuition" for experiencing directly the divine essence and divine transcendence, i.e., *unio mytica*.[114]

---

[106] Ibid.
[107] *Somn.* ii, 36, 242-243.
[108] Wolfson, *Philo,*1:237-40.
[109] Ibid.
[110] Ibid, 1:254-56.
[111] As examined earlier, Philo’s immanent Logos is identified with the revealed Law (e.g., *Leg.* III. xv, 46) while transcendent Wisdom appears equivalent to the preexistent Law, i.e., hypostatic Torah. (e.g. *Gen. Rab.* i. 1; Sir 24:23) in the sense of Nous (the divine or incorporeal mind).

Afterman demonstrates *unio mystica* without the mediating roles of the Logos by investigating Philo's idea of *henosis* with God, which appears similar to a mystical union in the Neoplatonic tradition.[115] It is notable that on the basis of the Platonic-Jewish thought, Philo develops the Deuteronomic conception of *devekut* (e.g., Dt 4:4, Dt 10:20, Dt 30:20, and Gen 2:24), through his allegorical interpretations, into a religious experience, and even the idea of *unio mystica* as the most intimate experience of God. Indeed, against the backdrop of the Deuteronomic commandment of *devekut* through the mediating roles of the Logos as the Image of God, Philo further explains the idea of *unio mystica* without a mediator or a hidden mediator.[116] In other words, unlike the mystical visions through the gaze of the Logos as a mediator for the ideal of *devekut*, Philo appears to describe a direct and intimate experience of God without mediators.[117] Philo thereby describes the process of the divine inspiration of the mind (or soul or intellect), i.e., tranformation from the human mind to "the divinely inspired mind" by "a God-inspired ecstasy" (*entheo mania*) (*Her.* lii, 264-65; *Fug.* xxx, 166-168).[118] It becomes clear that unlike a mere state of *devekut*, Philo identifies the *unio mystica* as an utmost state of ecstasy, which conveys "trance" (*Leg.* II. ix, 31), "divine possession," and "inspired frenzy" (*Migr.* vii, 34-35; *Her.* Lii, 259).[119]

---

[112] Afterman, "From Philo to Plotinus," 177–96.

[113] Ibid., 194-95.

[114] Ibid. See also Philo, *Post.* xlviii, 167-69. For Philo, this verse, "See, see that I am "(Dt 32:39) means that He actually is "apprehended by clear intuition rather than demonstrated by arguments carried on in words." In addition, this verse, "Thou shalt behold that which is behind Me, but My Face thou shalt not see" (Ex 33:23) explains His subsistence rather than His essence. Philo, *Praem.* vii, 43-46: "In the same way God too is His own brightness and is discerned through Himself alone, without anything co-operating or being able to co-operate in giving a perfect apprehension of His existence… The seekers for truth are those who envisage God through God, light through light."

[115] Afterman, "From Philo to Plotinus," 186-96. See also Winston, *Logos and Mystical Theology*, 44; Plotinus, *Enneads* IV. 8.1; V. 3.17-37; VI. 9.9-11.

[116] Philo, *Somn.* II. xl, 231-232: "To the souls indeed which are incorporeal and are occupied in His worship it is likely that He should reveal Himself as He is, conversing with them as friend with friends; but to souls which are still in a body, giving Himself the likeness of angels, not altering His own nature, for He is unchangeable, but conveying to those which receive the impression of His presence a semblance in a different form, such that they take the image to be not a copy, but that original form itself."

On the basis of this theory, Philo conceptualizes the idea of *henosis* with God through the allegorical interpretations of Gen 2:24, Dt 18:1-2, Dt 10:20, and Dt 30:20.[120] Philo thereby connects the idea of *henosis* to the conceptions of the *deveku*t and *uno mystica* as the unity of "one flesh" of husband and wife in Gen 2:24, which is based on the allegories of man (the human mind) and his wife (sense perception).[121] Philo further elaborates the idea of the *unio mystica* in the conception of man

---

[117] Afterman, *From Philo to Plotinus*, 186, 191; Philo, *QE* 2, 40. In the interpretations of Ex 24:12a, "Come up to Me to the mountain and be there?" Philo notes, "This signifies that a holy soul is divinized by ascending not to the air or to the ether or to heaven (which is) higher than all but to (a region) above the heavens. And beyond the world there is no place but God."

[118] Philo, *Her.* lii, 262: "For it says, 'if a prophet of the Lord arise among you, I will be known to him in vision, but to Moses in actual appearance and not through riddles' (Num 12:6, 8), and again 'there no more rose up a prophet like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face' (Dt 34:10). Admirably then does he describe the inspired when he says 'about sunset there fell on him an ecstasy' (Gen 15:12]." Philo, *Her.* li, 249: "Now "ecstasy" or "standing out" takes different forms."; *Fug.* xxx, 166-168: "For the nature of the self-taught is new and higher than our reasoning, and in very deed Divine, arising by no human will or purpose but by a God-inspired ecstasy."

[119] Philo, *Her.* lii.259: "But when it [the sum/mind] comes to its setting, naturally ecstacy (*ekstasis*) and divine possession (*entheos katokoche*) and inspired frenzy (*mania*) fall upon us. God gives the gift of inspired/posssed frenzy to a true "lover of learnng." *Migr.* vii, 34-35: "I have approached my work empty and suddenly become full, the ideas falling in a shower from above and being sown invisibly, so that under the influence of the Divine possession I have been filled with corybantic frenzy and been unconscious of anything, place, persons present, myself, words spoken, lines written."

[120] Afterman, *From Philo to Plotinus*, 194. Afterman notes that the concept of *henosis* shows an interpretative synthesis between Jewish mystical thought and "medieval Arab and Latin Neoplatonism." See Gary Lease, "Jewish Mystery Cults since Goodenough," *ANRW* 20 (1987): 862.

[121] Afterman, *From Philo to Plotinus*, 179, 195-6. Afterman argues that Philo's discussions of *henosis* had an impact on Plotinus' idea of *henosis* and on "a wide range of medieval Jewish, Christian, and Arab articulations" of the idea and experience of *unio mystica*. Philo's idea of *unio mystica* related to the concept of *henosis* has a profound relationship with or influence on the Neoplatonic conception of the human mind's elevation and *henosis*. Indeed, the notion of "union" (*ittihad*) in the Islamic mystical tradition seems to trace back to the Neoplatonic concept of *henosis* as the ultimate stage of *unio mystica* as articulated by Plotinus. Also see Altmann, "Ibn Bajja on Man's Ultimate Felicity," in *Studies in Religious Philosophy and Mysticism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1969), 104. The union achieved between that human mind (or soul) and God is directly based on the notion of a *hieros gamos* symbolizing the marriage between the human mind (or soul) and sense experience. See Philo, *Gig.*, xix, 61-62: "This Eve or sense from the very moment of coming into being through each of her parts as through orifices poured multitudinous light into the Mind, and purging and

"standing" in/with God in Dt 5:31 and Dt 30:20.[122] In this discussion, Philo particularizes Moses's mind, which can approach the hidden essence of the First Cause through his "reflection," by explaining the distinction between Moses and other prophets in Ex 24:2 (*Leg.* III. xxxv, 110f).[123] Winston argues that Philo describes "reflection" as an "inner intuitive illumination" that results from Philo's reasoned investigation.[124] However, Philo appears to describe a state of prophecy, ecstatic divination, and "sober intoxication," which appears as a direct interface with God Himself, in a manner different from other religious and mystical experiences focusing on mediating entities.[125] The

---

dispersing the mist set it as it were in the place of a master, able to see in luminous clearness the natures of things bodily. And the Mind, like one enlightened by the flash of the sun's beam, after night, or as one awakened from deep sleep." *Her.* ix, 45-46: "Now there are three kinds of life, one looking Godwards, another looking to created things, another on the borderline, a mixture of the other two. It is the mixed life, which often drawn on by those of the higher line is possessed and inspired by God, though often pulled back by the worse it reverses its course." Cf. *Somn.* i. 151.

[122] David Runia, *Philo and the Church Fathers: A Collection of Papers* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 199-200; As Runia describes, Philo explains the "standing" in/with God through the cases of Moses and Abraham. See Philo, *Leg.* III. xxxiii, 100-103; *Post.* ix, 29-30: "For I take it that, just as crooked things are straightened by a correct ruler, so moving things are brought to a stop and made stationary by the force of Him Who stands. In this case He charges another to stand with Him. Elsewhere He says, 'I will go down with thee into Egypt, and will bring thee up at last' (Gen. xlvi. 4). He does not say 'thou with Me.' Why is this? Because quiescence and abiding are characteristic of God but change of place and all movement that makes for such change is characteristic of creation. When then He invites a man to the good peculiar to Him, He says 'Do thou stand with Me,' not 'I with thee:' for in God's case standing is not a future but an ever-present act." Cf. Philo, *Cher.* vi, 18-19; *Gig.* xi, 48-49; *Conf.* ix, 30-32. Philo also describes the state of the human mind, which dwells in God himself as a "place" or "a portion" like Moses the Levite, who dwells in God instead of a terrestrial portion of the Holy Land. This shows a similar sense to the *devekut* of "one flesh" in Gen 2:24. See Philo, *Cher.* 40-53.

[123] Philo, *Leg.* III. xxxiii, 100-103: Moses's mind is "more perfect and more thoroughly cleansed, which has undergone intitiation into the great mysteries, and a mind which gains its knowledge of the First Cause (*to aition*) not from created things… but lifting its eyes above and beyond creation obtains a clear vision (or reflection) of the Uncreated One." Philo, *Sacr.* iii, 8-10: "There are still others, whom God has advanced even higher, and has trained them to soar above species and genus alike and stationed them beside himself. Such is Moses to whom He says, 'stand here with Me' (Dt v. 31). But through the 'Word' of the Supreme Cause he is translated (Dt xxxiv. 5), even through that Word by which also the whole universe was formed… He appointed him as god, placing all the bodily region and the mind which rules it in subjection and slavery to him. 'I give thee,' He says, 'as god to Pharaoh' (Ex vii. 1). One receives the clear vision of God directly from the First Cause Himself. The other discerns the Artificer, as it were from a shadow, from created things by virtue of a process of reasoning. Hence you will find the Tabernacle and all its furniture made in the first instance by Moses but afterwards by Bezalel, for Moses is the artificer of the archetypes, and Bezalel of the copies of these." Cf. *Post.* xlviii, 167-69.

[124] Winston, "Was Philo a Mystic?" in *The Ancestral Philosophy: Hellenistic Philosophy in Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Gregory E. Sterling (Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2001), 155-61; Winston, *Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1985), 46-47, 54-55.

[125] Philo, *Opif.* xxiii, 70-73: "It is invisible while itself seeing all things, and while comprehending the substances of others… And so, carrying its gaze beyond the confines of all substance discernible by sense, it comes to a point at which it reaches out after the intelligible world, and on descrying in that world sights of surpassing loveliness, even the patterns and the originals of the things of sense which it saw here, it is seized by a sober

"inner intuitive illumination" in the human mind maintains the divine transcendence by man "standing" in/with God while transcending his corporeality. By this logic, as Runia and Wolfson note, the *unio mystica* can co-exist with the divine transcendence and the incomprehensibility of divine essence.[126]

On the basis of these conceptions of the idea of *unio mystica*, as Schäfer also discussed, Philo's conception of "reflection" as "inner intuitive illumination" appears close to an unmediated and intimate experience through a divine light, which is similar to the idea of Wisdom, rather than through the idea of immanent Logos.[127] Winston argues that Philo mainly expresses religious and mystical experiences (e.g., prophecy, ecstatic divination) through the mediating roles of the Logos, by noting "human's highest union with God, according to Philo, is limited to the Deity's manifestation as Logos."[128] However, as Afterman analyzes, Philo's conception "light through light" (e.g., *Praem.* vii, 43-46) appears to describe a direct nexus between human light and the divine light instead of a mediating role of the Logos.[129] As noted earlier, for Philo, Wisdom as a property of God is also God's own wisdom (*Leg.* II., xxi, 87; xxii, 88). The relationship between God's own wisdom and human wisdom explicitly parallels the relationship between God's own (divine) light and human light (or mind). The idea of *unio mystica* thereby can be described as the state and process of human light (or mind), which receives and is activated by divine light symbolized by divine Wisdom as a hidden mediator. This implies that Philo's idea of *unio mystica* still necessitates the concept of an

---

intoxication, like those filled with Corybantic frenzy, and is inspired, possessed by a longing far other than theirs and a nobler desire." Cf. *Praem.* vii, 43-46.

[126] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:94-164; Runia, *Philo of Alexandria*, 442-43; Philo, *Her.* xlviii, 235-236. "The divine Word separated and apportioned all that is in nature. Our mind deals with all the things material and immaterial which the mental process brings within its grasp, divides them into an infinity of infinities and never ceases to cleave them. This is the result of its likeness to the Father and Maker of all. For the Godhead is without mixture or infusion or parts and yet has become to the whole world the cause of mixture, infusion, division and multiplicity of parts."

[127] Schäfer, *The Origns of Jewish Mysticism*, 167, 169, 173-74.

[128] Winston, *Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria*, 43-50; idem, "Was Philo a Mystic?" 151-59.

[129] Afterman, 185. Cf. Philo, *Praem.* vii, 43-46: "In the same way God too is His own brightness and is discerned through Himself alone, without anything co-operating or being able to co-operate in giving a perfect apprehension of His existence… The seekers for truth are those who envisage God through God, light through light."

"reflection" as "inner intuitive illumination," which appears to be symbolized by divine light as an invisible mediator, even if it does not necessitate the Logos as a visible mediator.

In all, this examination clarifies the existence of two types of *devekut* in Philonic thought: the idea of *devekut* through mediating entities, i.e., a visible (revealed) mediator as Logos, and the idea of *unio mystica* without a mediator or through an invisible (hidden) mediator as Wisdom. This shows that, unlike the idea of *devekut,* which necessitates the mediating images and activities of Logos, Philo also develops the Platonic-Jewish interpretation of the Deuteronomic conception of *devekut* into the idea of *unio mystica,* seemingly without a mediator or through a hidden mediator. This implies a critical difference between the vision through the Logos as a visualized and revealed mediator, and the "inner intuitive illumination" symbolized as transcendent Wisdom, which is a hidden mediator. Unlike the idea of *devekut*, which operates along with the angelic image of revealed and immanent Logos as an allegorical mediator, Philo's idea of *unio mystica* implicitly operates, along with a God like image of transcendent Wisdom, as a hypsotatic mediator symbolized by divine light, which is invisible and hidden, and thereby formulates a God-like image of Torah. This shows that rather than the general idea of *devekut*, the idea of *unio mystica* strongly appears to play a critical role not only in symbolically connecting the hypostatic notions and God, but also in correlating, mythically and symbolically, the hypostatic notions of Torah, human beings, and God.

In the Bahiric and Geronese Traditions

On the basis of the examination of the existence of Philo's ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* in the Second Temple period, I will try to prove the continuity and development of the idea of *unio mystica*, which is central in the formulation of the God-like images of the hypostatic notions of Torah from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods through the Middle Ages. It is first beneficial to recall that some evidence of mystical experiences (i.e., *devekut* and *unio mystica*) directed by the magic, theurgic, and ecstatic practices appear in relation to the letters of the divine names in the Torah as they commonly appear as the divine-like images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as *shekhinah* and Metatron, which are manifest in the late-antiquity and medieval Jewish mystical (Enochic, Hekhalot, and Hasidei Ashkenazi) literature, as well as the Kabbalistic literature, as examined earlier.[130] It is also crucial to note that Philo's ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* show a striking similarity to Maimonides' schema of eschatological noetic union, which was mainly based on the characteristics of Neoplatonic and Neo-Aristotelian philosophies and theologies. As noted earlier, the influence of Maimonides' schema of eschatological noetic union appears not only critical in the philosophical schema (the conjunction with the Active Intellect or angelic beings) but was also influential on kabbalistic schema (conjunction with the sefirot or Godhead) in the medieval Jewish mystical traditions.[131] This influence also appears to be essential to the development of the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* to the divine-like images of Torah not only in the bahiric and Geronese traditions but also in the Abulafian, zoharic, and Gikatillian traditions, which I will examine, in turn, in this study.

In this context, I will further examine the evidence of the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* in relation to the sefirotic and the dynamic relationships between God and the human soul (or intellect) in the bahiric and Geronese traditions. I will thereby reflect on the way in which these relationships dynamically formulate the God-like mages of Torah in the medieval Jewish mystical traditions. As noted earlier, the kabbalistic notion of *unio mystica* implies that union involves the process of integration into the sefirot or Godhead.[132] Specifically, we can see that the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* to the sefirot, and especially to the Tetragrammaton, appears in the process of worshiping during prayer in the thought of Jacob ben Sheshet and other thirteenth-century Geronese Kabbalists.[133] Ben Sheshet describes that the worshiper (e.g., Jacob) theurgically draws down the sefirot, from *Ein-Sof* to *hesed*, *din*, and *tiferet*, and eventually to *shekhinah* into a state of union, in accordance with what might be termed the "descent" position.[134] In the descending process, the sefirotic unification (i.e., an intra-divine *heiros gamos*) between *tiferet*, the male element, and *shekhinah*, the female element, is achieved, and thereby the unity of the entire sefirotic system in *shekhinah* is theurgically completed by reciting the formula of prayer, "blessed be the name of the glory of his kingdom for eternity" (b. *Pesaḥ*. 56a).[135] It is also notable that in the thought of ben Sheshet, the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* are interlocked with the three divine names: YHVH, *Elohim*, and YHVH, which are pronounced in the opening line of the *shema'* prayer (Dt 6:4).[136] As Mark B. Sendor explains, the movement of "descent" appears to be appropriate to these forms of prayer, which bring the sefirot into the human mind, i.e., psychologizing the sefirot.[137]

---

[130] The combination of the magic, ecstatic, and theurgic features in Hekhalot literature (e.g., *Hek. R.* 27-30) are also clearly found in the Abulafian and Gikatillian traditions, which I will discuss in great detail in this study.

[131] Afterman, *And they Shall be One Flesh,* 116.

[132] Ibid., 121-22.

[133] Jacob ben Sheshet, "Sefer ha-'Emunah veha-Bitahon," in *Kitvei ha-Ramban*, vol. 2, ed. Charles B. Chavel (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1967), 2:393-99, 340-41. Sheshet exemplifies a contrast between the "descent" and "ascent" positions during worship by describing the following cases: The patriarch Jacob reflects the "descent" position and Moses reflects the "ascent" position.

On the other hand, in a manner similar to the "ascent" position of sec. 60 of the Bahir, ben Sheshet explicates the "ascent" position, exemplified through the case of Moses, who is already in a state of conjunction (i.e., *devekut*) with *shekhinah*, and therefrom draws and unifies all the sefirot upward to *Ein-Sof*. In so doing, Moses's mind appears to move into a state of *unio mystica*.[138] In this context,

---

[134] Ibid. This formula appears in a similar context in R. Ezra of Gerona, *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, in *Kitvei ha-Ramban*, 477.

[135] In a manner similar to ben Sheshet, in sec. 60 of the Bahir, the "descent" position entails the visionary experience of the three sefirot of *hesed*, *din*, and *tiferet*, which can be identified with the divine chariot. See Abrams ed., *The Book Bahir*, sec. 60. In this sense, Scholem asserts that the "descent" position in an early redactional layer of the Bahir appears to be related to the visionary mysticism of the *merkavah* mystics, such as in Hekhalot literature. See Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 129-30.

[136] Ben Sheshet, "Sefer ha-'Emunah ve-ha-Bittahon," 2:340-41. For ben Sheshet, in the descending order, the first name of Dt. 6:4 (YHVH= the Tetragrammaton) is the divine essence (*'etsem*), which is identified with the first sefirah, *keter* or *Ein Sof*. In contrast, in the ascending order, the third name (YHVH) is the divine essence. The "descent" position begins with *Ein-Sof*, and moves, along with *ḥokhmah*, down to *binah* and *tiferet* in correspondence to the three mentions of the divine names (i.e., יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה, YHVH Eloheinu YHVH) in the *shema'* prayer. In the descending order, the first name YHVH is identified with the divine essence, the second YHVH designates *tiferet* (or *rahamim*), and *Elohim* designates *hesed* and *din*. In the descending direction of prayer, the first Tetragrammaton is "a reference to the highest sefirah," while the second Tetragrammaton designates the divine chariot or the seven sefirot below *binah*, which becomes "a lookout from which a mediated vision of the highest sefirot is possible." See Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers*, 226, 234. Cf. Idel, *KNP*, 141-3; Wolfson, "Negative Theology and Positive Assertion in the Early Kabbalah," *Da'at* 32/33 (1994): v-xxii. A similar form is also found in R. Asher's *Sefer ha-Yihud*, 75, 80.

[137] Sendor, *The Emergence of Provençal Kabbalah: Rabbi Isaac the Blind's Commentary on Sefer Yeẓirah* (PhD Diss.; Ann Arbor, MI: U.M.I., 1995), Vol. 1, 246-61; idem, Vol. 2 (English translation), 25.

[138] Jacob ben Sheshet, "Sefer ha-'Emunah ve-ha-Bittahon," 2: 393-99; 340-41. Cf. Azriel of Gerona, *Commentary on the Talmudic Aggadoth*, 118. Pedaya assumes that the "ascent" position of the Bahir is that of its later layer of Provencal redactor, whose approach is shared by R. Isaac's circles. See Pedaya, "The Provencal

Dauber elucidates the exegetical implications of "running and returning" (Ezek 1:14), which allude to "specific mystical praxes during prayer" in relation to the "ascent" and "descent" positions.[139] In this regard, Dauber further elaborates the features of the idea of *devekut* to the sefirot by analyzing related passages, such as sec. 32 of the Bahir, which refers to the verses "what is more wondrous [*mufla*] than you, do not inquire; what is hidden from you do not investigate [*tahkor*]" and "Peer at what is permitted to you, and you have no dealings in the hidden things," (Sir 3:21-22), as well as to a passage in R. Azriel's Commentary of *Sefer Yetsirah,* according to which "you must peer (*le-hitbonen*) from the revealed to the concealed."[140] On the basis of these passages, it becomes clear that a holistic understanding of *ḥokhmah* and *binah* is impossible. In the idiom of *Sirach*, you should not inquire about what is "wondrous," i.e., the sefirah of *ḥokhmah*, nor investigate that which is "hidden," i.e., the sefirah of *binah*. However, there remains the possibility of gaining some insight into the lower seven sefirot beneath *binah*—again in the idiom of *Sirach*, you can "peer" (*hitbonen*) at that which is permitted. Yet, the peering (*le-hitbonen*) at the mythic images of the revealed, i.e., the lower seven sefirot, can offer a glance of the concealed, i.e., the upper three sefirot.[141] Dauber further explains that the visionary experience of the mythic (or anthropomorphic) descriptions of the matrix of the sefirotic symbols brings out "a mediated glimpse of [divine] thought," despite the impossibility of a direct "lookout" to the divine essence.[142] This substantiates that the lower seven sefirot below

---

Stratum in the Redaction of Sefer ha-Bahir," 154-55. The "ascent" position implies that the process of unification of the divine through the recitation of *shema'* prayer moves "from below to above" i.e., from the lower sefirot to the higher ones in the sefirotic realm. This shows a conflict between the "ascent" position in its later layer of Provencal Stratum and Nahmanides and ben Belimah's "descent" position. Interestingly, in this section of the Bahir, knowledge (*da'at*), which generally refers to *tiferet* or the seven lower sefirot in early kabbalistic texts, is profoundly correlated with and replaced by the *merkavah* imagery.

[139] Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers*, 228-29.

[140] Ibid.; Azriel, *Perush le-Sefer Yesirah*, 453; Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 129-30; *Reshit ha-Kabbalah ve-Sefer ha-Bahir*, 246, 283-85. The Bahir implies, according to Scholem, a new kind of speculative mysticism that moves beyond the visionary kind used by *merkavah* mystics.

[141] Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 279-80, 289.

[142] Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers,* 224-5, 230-31. As Dauber explains, in the bahiric and Geronese tradition, the "descent" view is generally directed to an investigation of the divine chariot in a visualized (i.e. mythic and anthropomorphic) image, which is limited to the sefirot below *binah*, especially *hesed*, *din*, and *tiferet*. The "ascent" view and direction are directed to a mystical experience in the "pure (or divine) thought" mediated by the mythic imageries by the sefirotic symbolism for the upper three sefirot in a non-visual image.

binah appear in a comprehensible visual image, whereas the upper three sefirot, which appear in a non-visual image, are not clearly comprehensible. In this process, despite the impossibility of actual knowledge of the highest sefirot (e.g., *keter*, *ḥokhmah*, and *binah*), the mythic and anthropomorphic conceptions and themes serve as a hermeneutic apparatus which allows for the investigation of the lower seven sefirot, such as *hesed*, *din*, and *tiferet*, and eventually for an ultimate state of *unio mystica* of the human soul through the immediacy of the divine.

On the basis of this analysis, Dauber further exemplifies the ideal of *devekut* (i.e., *unio mystica*) through explaining the mode of "*shigionot*" (שִׁגְיֹנוֹת, Hab 3:1) in a prayer of the prophet Habakkuk, mentioned in sec. 46 (a late redactional layer) of the Bahir.[143] He notes that "*shigionot*" is explained by the term "*tishge*" (תִּשְׁגֶּה), which means "infatuated" (Prov 5:19), implying a "transformation of worldly pleasures into an eroticized ecstatic experience (i.e., a state of *devekut*) of the *shekhinah.*"[144] This also demonstrates that the mythic descriptions of the gendered and hypostasized sefirot allow us not only to speak of the ineffable but also to attempt to reach a state of *devekut* or *unio mystica* between the human soul and the divine. This eventually implies the ultimate goal of the *unio mystica* to the highest sefirot through *devekut* to the *shekhinah* and later *ḥokhmah*.[145] In a manner similar to the Bahiric tradition, the possibility of an utmost mystical experience (i.e., *unio mystica*) of participating in the divine unity of the concealed (the upper three sefirot) appears to be intensified through a spiritual and theurgical prayer in the Geronese tradition.[146]

---

[143] Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers*, 166-67.

[144] Ibid.; Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 270-317; Idel, *KNP*, 42-56; idem, "Asceticism and Eroticism in Medieval Jewish Philosophical and Mystical Exegesis of the Song of Songs," *With Reverence for the Word: Medieval Scriptural Exegesis in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, eds., Jane Dammen McAuliffe, Barry D. Walfish, and Joseph W. Goering (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 93; idem, "Eunuchs Who Keep the Sabbath: Becoming Male and the Ascetic Ideal in Thirteenth- Century Jewish Mysticism," *Becoming Male in the Middle Ages*, eds., J. J. Cohen and B. Wheeler (New York: Garland, 1997), 151-85; Pedaya, "Possessed by Speech: Towards an Understanding of the Prophetic-Ecstatic Pattern among Early Kabbalists," *Tarbiz* 65, no. 4 (1996): 565-636 (Hebrew); Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 227-32.

[145] It is also reminiscent of the images of *ḥokhmah* in a mythic sense in sec. 90 of the Bahir. As also noted earlier, R. Asher explains that through the river that flows from Eden (i.e., *ḥokhmah*) to the garden (i.e., *binah*), the tree (i.e., *tiferet*) is planted in the garden, which is not separate from *ḥokhmah* and *Ein Sof*. In light of this kabbalistic symbolism, R. Asher implies that the "garden of Eden" esoterically refers to the union of *binah* and *ḥokhmah*, which are not separated from *Ein Sof*. See Asher b. David, "*Sefer ha-Yihud*," in *His Complete Works and Studies in His Kabbalistic Thought*, 75-76, 106. The mechanism of *devekut* implicitly appears in a two-fold (upper and lower) conception of *hohkmah*. This also corroborates that the lower *ḥokhmah* is identified with the *shekhinah* (as a visible *kavod*) of God and symbolically as "daughter of the king."

As noted earlier, R. Ezra and R. Azriel develop a specific tradition centered on the second sefirah, *ḥokhmah* in relation to the term אמון (or אמן) in Prov 8:30.[147] Dauber analyzes, from the poem of the Meshullem da Piera, the anti-Maimonidean Kabbalist and poet, R. Erza and R. Azriel's kabbalistic understanding of divine unity centered on the *ḥokhmah*.[148] Meshullam's poetic description implies that the sefirah of *ḥokhmah* can only be understandable and accessible by "suckling" after the model of an infant suckling from the breasts of its mother, which implies a mystical experience. This shows that the concept of *ḥokhmah* appears as an object of *devekut*, as noted earlier.[149] This also demonstrates that the idea of *devekut* to the *ḥokhmah,* including the higher sefirot in the Geronese tradition, shows a tendency going towards a state of *unio mystica* to the *ḥohkmah*, which is in close proximity to the *Ein Sof*, and thereby covers a linguistic infinity and divine-like image of Torah.

In all, this shows that the Bahiric circles and most Geronese Kabbalists have a special interest in the relationship between the divine entities and divine essence, on one hand, and the concepts and images of Torah, on the other. This substantiates that, in the bahiric and Geronese traditions, the mystical experiences and consciousness of the Jewish mystics are primarily focused on the investigation of the secrets of the divine unity of the sefirot comprised of the hypostatic notions of Torah. This also shows that the sefirotic system for the Jewish mystics eventually became a critical mediator for experiencing God and expressing the dynamic relationships between God and the human soul (or intellect). The images of the upper three sefirot appear close to the *Ein Sof*, which is transcendent, wonderous, hidden, and incomprehensible. Specifically, the image of *ḥokhmah* appears as a God-like image of Torah, which conveys the mystical conceptions of the Torah as a divine name and as a living organism. This substantiates that the God-like image of *ḥokhmah* in the bahiric and Geronese traditions plays a critical role not only in promoting the idea of *devekut* understood as a state of *unio mystica*, i.e., a mystical and absorptive union, but also in formulating the God-like image of Torah.

---

[146] Idel, *KNP*, 42-49; E. Wolfson, "Hebraic and Hellenic Conceptions of Wisdom in Sefer ha-Bahir," 153-54; idem, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 160-87; idem, "God, the Demiurge, and the Intellect," 77-111.

[147] Azriel of Gerona, *Commentary on the Talmudic Aggadoth*, 82.

[148] Dauber, "Competing Approaches to Maimonides in Early Kabbalah," 73-5; Hayim Brody, "Shire Meshulam ben Shelomo Dapiera," *Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry in Jerusalem* 4 (1938): 92. In poem 40, II. 37-9, "For me Ezra, And Azriel are a help. They place traditions in my hands. They give me knowledge And teach me wisdom (חכמה), And they suckled me from the breasts of a nurturer (אמן) With one heart (בלב אחד), We relate to the unified One (אנחנו במיוחד)."

[149] Scholem, "Devekut, or Communion with God," in The *Messianic Idea in Judaism: And Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York: Schocken, 1971), 203-27.

In the Abulafian Tradition

As noted earlier, Abulafia, in *'Oẓar 'Eden Ganuz*, teaches how to unify the divine names so as to create the gradual process of *devekut*, which attaches the human soul to the Active Intellect.[150] According to Abulafia, the letter-combination of the divine names brings about a prophetic vision, i.e., *ma'aseh merkavah*, and eventually leads to a state of conjunction (*devekut*) or noetic union with the Active Intellect.[151] Abulafia specifically establishes the identity between the Active Intellect and the divine names, such as Metatron, Yaho'el,[152] and *shekhinah*, in his *Sefer Sitrei Torah*, a commentary on *The Guide of the Perplexed*. In the same work, he also describes the human intellect's intellectualizing process on the road to conjunction.[153] As examined earlier, the images of Metatron and *shekhinah*, which combine the mystical and philosophical concepts of Torah, were developed in Hekhalot and Ashkenazi literature, as were secrets of the divine names. Abulafia further explains that the human intellect can connect to the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Metatron, *shekhinah*, and Yaho'el, which explicitly appear as transcendent or God-like images, through the process of *unio mystica* i.e., the intellectualizing process of the human intellect, and thereby become ontically identified with the Active Intellect.[154]

---

[150] Abulafia, *'Oẓar 'Eden Ganuz,* 133b-134a.

[151] Idel, *KNP*, 42-49. Abulafia describes his "science of letter combination" as the "account of the chariot" (מרכבה) and claims that it eventually leads to the attainment of prophetic ability. The prophecy brings the esoteric wisdom of the *Merkavah*, which is generated by knowledge of the combinations and permutations of the divine names.

[152] Ibid., 67-9. The name Yaho'el contains יה, as an abbreviation of the Tetragrammaton YHWH. Scholem notes that the name Yaho'el appears in Jewish gnostic literature dating to the end of second century. See Scholem, *Major Trends*, 69; idem, *Origins of the Kabbalah,* 89. In the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the angel Yaho'el appears as the spiritual teacher of Abraham, who teaches him about the Throne of Glory. His image is similar to that of Metatron in the Hekhalot literature and Ashkenazi literature. Cf. George H. Box, and Joseph I. Landsman, *The Apocalypse of Abraham* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918), Introduction, xxv; Odeberg, Introduction to *3 Enoch*, 189. The angel Yaho'el is a metamorphosis of the patriarch Enoch.

[153] Abulafia, *Sefer Sitrei Torah*, 132b. In order to explain the intellectualizing process of the human intellect, Abulafia describes the relationship between angelic concepts [e.g., Metatron, the Agent (Active) Intellect, divine (faithful) Spirit, and *shekhinah*], and the divine names (e.g., Yaho'el, Shadday, and *Elohim*).

It is also crucial to note that Abulafia's philosophically inclined idea of *unio mystica* is essentially applied to a conception, which identifies the Tetragrammaton with the divine essence.[155] Abulafia appears to intellectualize and psychologize the sefirot in human "pure thought," unlike the contemplative and theosophical conceptions focused on the divine unity in the supernal "pure thought" in the Geronese tradition.[156] The Abulafian tradition appears to place more focus on *devekut* to the divine names, especially the Tetragrammaton, in the human pure thought than it does on the *devekut* to the sefirot in the supernal pure thought (i.e., the sefirah of *ḥokhmah*) as in the Geronese tradition.[157] The idea of noetic union, from the philosophic perspective, appropriated in the Abulafian tradition, is radicalized insofar as the climax of the experience is mystical ecstasy, which involves direct contact between the human soul and divine, i.e., Godhead itself. This experience is brought about through linguistic techniques of manipulating the letters of the Torah, especially the letters of the Tetragrammaton.[158]

However, it is notable that while accomplishing the ultimate task of *devekut* to the letters of the Tetragrammaton in a philosophic sense, Abulafia implicitly formulates the conception of *unio mystica* employed by theosophic Kabbalists, who are usually thought to represent an opposing stream of Kabbalah. In *Sefer Sitrei Torah,* we can see that Abulafia describes intellectual perfection through the

---

[154] R. Azriel also involves the Active Intellect with the God-like images of the first sefirah, *keter*, and the Throne of Glory as well as to the image of pre-existent Torah. See Azriel, *Kabbalistic Works of R. Azriel of Girona,* fols. 90-98.

[155] Liebes, *Studies in the Zohar*, 27; idem, "Zohar and Eros," *Alpayyim* 9 (1994): 71-72. The esoteric nature of the highest sefirot in the Geronese tradition, as previously examined, also appear in the Abulafia's approach to the letters of the divine names as revealing and concealing the secrets of Torah.

[156] Idel, *KNP*, 55-57; In the Abulafian tradition, human pure thought parallels supernal pure thought, the sefirah of *keter*. Cf. Altmann, *Faces of Judaism* ed. A. Shapira (Hebrew; Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1983), 87-88.

[157] Idel, *KNP*, 55-57.

[158] Ibid., 106-7, 112.

Active Intellect as a precondition to knowledge of the Tetragrammaton, which is identified with the divine essence, and is implicitly related to the sefirot.[159] This shows that Abulafia eventually prioritizes the kabbalistic ideal of the *unio mystica* to the Tetragrammaton over the philosophical ideal of the conjunction (i.e., *devekut*) with the Active Intellect.[160]

Abulafia's idea of *unio mystica* can be found in the idea of *unio mystica* of R. Isaac of Acre, who was his student.[161] R. Isaac of Acre was an eclectic Kabbalist, who mixes philosophical vocabularies and symbolic images, in his descriptions of mystical union with the Tetragrammaton. R. Isaac's idea of *unio mystica* means the absorption (but not annihilation) and incorporation of the human soul (or intellect) into a psychological and spiritual structure of divine realms, and eventually the immortality of the human soul.[162] In *Me'irat 'Einayim,* R. Isaac schematizes a process of the mystical path by highlighting the identification between the human soul (נפש) and the Active Intellect [השכל הפועל] through the idea of *devekut*, and eventually the human soul's identification between the human soul (נפש) and the Active Intellect [השכל הפועל] through the idea of *devekut,* and eventually the human soul's identification with the Divine Intellect.[163] In particular, for R. Isaac, the Divine Intellect implicitly appears to be associated with the Tetragrammaton and with *Ein Sof*, i.e., God.[164] This shows that by utilizing both the idea of *devekut* to the Active Intellect and the Divine intellect and the knowledge of the sefirot, R. Isaac and Abulafia appear to identify the Active Intellect (and the Divine Intellect) with Torah, whose inner essence is the Tetragrammaton, and, in turn, with God.[165] By this logic, R. Isaac further describes the human soul, which combined with the Divine Intellect, as an anthropomorphic image, such as a “divine man” [איש האלהים] or a *ẓaddik* who attaches to the the Tetragammaton and Torah.[166] This shows not only Abulafia’s philosophical (i.e., Neo-Aristotelian and Neoplatonic) influences on R. Isaac of Acre, but also the ultimate interest and goal of *devekut* of Abulafia which was a radical identification between the human soul (or intellect) with the Active Intellect and even God (i.e., *unio mystica*).[167] This also substantiates that both R. Isaac of Acre and Abulafia formulate the angelic and God images of Torah by using the letters of the Tetragrammaton, which are implicitly related to the sefirot, as an apparatus for the mystical experiences of *devekut* and *unio mystica*.

---

[159] *Sefer Sitrei Torah,* 163a.

[160] Wolfson, *Abraham Abulafia,* 72.

[161] Idel, *KNP*, 306.

[162] See Isaac ben Shmuel of Acre, *Sefer Me'irat 'Einayim*, ed. Amos Goldreich (Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1984), 222-23. R. Isaac describes the process of *unio mystica* in the descending order, i.e., from the Divine Intellect [השכל האלוהי] to the Active Intellect, and then from the Active Intellect to the Acquired Intellect [השכל הנקנה], and to the Agent Intellect [השכל המתפעל], and finally from the Agent Intellect to the human soul.

[163] Ibid., 244-45.

[164] Ibid., 224-27.

[165] Idel, "Defining Kabbalah: The Kabbalah of the Divine Names," 106-8. As noted earlier, both of the two kinds of Kabbalah (ecstatic and theosophic) basically share the perspective that the divine names are "a symbol of the divine structure." (106).

It is beneficial to note that Idel provides critical insight into the features of *devekut* and *unio mystica*, which appear in the Geronese and Abulafian traditions through the explanations of the relation between *devekut* and theurgy. Idel discusses the theurgical features of liturgical prayer in the Geronese tradition by explaining the shared theurgical implications of the Temple sacrifices and the *devekut* to the divine names following the rabbinic rhetoric of substitution.[168] This implies that the theurgical acts encompass not only the kabbalistic worship and prayers for the unification of the sefirot with a theocentric emphasis, but also the *devekut* to the divine names, especially the Tetragrammaton, with a meditative and psychological emphasis. In this sense, even if Abulafia did not exercise overtly theurgical acts, his use of meditative and psychological features of the *devekut* and *unio mystica* to the letters of the Tetragrammaton implicitly convey a theurgical aspect in the kabbalistic worship and prayers.

In this context, Idel provides a clear summary of the ultimate features of kabbalistic worship and prayers in a theurgical sense that applied to the theosophical Kabbalists and to some extent to Abulafian tradition: “1) the primary cleaving of thought to the letters of the Divine Name (=the

---

[166] Isaac ben Shmuel of Acre, *Sefer Me’irat ‘Einayim*, 223.
[167] Abulafia’s idea of *unio mystica* unquestionably gave a huge impact on the formation of prophetic Kabbalah. See Eitan P. Fishbane, *As Light Before Dawn: The Inner World of a Medieval Kabbalist* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009), 278-79.
[168] Idel, *KNP*, 55-56.

Tetragrammaton); 2) the activation of these letters as symbols of higher entities so as to constitute a unified totality; 3) cleaving to this unified divine totality."[169] This explanation implies that the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* to the letters of the Tetragammaton has a causative relationship to the unification of the sefirot in *hohkmah* through the theurgical effect of the human soul's liturgical (i.e., *shema'*) prayer.[170] The process of *devekut* regarding the divine names of Torah progresses to the process of the *devekut* that theurgically unifies the sefirot, a process which begins moves forward to the process of the *devekut* unifying the sefirot, which begins with unifying the lower seven sefirot and then ends up unifying the upper three sefirot.[171] Through this process, the worshiper eventually moves forward to be a participant or to be absorbed in a unified divine totality (i.e., a state of the *unio mystica* to the sefiortic system) through the theurgical worship and prayers.[172] This demonstrates that the *devekut* to the Tetragrammaton, which is the climax of the *devekut* and *unio mystica*, appears as a starting point of the *devekut* which ultimately leads to reaching the state of *unio mystica* in the theosophic and kabbalistic system. In other words, to further elaborate on this process, the first stage of *devekut* involves the visual and imaginative comprehension of the immediate and direct presence of God through the letters of the Tetragrammaton. The second stage moves, beyond envisioning the imaginative and visualized forms of God, to a convergent with the sefirot now depicted in a linguistic symbolism. Finally, the worshipers reach an absorptive participation (i.e., *unio mystica*) in the sefirot as non-sensual or non-visual entities that are accessed through a symbolic meditation. Above all, this substantiates that a God-like image of Torah is implicitly formulated as a symbolic or hidden mediator which connects God and human beings in the process of *unio mystica* to the sefirot and the letters of the divine names and the Tetragrammaton as divine essence.

---

[169] Idel, *KNP*, 56. Idel regards the *unio mystica* through the prayer, in Geronese Kabbalah, as an "inner mental processes," i.e., "an interiorization of the Divine," which activates "the divine powers by means of their reflections in human thought."

[170] Idel, *KNP*, 53-55, 297, n. 117; idem, "The Sefirot above the Sefirot," 278-80; Scholem, *Reshit ha-Kabbalah*, 73-74. The idea of *devekut* to the Tetragrammaton is achieved by the restoration and unification of the sefirot through theurgical intention during the recitation of liturgical prayer.

[171] Idel, "The Sefirot above the Sefirot," 278-80.

[172] Idel, *KNP*, 297, n. 117. As Idel notes, in an anonymous text, which appears to originate from the Geronese school, *devekut* to the Tetragrammaton occurs after the unity of the sefirot is achieved in the "pure thought" of the worshiper as a result of a liturgical prayer:

> And the righteous and the pious men, and those people who seek solitude and unite the Great Name, grab hold of the fire on the altar of their hearts. Then in his pure thought (*mahshavah tehorah*) all the sefirot will be united, and they will be tied one to another so that they extend until the spring of the flame whose exaltation is endless. And this is the secret of all of Israel cleaving to God, may He be blessed: "to recite your mercies in the morning and your faith at night" (Ps. 92:3). This is the secret of the unity [effected by] a man in his morning and evening prayer, when he raises all the sefirot into one bundle and unifies them. Then he cleaves to the great name [=Tetragrammaton].

In the Zoharic and Gikatillian Traditions

In the Zohar, the dualistic conception of Torah, i.e., the Torah of the Tree of Knowledge (Good and Evil) and Torah of the Tree of Life, symbolically reflects the images of Torah as a mediator and interconnector between visible and invisible entities in relation to the sefirotic system.[173] As Tishby notes, in the Zohar, there are three levels of Torah, which are linked to the development of Torah: the preexistent Torah, the written Torah, and the oral Torah, which represent *hohkmah*, *tiferet*, and *malkhut*, respectively.[174] As instances of the Zohar's symbolic terminology, the sefirah *tiferet* is identified with the Tree of Life, while the sefirah *malkhut* is identified with the Tree of Knowledge.[175] Interestingly, the Tree of Knowledge (Good and Evil) appears to be related to the image of *shekhinah* (or *malkhut*) and Metatron, which combines an angelic and divine-like image of Torah.[176] This feature in Zoharic sources, including *Ra'ya Mehemna* and *Tikkunei Zohar*, is reminiscent of the dualistic conception of Metatron and *shekhinah*, which convey both the angelic and divine-like images of Torah as in the late antique Jewish mystical literature and early Kabbalistic literature.[177]

---

[173] See Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 3:1102-3.

[174] Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 3:1079

[175] Ibid.

[176] See *Zohar Ḥadash* (*Tikkunim*), ed. Reuven Margalioth (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1964), 106d-107a. Thes differentiates the levels of the Tree of Knowledge (related to lower *shekhinah* or Metatron) and the Tree of Life (related to higher *shekhinah*) in the intention (*kavvanah*) of the worshipers. Ibid.See *Sefer ha-Zohar* I. 126b.

[177] Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 3:1106. See *Sefer ha-Zohar* II. 118b-119a: (*Raya Mehemna*); *Sefer ha-Zohar* I. 21a; III. 226b, 228b. The images of *shekhinah* in the Zohar, which convey aggadic and kabbalistic features, also play a critical role not only in controlling the system of the creatures, wheels, and powers of the *merkavah*, but also appear as an anthropomorphic figure, who sits upon the Throne of Glory described as the upper chariot.

Unlike the dualistic conception of the images of the Tree of Knowledge, the image of the Tree of Life, which is identified with the sefirah *tiferet,* clearly reflects the divine-like image of Torah, related to the higher of the two forms of *shekhinah* in the dual-*shekhinah* concept examined above.[178] As Tishby notes, unlike the lower *shekhinah,* the higher *shekhinah* in the Zohar appears to be identical to the second sefirah, *hohkmah*.[179] In this sense, the image of the Tree of Life appears to be related to a divine-like image of *tiferet* along with that of *ḥokhmah,* which is identified with preexistent Torah, as the highest level of Torah.[180] By this logic, the image of Tree of Life also appears to have a profound nexus with the God-like image of *ḥokhmah*, which is identified with that of personified Wisdom (Prov 8:22-31), as examined earlier.[181] The image of the Tree of Life related to the *ḥokhmah*, which is in the closest proximity to God, is connected not only to the *ḥokhmah* as a hidden point (i.e., *yod*), the first letter of the Tetragrammaton, but also to the concept of primordial or preexistent Torah (e.g., *Gen. Rab*. i, 1), which eventually takes on a God-like image of Torah.

Importantly, Tishby explains that the secrets of the Torah of the Tree of Life (which is identified with the Torah of emanation) are implicitly reflected in the sefirot as divine entities and divine names, which encompass the whole Torah.[182] In the Zohar, the Torah is explicitly identified with the letters of the Divine Name (e.g., *Sefer ha-Zohar* II. 87 b; III. 80 b).[183] As Tishby notes that “the Torah is the embodiment of the divine order of things, which is comprised in the name of the divine essence,” i.e., the Tetragrammaton.[184] It is beneficial to note that in a manner similar to the images of Torah in *ʾOr Zaruʿa*, as examined earlier, which combines the mythic and philosophic features, the letters of the Tetragrammaton are implicitly intertwined with the images of the sefirot and *merkavah*. This implies that the symbolic and mythic images of the Tree of Knowledge and the Tree of Life are profoundly intertwined with the images of the sefirot and the letters of the Tetragammaton.

---

[178] Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar,* 3:589; 1105-6; *Sefer ha-Zohar* II. 65b-66b.
[179] *Sefer ha-Zohar* I. 35b; III. 4b, 267b.
[180] *Sefer ha-Zohar* I. 145a, 248b. The Torah appears as “the wisdom of God” and “pure thought” or hidden Thought. The *sod* in *pardes* is identified with the *shekhinah* and *ḥokhmah,* but *remez, peshat,* and *derush* are connected with *sitra ahra*.
[181] Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar,* 1:270, 342-43. The *ḥokhmah* in the Zohar conveys a dualistic conception: supernal and transcendent Wisdom, and lesser Wisdom intrinsic within the supernal Wisdom.
[182] Ibid., 3:1102-7, 1079-80. Cf. *Gen. Rab*. i, 1. See also *Sefer Zohar Ḥadash, Tikkunim,* 106d. R. Simeon ben Yohai notes a division between a man of the Tree of Knowledge and a man of the Tree of Life. This implies there are two levels of the Torah: the Torah of creation, and the Torah of emanation. The Torah of emanation is “the Tree of Life,” and “the spiritual-mystical Torah,” as well as “Torah of truth.”
[183] Scholem, “The Meaning of Torah in Jewish Mysticism,” 41-42, notes that “the same statement recurs in the writings of several members of this Geronese group, and was finally taken over by the author of the Zohar, the classical text of Spanish Kabbalism… I assume that this new idea was well known to Nahmanides himself, but he refrained from expressing it in a work intended for the general public… The Torah was essentially nothing but the one great Name of God was certainly a daring statement calling for comment… The Torah as the Name of God means that God has expressed His transcendental being through it.” See also Afterman, 218-221.

In this context, Idel notes that there are complex ideas of the *devekut* to the sefirot and the letters of the Tetragrammaton in the Torah, which are formulated through mythic and anthropomorphic strategies in the Zohar.[185] In this sense, Tishby first recognizes that it is difficult to systematically investigate the multiple usages of the verb forms of *devekut* (e.g., אדבק or אתדבק) and their implications of *devekut* and *unio mystica* in the Zohar.[186] Notwithstanding their complicated implications, for Tishby, *devekut* alludes to both an intimate relation and a direct contact, i.e., *unio mystica*.[187] Ronit Meroz describes a polychromatic view of the idea of *unio mystica* in the Zohar on the basis of her theory of multiple authorship of the Zohar by multiple circles.[188] Wolfson also discusses a range of the meanings of *unio mystica* in the Zohar by analyzing variations of the motif of unification across the Zohar. He does so despite the lack of concrete vocabularies of *unio mystica* in the language of the Zoharic sources.[189] He eventually suggests a "triadic" dimension of *unio*

---

[184] Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 3:1080.
[185] Idel, "Types of Redemptive Activities in the Middle Ages," 269-73; Wolfson, *Venturing Beyond-Law and Morality in Kabbalistic Mysticism*, 8.
[186] See also Isaiah Tishby, "Fear, Love, and Devekut in the Teaching of the Zohar," *Molad* 19, no. 151-152 (Tel-Aviv: *Mifleget Poʿale Eretz-Yi'sra'el*, 1961): 50-55 (Hebrew). Joshua Abelson, *Jewish Mysticism: An Introduction to the Kabbalah* (New York: Sepher-Hermon, 1981), 123. Abelson suggests a relationship between *itdabaq* (אתדבק, *Zohar* II: 216b) which he renders as "comes into union" and a mystical union.
[187] Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 3:1010.
[188] Ronit Meroz, "The Weaving of a Myth: An Analysis of Two Stories in the Zohar," in *Study and Knowledge in Jewish Thought*, ed. Howard Kreisel vol. 2 (Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2006), 167-205. Meroz exemplifies a contradictory notion of *devekut* in the narrative of a dispute between R. Yose and R. Abba. Melila Hellner-Eshed also claims that the sense of *unio mystica* implies either just "an experience of participation rather than unification," or a "complete merging with the divinity through ecstatic death." See Melila Hellner-Eshed, *A River Flows from Eden: The Language of Mystical Experience in the Zohar*, trans. Nathan Wolski (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009), 295, 312. Regarding the multiple authorship of the Zohar by multiple circles, See Meroz, *Headwaters of the Zohar: Analysis and Annotated Critical Edition of Parashat Exodus of the Zohar* (Hebrew; Tel Aviv: The Haim Rubin Tel Aviv University Press, 2019), 39-119.
[189] Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 330, 357, 361, 364-67, 376, 386.

mystica in the Zohar that combines theory and praxis: ontological (i.e., theosophic) infra-structure, ecstatic (and theurgic) experience, and hermeneutical attitude in the zoharic homilies, while taking an intermediate position which synthesizes the competing views of *unio mystica* in the Zohar.[190]

It is first clear that, as Idel notes, in a manner very similar to Abulafia's conception of the *unio mystica*, the idea of *devekut* in the Zohar appears to convey a sense of noetic union (e.g., an ecstatic path of the *devekut* to the letters of the Torah) based on Aristotelian epistemology and Neoplatonic ontology.[191] In addition, the *devekut* to the Tetragrammaton in the Zohar is profoundly related to the sefirot, in a manner similar to the Geronese and Abulafian traditions, on the basis of mythic and anthropomorphic strategies.[192] As Wolfson further notes, in the Zohar, there are theological and ecstatic elements, i.e., "speculative devices for expressing the knowable aspect of God" and "practical means for achieving a state of ecstasy, that is, an experience of immediacy with God that may eventuate in union or communion."[193]

In this context, Afterman tries to explain this intricate feature of *devekut* and *unio mystica* in the Zohar as "somewhat milder" than in, more philosophically inclined works, like those of Abulafia's works, de Leon's *'Or Zaru'a*, and Gikatilla's *Ginnat 'Egoz*.[194] In a manner similar to the ways of *devekut* and *unio mystica* in the Geronese tradition, in the Zohar, the "initial integration" of the divine realm (i.e., sefirotic system), which enables "the divine essence to dwell within the human vessel (i.e., human soul), serves as "the pre-condition for human participation in the unitive dynamics within the Godhead."[195] As Afterman notes, like the Geronese tradition, the Zohar appears to presuppose the state of *devekut* to the sefirah of *shekhinah*, as a precondition for the theurgical actions, and then moves forward to the eventual *unio mystica*, which is achieved by completing the self-perfection of the human soul "below," and the unity of the sefirot "above."[196] Lachter also elaborates that the human imagination, in the context of a theurgical prayer, i.e., the *devekut* to the divine names in the letters of the Torah, explicitly shapes a mystical experience (i.e., *unio mystica*).[197] Liebes also notes that the *unio mystica,* as an ideal of *devekut* to the sefirotic system, is completely achieved by theurgical actions (e.g., Dt 28:9).[198] This implies that the idea of *unio mystica* in the Zohar pursues a convergence of the opposites of ontological and experiential dimensions through theosophic, ecstatic, and theurgic approaches.[199] This demonstrates that the Zohar conveys a dualistic feature of *unio mystica*, i.e., a "meditation" on the letters of the Torah as a living organism, which contains the divine and hidden light of God, and a theurgical prayer through "imagination," i.e., visual and non-visual comprehension of the mythic and anthropomorphic images in the human mind or consciousness.[200]

---

[190] Wolfson, *Through a speculum that shines: Vision and imagination in medieval Jewish mysticism* (Princeton University Press, 1997), 331, 357, 361. Ibid., 331. This "triadic" dimension effectively explains the identification of God and the Torah as the divine names in relation to the sefirotic system.
[191] Wolfson, "Poetic Thinking," in *Library of Contemporary Jewish Philosophers*, eds. Hava Tirosh-Samuelson and Aaron W. Hughes, vol. 11 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 75-78.
[192] Idel, "The Concept of the Torah in Hekhalot Literature and Kabbalah," *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 1 (1981): 75, n. 122.
[193] Wolfson, "Forms of Visionary Ascent as Ecstatic Experience," 210.
[194] Afterman, 189-90; Idel, *KNP*, 61.
[195] Afterman, *And They Shall be One Flesh*, 206-7. Afterman (109) notes that in the Zohar, "the distinction between the divine and the human realms" does not appears as a "clear cut," insofar as the human soul participates in "this process of union and unity."

Specifically, Lachter also emphasizes that the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* in the Zohar are still focused not only on the secret of divine inner unity within the Godhead but also on the intensive participation and integration of the human soul into the divine unity through mythic and anthropomorphic strategies.[201] As Wolfson notes, the imaginative nature of these mythic strategies plays a critical role in formulating the images of Torah as a symbolic mediator, which bridges between the human structure and anthropomorphic structure of the divine, and thereby plays a critical role in uniting the divine and human realms and in enhancing the relationship between them.[202] On the basis of this theory, Idel explains that *devekut* is eventually accomplished by the concept of *imitatio dei*, insofar as it is based the resemblance between human beings and the divine entities, through the mythic and anthropomorphic strategies.[203] Idel clarifies the significance of hermeneutic (mythic and symbolic) strategies in the Zohar not only for expounding upon "the structural relation of the human body to the supernal image in the sefirot," but also for understanding the symbolic similarities of the activities of the human beings and divine entities.[204] Abrams also points out, the reality of *unio mystica* manifest in the Zohar appears in the praxis of a mythic and gendered (i.e., an erotic coupling) union through sefirotic symbolism.[205] As Wolfson also notes, the mythic and anthropomorphic strategies based on sefirotic symbolism utilize polar opposites made by the gendered schemes and ultimately leads to an ontic assimilation into the divine unity.[206] He explains that the process of unification in the state of *devekut* ultimately overcomes metaphysical boundaries made by the gendered schemes based on the mythic and anthropomorphic images of God, which are formulated by the imagination and visual apprehension.

---

[196] Ibid., 139-41.

[197] Lachter, *Kabbalistic Revolution,* 139.

[198] See Liebes, "The Messiah of the Zohar," 175-81, also includes, in a dualistic conception of *unio mystica* in the Zohar, the significance of the *unio mystica* as a mystical experience of the *devekut* to the Divine Name (e.g., Dt 10:20).

[199] Idel, *KNP*, 58; Wolfson, *Venturing Beyond-Law and Morality in Kabbalistic Mysticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 192.

[200] Idel, "Types of Redemptive Activities in the Middle Ages," 269-73. Idel notes that the state of *devekut* in the Zohar is eventually directed to the state of *unio mystica* between the divine unity and the human soul (or intellect).

[201] Lachter, *Kabbalistic Revolution: Reimagining Judaism in Medieval Spain* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2014),, 114.

In all, whatever the precise type of *unio mystica* in the Zohar, the analysis of these scholars primarily corroborates that a linguistic and sefirotic symbolism plays a critical role in the unitive process, intimately interconnecting the divine and the human realms through the idea of *devekut*. As noted earlier, the angelic and divine-like images of the sefirot and the letters of the Tetragrammaton in the Zohar appears as an object of the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* that lead the human souls to the ideal of human perfection. This examination shows that the idea of *devekut* in the Zohar results in the climax of *unio mystica* through the angelic image of Torah as a visible mediator and the God-like image of Torah as an invisible mediator through a hermeneutical strategy. This corroborates that, in the context of *unio mystica*, a God-like image of Torah appears as an invisible and hidden mediator in the symbolic images of the sefirot and the letters of the Tetragrammaton, which are formulated through the anthropomorphic and mythic strategies.

---

[202] Wolfson, *Poetic Thinking*, 78. Wolfson also analyzes that the mythic (or poetic), theosophic, and linguistic symbolism of the Zohar can be primarily described as a mystical midrash, which draws on ancient biblical and Rabbinic ideas. See also Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 304.

[203] Idel, "Types of Redemptive Activities in the Middle Ages," 269-73.

[204] Idel, *KNP*, 56.

[205] Daniel Abrams, *Ten Psychoanalytic Aphorisms on Kabbalah* (Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2011), 23, 48.

[206] Wolfson, *Luminal Darkness: Imaginal Gleanings from Zoharic Literature* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2007), 112-14. The mythic and gendered (i.e., coupling) strategy in the Zohar reveals not only the secrets of creation and existence but also the various aspects of unitive experience.

Interestingly, the Abulafian and zoharic traditions regarding the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* are combined in the thought of the thirteenth-century Kabbalist Gikatilla**,** who dynamically developed the philosophical, kabbalistic, and zoharic traditions. Scholem sees, in Gikatilla’s works, a possibility of encountering and reconciling three different kabbalistic streams: that of R. Ezra, R. Azriel, and Nahmanides, that of Abulafia’s ecstatic kabbalah, and that of the Zoharic Kabbalah of Moses de Leon.[207] Scholem and Wolfson also explain that Gikatilla’s conception of *unio mystica* in *Sha‘arei Orah* is primarily grounded in a linguistic mysticism, which combines and integrates literary features of the Maimonidean, Abulafian, and Zoharic sources—three streams that intersected in the dynamic culture of Castile at the end of the thirteenth century.[208] It is notable that in a manner similar to both the Abulafian and zoharic theories, Gikatilla pursues the mystical experiences of *devekut* and *unio mystica* through the theurgical focus, the psychologization of the sefirot, while demystifying the kabbalistic ontology inherent in the sefirotic system.[209] It is also critical to note that in Gikatilla’s works, the combination of the letters (i.e., the divine names) in the Torah focuses on the sefirotic symbolism with the aim of investigating the mysteries of creation and cosmology. In *Ginnat ’Egoz*, Gikatilla’s use of *gematriot* aims at not only understanding the mysteries of *merkavah* imagery and angelic worlds but also at achieving the ideal of *devekut*, as in Abulafia’s system. In *Ginnat ’Egoz*,

---

[207] Scholem, *Origin of the Kabbalah*, 57-61. See also Morlok, *Rabbi Joseph Gikatilla’s Hermeneutics*, 28-38; Idel, *KNP*, 211-13.

[208] Scholem, *Major Trends*, 194; Wolfson, “Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar,” 195-236. See also Idel, “Abulafia's Secrets of the Guide: A Linguistic Turn,” *Revue De Métaphysique Et De Morale* 4 (1998): 495-528.

[209] Gikatilla, *Ginnat ’Egoz*, fol. 52d, 54b. Cf. Idel, *KNP*, 56-61, 146-53. In *Ginnat ’Egoz*, he also shows particular interest in the numerical relationship between the divine names and philosophical concepts concerning the laws of the nature.

Gikatilla seems to follow Abulafian methodology of making frequent use of the device of *gematria*. The character of letter combination (*tzerufei otiyyot*) in *Ginnat ʾEgoz* appears as a recombination of the divine names through *gematriot*, like the methods of Abulafia. By contrast, the letter combination in *Shaʿarei Orah* appears to be more emphasized as part of a broader hermeneutical system of the *gematriot* i.e., combining the prophetic and theosophical aspects, and revealing the secrets of the Torah through a sefirotic symbolism.[210]

On the basis of this linguistic conception, Gikatilla's *Shaʿarei Orah* further elaborates the relationships of the divine names to the *merkavah* imagery, which appear in various mythic images and anthropomorphic expressions, as examined earlier. As Huss notes, unlike the philosophical and allegorical approaches in *Ginnat ʾEgoz,* in *Shaʿarei Orah*, the images of God and Torah are described in the mythic and anthropomorphic expressions through the sefirotic symbolism.[211] It is beneficial to recall that in the Zohar, the *shekhinah* appears as a God-like image who is a spiritual "emissary" of divinity. There is, therefore, in the Zohar, a blurring of the border between the sefirot and God through the mythic and anthropomorphic strategies.[212] In the Zohar (e.g., *Sefer ha-Zohar* II. 22b; 51a), the image of *shekhinah*, which is a reference to the lower *ḥokhmah*, is a female connected in the sexual union to the image of higher *ḥokhmah*, through the mythic and anthropomorphic strategies. In a manner similar to the Zohar, the God-like image of *ḥokhmah* in *Shaʿarei Orah*, which appears in its relationship with the Tetragrammaton as the divine essence, is a reverberation of the God-like image of personified Wisdom, which possesses the closest proximity to God, and also formulates the God-like image of primordial Torah.[213] In *Shaʿarei ʾOrah*, the image of higher *ḥokhmah* in the sefirotic system appears to play a critical role and function as a hidden mediator, which has utmost proximity to *Ein Sof*. The God-like image of *ḥokhmah* also embraces the other sefirot, while connecting them to the *Ein Sof*, who is not enclosed within the sefirotic system. Specifically, the image of *ḥokhmah* is expressed through a "light-metaphor" in which the *ḥokhmah* is divine light for the sefirot, which flows from the essence of *Ein Sof***.**[214] This "light-metaphor" is a reverberation of Philo's idea of *unio mystica*, as noted earlier. Specifically, this shows that Gikatilla explicitly formulates a God-like image of higher *ḥokhmah* through linguistic and sefirotic symbols, such as "light" and "primordial point," and *yod* in the Tetragrammaton.[215] By this logic, Gikatilla creates a God-like image of Torah, expressed sefirotically as *ḥokhmah* and *binah*, which is connected in closest proximity to *Ein Sof*.

---

[210] Morlok (38-56, 77-79) emphasizes a hermeneutical difference between in *Ginnat ʾEgoz* and *Shaʿarei ʾOrah* with regard to the linguistic techniques: letter combination and *gematriot* for the *unio mystica*.
[211] Huss, "Rabbi Joseph Gikatilla's Definition of Symbolism," 157-76.
[212] Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 1:379.
[213] Idel, *Language, Torah, and Hermeneutics in Abraham Abulafia*, 40-41; Scholem, *Major Trends*, 173. The conception of the "primordial point," i.e., *ḥokhmah* appears in Gikatilla's writings and in the Zoharic sources and is linked with the primordial Torah conceived as the wisdom of God in Prov 8.

The God-like image of *ḥokhmah* is a reverberation of the God-like image of personified Wisdom, which possesses the closest proximity to God, and eventually formulates the God-like image of primordial Torah.[216] This shows that Gikatilla, in *Sha'arei 'Orah,* creates the God-like image of Torah as a hidden and esoteric mediator between God and human beings through a particular hermeneutic methodology, combining the biblical and kabbalistic interpretations, which elucidate the relationship between the Tetragrammaton, as the divine essence, and the concept of *ḥokhmah*. In a manner similar to the Zohar, Gikatilla also creates similarity and intimacy between the concepts of the highest sefirot (*binah*, *ḥokhmah*, and *keter*) and the letters (of the Tetragrammaton) in the Torah through the symbolic natures of language. In particular, the images of *ḥokhmah* are theosophically associated with the God-like image of Torah in a dialectic mechanism of the "hidden" and "revealed" of the Torah.

In all, as examined earlier, in similar ways with the Geronese and zoharic traditions, we can see that Gikatilla primarily weighs in on the significance of an ultimate restoration of the divine entities

---

[214] Scholem, *Major Trends*, 225-28, 261, 265-66, 271-72. This "light-metaphor" is also applied to the metaphor of the sexual union of the sefirot—in particular, the male *yesod* and the female *shekhinah* or *malkhut*.
[215] The second sefirah, *ḥokhmah,* is derived from the first sefirah, *keter,* which is endlessly connected to *Ein Sof*. See also *Sha'arei Orah*, Introduction, 5, 49-50, 136; Gikatilla, *Ginnat 'Egoz*, 158, 360, 330.
[216] Idel, *Language, Torah, and Hermeneutics in Abraham Abulafia*, 40-41; Scholem, *Major Trends*, 173. The conception of the "primordial point," i.e., *ḥokhmah* appears in Gikatilla's writings and the Zoharic sources and is linked with the primordial Torah conceived as the Wisdom of God in Prov 8.

(i.e., in the second sefirah, *ḥokhmah*, which embraces all other sefirot and *Ein Sof*) through the sefirotic symbolism. In a manner similar to the idea of *unio mystica* in the Zohar, Gikatilla moves forward to elaborate his own method of *unio mystica* by utilizing the mythic and anthropomorphic themes based on the sefirotic symbolism.[217] On the basis of his conception of *unio mystica*, Gikatilla, in *Sha'arei 'Orah*, actively creates the God-like image of Torah through a particular hermeneutic strategy utilizing the myth and anthropomorphic themes and combining the biblical and kabbalistic interpretations. The God-like images of Torah, in the image of *ḥokhmah* and the letters of the Tetragrammaton, play a critical role as a hidden and esoteric mediator between God and human beings for the mystical experiences of *devekut* and *unio mysitca* through the sefirotic symbolism.

Critical Findings and Implications

This examination shows that the dualistic conceptions of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos, which contain both the angelic and God-like images within the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions, were continued, in various forms, from the Second Temple and later Rabbinic periods through the Middle Ages. The primitive forms of *unio mystica* seen in Philo's two conceptions of *unio mystica—visio dei*, as a "direct mystical vision" of God and "reflection" of "intuitive illumination," an indirect experience of the divine transcendence, are explicitly interlocked with the various types of *unio mystica* that were dynamically developed in the medieval Jewish mystical tradition. Specifically, we have seen that the features of *unio mystica* are profoundly related to the formulation of the God-like images of Torah, which are manifest in the kabbalistic (Geronese, Abulafian, zoharic, and Gikatillian) traditions.

In the Geronese tradition, as examined earlier, the dynamic relationships and interactions between the three higher sefirot (*keter*, *ḥokhmah*, and *binah*) are significantly related to the three main hypostatic notions: Torah, Wisdom, and Logos, as they were manifest within the Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered traditions dynamically developed since the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. This also illuminates that the secrets of the sefirotic system and the hidden divine essence beyond human knowledge are esoterically expressed through mythic and anthropomorphic descriptions generated by the theosophic imagination of the early and thirteenth century Kabbalists.[218] Above all, as noted earlier, the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica*, in the Bahiric and Geronese traditions, prioritize a theosophic (i.e., inner-divine) union of the Godhead in the process of the unification of the sefirot over the participation and absorption of the human soul with the Godhead (i.e., the *devekut* and *unio mystica.* This also shows how the sefirotic system for the Jewish mystics became a critical mediator for experiencing God and how the idea of *unio mystica* operates along with the sefiortic system in the mystical experiences and consciousness of the Kabbalists. In all, this corroborates that the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* operate along with a hermeneutic strategy creating the dynamic interactions of the hypostatic notions of Torah in relation to the sefirot of *shekhinah* and *ḥokhmah* and thereby formulating the God-like images of Torah.

---

[217] Dauber, *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers*, 300.

By contrast, as noted earlier, Abulafia appears to choose a different way of conceiving the idea of *unio mystica* by explaining the dynamic mechanism of the sefirot and the mystical experiences of *unio mystica* by mapping and internalizing them into a human inner (i.e., psychological and mental) system on the basis of the philosophical system. However, in a manner different from the angelic image of Torah in relation to the *merkavah* imagery, Abulafia creates the way of achieving a state of *unio mystica* through the ecstatic *merkavah* visions which occur as a result of letter combination (*tzerufei otiyyot*) of the Tetragrammaton. Abulafia thereby creates and formulates a God-like image of Torah in relation to the Tetragrammaton against the backdrop of the radical ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica,* i.e., in the process of psychologizing the sefirot in human "pure thought," which facilitates the formation of ontic continuum that is formed between the human soul (intellect) and the Active Intellect, which is, in turn, identified with Torah. Nonetheless, for

---

[218] Scholem, *Origin of the Kabbalah*, 129-30.

Abulafia's system based on the Maimonidean thought, in accordance with the theological dictum of the Biblical text, "for my thoughts are not your thoughts" (Isaiah 55:8), a theological and ontological distinction between God and humanity appears to be still assumed and maintained, even in the state of *unio mystica*.[219]

However, the Zohar and Gikatilla appear to pursue a state of *unio mystica* by blurring the boundary between the human soul (or intellect) and the infinite divine (i.e., *Ein Sof*) through an intense inner mystical experience**.** This conception specifically appears in connection with a linguistic symbolism, which formulates the God-like images of Torah. The main common point in the Geronese, Abulafia, zoharic, and Gikatillian traditions is that they discussed the ideas of *unio mystica* to the Tetragrammaton and the highest sefirot, with a focus on the *ḥokhmah*, while explicating the dynamics of the divine essence. Abulafia's philosophically oriented conception of the idea of *unio mystica*, which mainly investigates the divine realms from a philosophic perspective, appears to be advanced by the mythic and linguistic features in the Zohar and Gikatilla's works. The linguistic and symbolic features in the Zohar, which seems to combine the Geronese and Abulafian traditions, focus on the *devekut* to the letters of the Tetragrammaton and the *devekut* to the sefirotic divine unity. In particular, the mythic and symbolic strategies in the Zohar appear in the God-like images of the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as *shekhinah* and *hohkmah* in the sefirot, which were dynamically formulated by a hermeneutical mechanism of *devekut* and *unio mystica* in a philosophic and kabbalistic ethos.

The idea of *unio mystica* in the Geronese Kabbalists, described earlier, implicitly appears through theurgical prayers in the process of *devekut* to the letters of Torah (i.e., the Tetragrammaton) and in the process of the human soul participating in the divine unity in the sefirot. In a manner different from the Geronese tradition, the idea of *unio mystica* in the Zohar conveys a sense of unitive experiences which includes visual comprehension of the immediacy of the divine presence in a mythic and anthropomorphic image, especially in the letters of the Tetragrammaton through kabbalistic symbolism. The Zohar actively utilizes mythic and anthropomorphic conceptions and themes to investigate the lower seven sefirot, such as *hesed*, *din*, and *tiferet*, through sefirotic symbolism, due to the impossibility of knowledge of the highest sefirot (i.e., *keter*, *ḥokhmah*, and *binah*). Furthermore, as seen earlier in the Zohar, the goals of the mythic descriptions of the gendered and hypostasized sefirot are implicitly focused on reaching a state of *unio mystica* through the *devekut* to the letters of the Tetragammaton. In this process, the images of the Tetragrammaton in the letters of Torah related to the sefirotic system substantiates a God-like image of Torah, which is formulated by the exegetic (i.e., mythic) strategies along with the idea of *unio mystica*.

---

[219] Abulafia, *Sefer Sitrei Torah*, 192b; As Rachel Elior, in *The Mystical Origins of Hasidism*, trans. Shalom Carmy (Oxford; Portland, OR: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2006), 81-2, notes, the necessity of a mediator between God and human beings emphasizes divine transcendence.

Gikatilla further conceptualizes the image of Torah as a God-like linguistic entity, which manifests in the letters of the Tetragrammaton.[220] Specifically, in Gikatilla's *Sha'arei 'Orah* and the zoharic tradition, the image of *ḥokhmah* is an inaccessible entity and is interchangeable with God Himself, hidden in the letters of the Torah, which appears to be associated with a God-like image of Torah. By this logic, the God-like image of Torah symbolized in the images of *ḥokhmah* comes to the fore through the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* to the sefirot and the letters of the divine names of the Torah by means of linguistic and sefirotic symbolism, which connects the infinite natures of the language of the Torah to God.[221] Gikatilla emphasizes the process of combining the eternal nature and power of language with the ecstatic (i.e., philosophic) and theosophic elements in a broader hermeneutic system which formulates the God-like image of Torah through the idea of *unio mystica*. By this logic, Gikatilla does not appear to follow the apophatic theology that was the core of Maimonidean thought, while investigating the concept of divine unity and the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* in a different sense from the Maimonidean and Abulafian traditions. Through this process of *unio mystica*, even the boundary between God and the human soul appears to be gradually blurred by a linguistic and sefirotic symbolism. Strictly speaking, the boundaries between the hypostatic notions of Torah and God disappear, but the God-like image of Torah reemerges as a symbolic and hidden mediator, who is closest to God Himself. This corroborates that the idea of *unio mystica* primarily functions in the formative process of the God-like images of the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as the *shekhinah* and *ḥokhmah*, which are the closest proximity to God Himself, through the exegetic (i.e., mythic and anthropomorphic) strategies, which are manifest within the Geronese, zoharic, and Gikatillian traditions. This further substantiates that the idea of *unio mystica* offers a critical insight not only into the interpretative and hermeneutic methodology of religious experiences, but also on the process of formulating the God-like image of Torah mainly manifest through this history of Jewish mystical thought.

---

[220] Afterman, 160; Idel, *Studies in Ecstatic Kabbalah,* 7-11.

[221] Isaiah Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar,* 3:1080, 1086.

Consequently, this examination demonstrates that the appearance of the angelic and God-like images of the hypostatic notions of Torah within the medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions is a phenomenological reverberation of the angelic and God-like images of Torah, which were manifest in the Wisdom-centered tradition during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. This also substantiates the relationship of the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* to the formulations and interpretations of the angelic and God-like images of Torah, which were dynamically developed in the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions reflected in the Geronese, Abulafian, zoharic, and Gikatillian traditions.

Chapter V: A Messianic Image of Torah in the Jewish Philosophic and Mystical Tradition

The previous examination shows that the messianic images of Torah in Second Temple period and Rabbinic sources appear in combination and dynamic interactions with the angelic and God-like images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, and the Johannine Logos, *memra,* and *shekhinah.* In this context, I now will try to show the continuity and development of the messianic images of Torah which are intertwined with the angelic and God-like images into the features of the messianic images of Torah manifest in the medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions.

It is notable that unlike Scholem, who weighs the historical element as a causal one in the formation of messianic ideas, Idel argues that it leads him to centralize the apocalyptic form of Jewish messianism and neglect individualistic and inner-spiritual forms as a deviation of Jewish messianism.[1] Scholem, in this sense, describes messianism as a type of "diachronic monochromatism," and as a "collective phenomenon," that comprises "the national, historical, and geographical elements of redemption" and generates transformation in a "dialectical continuity."[2] Idel also acknowledges that, relative to the images of messianic figures in apocalyptic literature, metaphysical and theological perspectives on the messianic figures are limited in Rabbinic literature, including the Mishnah Talmud, and Targums.[3] Idel, however, offers a different opinion regarding the relationship between historical context and messianic tendencies. He comprehensively examines certain philosophical and mystical models of messianism, which were rejected due to the prejudices of leading scholars, such as Scholem. This allows him to show new and different paradigms of Jewish mystical messianism.[4] Indeed, Idel shows that the revelatory and mystical experiences of Jewish messianic characters should be critically considered on their own terms, even as they interact with history. Similarly, Talmon states that "the spiritual dimension of Jewish messianism continued to manifest itself in historical realism and societal factuality."[5] This implies that the apocalyptic features in the early Jewish sources were implicitly continued in the eschatological and spiritualized (e.g., soteriological) discussions in later Jewish messianism and became as a critical messianic element in the Jewish mystical tradition. In this sense, Idel explores the multiple interconnections between messianic ideas and other historical, intellectual, and spiritual environments.[6] By this logic, Idel suggests a triadic model, which intertwines history, messianism, and Jewish mysticism, while emphasizing the interaction of the three spheres in the history of Jewish mysticism.

---

[1] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 30-35; Siegmund Hurwitz, "Some Psychological Aspects of the Messianic Idea in Judaism," in *The Well-Tended Tree; Essays into the Spirit of Our Time,* ed. Hilde Kirsch (New York: Putnam, 1971), 130-33. For instance, Scholem sees the Spanish expulsion (1492) as a causal factor for the emergence of the Lurianic kabbalah, which later directly influenced the movement of Sabbatai Zevi (1626-1676), who further developed the concepts of "exile" (*galut*) and messianic redemption in the Middle Ages. In this sense, Scholem posits a linear historical development of messianism, according to which the false messiahs Zevi and Jacob Frank, emerged after the Spanish expulsion, whereas in pre-Spanish expulsion Kabbalah there was indifference to messianism. See Scholem, *The Messianic Idea of Judaism*, 194.

[2] Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism,* viii, 2; Amos Funkenstein, "Gershom Scholem: Charisma, Kairos and the Messianic Dialectic," *History and Memory* 4 (1992): 123-39.

This type of analysis can provide us critical insight into the messianic features of the various texts. Scholem emphasizes the radical divergences between the Jewish and Christian forms of messianism while prioritizing the apocalyptic component of Jewish messianism.[7] Idel's analysis suggests, by contrast, that the messianic ideas are intertwined with apocalyptic and spiritualized aspects, which dynamically appear, in varying measures, in the different types of messianism. As Idel notes, the messianic ideas and conceptions of thirteenth century Kabbalists were developed into diverse topics, which can be organized according to various patterns and contexts and which are intertwined within different philosophical and kabbalistic conceptions and systems.[8] This complexity demonstrates “the substantial integration of messianism within a variety of forms of Kabbalistic literature,” as well as “a dramatic diversification of the very concept of Kabbalah.”[9]

---

[3] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 30-35; Lawrence Schiffman, "The Concept of the Messiah in Second Temple and Rabbinic Literature," *Review and Expositor* (1984): 235-46; Anthony J. Saldarini, "Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Literature," *CBQ* (1975): 348-58; Baruch M. Bokser, "Messianism, the Exodus Pattern, and Early Rabbinic Judaism," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 239-58; idem, "Changing Views of Passover and the Meaning of Redemption according to the Palestinian Talmud," *AJS Review* 10, no. 1 (1985): 1-18.

[4] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 30-35. Idel warns that one element should not be regarded in an overdetermined manner as the only significant feature in the formation of messianism.

[5] Talmon, "The Concept of the Messiah and Messianism in Early Judaism," in *The Messiah*, 115.

[6] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 101. Idel considers both the spiritual and intellectual environments of the thirteenth century Kabbalah.

[7] Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, 1-2, 15-16; Dan, "Gershom Scholem and Jewish Messianism," in *Gershom Scholem: The Man and His Work*, ed. Paul Mendes-Flohr (New York: SUNY Press; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1994): 73-86; Schwartz, *Messianism in Medieval Jewish Thought*, 78-97.

Idel categorizes three models of messianism: R. Isaac ben Jacob ha-Kohen’s mystical-apocalyptic model, Abulafia's mystical-ecstatic model, and the Zohar's mythical-theurgic model.[10] Idel’s first exemplar of an acute (or apocalyptic) messianism is R. Isaac ben Jacob ha-Kohen, a Castilian Kabbalist who was active in the middle of the thirteenth century.[11] R. Isaac is reflective of a typical form of Jewish apocalyptic eschatology, which depicts historical catastrophe and an apocalyptic future. Following Idel’s categorization and panoramic approach, I will examine and compare the apocalyptic messianism with the two other types of messianism: Abulafia's, and the Zohar's. In this case, I will focus on select examples of the messianic images from these two models—Abulafia’s mystical-ecstatic model and the Zohar's mythical-theurgic model—in order to show how the concrete features of the images of Torah, which intertwined with messianic conceptions. Specifically, I will discuss the combination and formulation of various messianic figures in relation to the angelic and God-like images of Torah within medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions.

The Continuity of Messianic Images of Torah

It is notable that the messianic image of Torah, which are intertwined with the angelic and God-like images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, are based on the “proto-messianic” ideas and figures described in Second Temple Jewish sources, including the Hebrew Bible and the Wisdom literature, early Christian sources, and Rabbinic literature. It is clear that the messianic images of the hypostatic notions of Torah are intertwined with the various apocalyptic, allegorical, and symbolical depictions of messianic figures—part of an "unreconciled diversity" of different sources and groups with unique historical and social contexts, such as Qumran texts, Rabbinic literature, and Christian sources.[12] It is critical to note that the dual conception of the hypostatic notions of Torah, i.e., the angelic and God-like images of the personified Wisdom figures in the Wisdom literature and Philo's Logos, also have a messianic aspect and are related to conceptions of the Messiah and messianic era. As noted earlier, from the interpretations of אָמוֹן in Prov 8:22-31, in which angelic and God-like images of Torah are intertwined, the messianic and salvific images of personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos have two different versions: the first image is close to an angelic or son-like image of personified Wisdom (אָמוֹן) and is found in in the Logos-centered tradition; the second image is close to a God-like image of personified Wisdom and is found in the Wisdom-centered tradition.

---

[8] Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism,* 38-57. Cf. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines,* 326-92.
[9] Idel, *Messianic Mystics,* 108.
[10] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 41-42. Idel suggests three models of messianic phenomena in the biblical literature: 1) a present Messiah (a king, priest, or occasionally prophet); 2) an eschatological Messiah; 3) messianism, which implies “diffuse-redemption hope” without a historic and central figure.
[11] Ibid, 35-57.

The son-like or angelic image of personified Wisdom (e.g., Prov 8:22) is intertextually and semantically connected to, for instance, the images of "firstborn" (בְּכוֹר, πρωτόγονον) and "the highest of the kings in the world" (עֶלְיוֹן, לְמַלְכֵי-אָרֶץ), who will be a reflection of King David promised by God (e.g., Ps 89:28). As can be seen in his exposition of "the image of God" in *Opif.*,, Philo's Logos also demonstrates the dual conception of the messianic image, which is connected to both the angelic and God-like images of Torah.[13] The first messianic concept of Philo's Logos as an allegorical designator for the Law of Moses also appears as a political messianic figure in the Logos-centered tradition. As examined earlier, the images in Philo's Logos convey not only the son-like image in conjunction with "first-born" and "king" images in Philo's account of Logos as a being formed after the Image of God, but also the son-like image that foreshadows the "begotten" son of the Johannine Logos, i.e., Jesus (e.g., Jn 1:1-18). The "son of God" (i.e., divine sonship) appears in various forms, such as a specific messianic figure (mainly as a royal figure, such as king) or a collective concept of the children of Israel, a concept found in the Wisdom literature, the Qumran texts, and Rabbinic literature. Philo’s Logos and the Johannine Logos, as son-like (or angelic) images of Torah, are reminiscent of multiple images (a priest, king, and prophet) of messianic figures in the Qumran texts (e.g., the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel in 1QS 9:11). These images also have eschatological and salvific implications in Qumran texts and Rabbinic literature.[14] These messianic figures appear as an angelic image of Torah as a visualized mediator, which bridges God and human beings. This shows that a conceptual interaction between various messianic forms (or figures) prominently appears in the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo’s Logos, the Johannine Logos, and *memra*, since the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.

---

[12] Morton Smith, "What Is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures," *JBL* 78 (1959): 66-72.
[13] Hecht, "Philo and Messiah," 140, 158.

In addition to the angelic image of Torah, as discussed earlier, the God-like image of Torah appears in the philosophical and mystical conceptions of various hypostatic notions that are found in Wisdom-centered tradition of the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. These include personified Wisdom, *shekhinah* in the Wisdom literature, Philo’s Logos, Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, the messianic figures in the Qumran texts, and the Rabbinic literature. As examined earlier, the God-like and salvific image of Torah, which appeared in the interpretations of personified Wisdom as a sage or master in Prov 8 and 9, is related to the divine-like and salvific images of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels. The God-like and salvific images of personified Wisdom, which is in closest proximity to God in creation, also appears to be related to the images of the personified Wisdom figures in *Sirach* and *Wisdom of Solomon* (e.g., Wis 7:25- 8:1), as well as the images of Philo’s Logos. As examined earlier, Philo’s dual conception of the Logos leads to two different messianic implications: a messianic figure close to an angelic image, and a messianic era related to a God-like image. This shows that unlike a historical and apocalyptic figure, the messianic figures, related to the Logos, appear as a mystical and eschatological image, which neutralizes the historical and political aspects of Jewish messianism. It is notable hat as Harry Wolfson implies, the divine-like image of Philo's Logos appears as part of an abstract idea of a messianic era, which, through mystical symbolism, is esotericized and transformed into a de-historized, mystical, and spiritualized messianism.[15] In this sense, Philo's conception of the Logos as a messianic era neutralizes the political and apocalyptic sense of the messianic concept, while mitigating the tension between the present condition and an eschatological ideal. Nonetheless, this type of messianism still appears to be progressive in that the messianic era is consummated by a "world to come" or "kingdom of God" ruled by the teachings of Torah and by the redemptive activities of an abstract, mystified figure who symbolizes a God-like image of Torah. This shows that the dual eschatological concept of Philo's Logos creates both the angelic and God-like images of the hypostatic notions of Torah that are aligned with messianic ideas. This corroborates that Philo's messianic concept of the Logos as a messianic era implicitly echoes a God-like image of Torah formulated through mystical symbolism.

---

[14] Shemaryahu Talmon, “Waiting for the Messiah: The Spiritual Universe of the Qumran Covenanteers,” in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs*, eds. Neusner et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 123-31; William M. Schniedewind, “King and Priest in the Book of Chronicles and the Duality of Qumran Messianism,” *JJS* 45, no. 1 (1994): 71-78.

This messianic image of Torah, which is associated with the angelic and God-like images, is intertwined with both apocalyptic messianism and metaphysical and spiritualized messianism in the several genres of Rabbinic literature, including the Mishnaic and Talmudic sources as well as Targums and late-antique Jewish mystical literature. In the Mishnah and Talmud, messianic figures generally appear as apocalyptical in their functions and are connected to apocalyptic and eschatological events. For instance, the rabbinic concepts of the Messiah, exemplified by Bar Kokhba, are generally focused on the idea of a national redemption in an apocalyptic sense by a political figure, i.e., a Davidic descendent or king-messiah. This notion of the Messiah can be gleaned from Talmudic and Midrashic literature since Late Antiquity and later Rabbinic periods.[16] In Jewish and Christian traditions from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods, two different (apocalyptic and eschatological) images of messianic figures emerge in depictions of hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos and Incarnate Logos (i.e., Jesus).[17] As noted earlier, in the dualistic conception of Philo's Logos, the "son" and "king" images of a messianic figure appear as an angelic image of the Logos. In addition, Philo conceptualizes a "man" as the Messiah, by connecting the notion of the Messiah to the son-like and angelic images of the Logos, which are identified with Torah.[18] Philo's conception of the Messiah as a "man" in relation to the images of the Logos is apparently reminiscent of "one like a man" in Dan 7:13 and similar expressions, such as the "scion of David" in the Hebrew Bible. It is notable that these expressions combine the son-like and salvific images.[19]

---

[15] H. Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:395.

[16] Idel, *Golem*, 261; Yehuda Even-Shmuel, ed., *Midreshei Ge'ulah: Chapters in Jewish Apocalypse from the Closure of the Talmud until the Early Sixth Century* (Hebrew; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1954), 15-16.

As most scholars agree, the messianic ideas found in the Gospels and the Book of Revelation (or the Apocalypse of John) appear to be directly or indirectly interacting with late antique Jewish (or Jewish-Christian) mystical apocalyptic traditions regarding the Son of Man.[20] As analyzed earlier, a messianic image of Jesus in the Gospel of John conveys both a son-like (and angelic) image and a salvific image as reflected in phrases like "the Son of God" (e.g., Jn 11:27, 20:31), and "the Son of Man" (e.g., Jn 12:34). These images of Jesus appear similar to the "son" and "king" images of the kingly messianic figure, that is, Davidic King-Messiah in the Qumran texts.

In addition, it is notable that these images of Jesus and the messianic figures in the Qumran texts appear to be related to the angelic and salvific images of Metatron or Enoch, in a historical and apocalyptic sense, as found in Talmudic and Midrashic literature.[21] For instance, in b. *Ḥag.* 14. 1-6, the identification of Rabbi Akiva himself with the Son of Man (e.g., Dan 7:13) as an angelic figure is also connected to the image of the Davidic Messiah. As Mowinckel explains, the identification between the Son of Man and Messiah in the Targums, along with the interpretation of the "one like a man" and the Son of Man in Dan 7:13, are concatenated in various messianic figures, such as "the last descendent of David" in 1 Chr 3:24, as the 'Cloud Man,' and the Messiah-Son of Man.[22] Furthermore, the images of the Son of Man combine an angelic and messianic image, such as Enoch, who is explicitly identified with Metatron and the Son of Man in *3 Enoch*, as "one like a man" in Dan 7:13 and the *Similitudes in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (e.g., *1 Enoch*, xxxvii-lxxi), and as the "man" who "shall spring from the seed of David" in the *Greek Apocalypse of Ezra* (*2 Esdras* xiii, 3; xii, 32; cf. vii, 29; xiii, 25ff).[23] This shows a profound amalgamation among the Messiah, the son-like image of the Son of Man, and the angelic image of Metatron. This thereby substantiates that the messianic image of the Son of Man, who is identified with the angel Metatron, is a unique form, which conveys both an apocalyptic and allegorized conception, as shown in the messianic images of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah during the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.

---

[17] Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 348-55.

[18] Savingnac, "Le Messianisme de Philon d'Alexandrie," 319-24; Philo, *Praem.* Xxix, 172; *Conf.* xiv, 63*; Mos. II*. vii, 44*; II.* li, 288; *Opif.* xxvi, 79-81.

[19] Philo, *Opif.* xxvi. 79-81; *Mos. II*. i-vii. 1-44; *Praem.* xvi. 95-97; Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, c2005), 324, 333-35, 361. The son-like image of Philo's Logos is connected to the motif of the Son of Man, which is also associated with Metatron and *shekhinah*, as shown earlier.

[20] Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 347, 357-8. It is notable that the dual (apocalyptic and eschatological) conception of messianism, in late antique Jewish and Christian traditions, mainly derives from the Persian, Hellenistic, and Gnostic influences. The image of Jesus as the Son of Man indicates a mediatorial role or mission for the Kingdom of God. This image is associated with several figures in as part of the account of the eschatological transformation in the Enoch-Metatron traditions, such as in the *Similitudes in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch*.

In contrast to the messianic image of the Son of Man, which appears close to an angelic image, we can also see, in late antique Jewish mystical literature, a conceptual change of the Son of Man, which appears in the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, from a political or angelic figure to an incarnate and heavenly messianic figure, i.e., divine-human Messiah or a messianic era understood as an abstract eschatological concept. The image of the Son of Man not only refers to its pre-existence and eternality before creation, but also appears in the messianic conception of "the Ancient of Days" of Dan 7:9, understood in Enochic sources, such as 3 *Enoch* (*the Apocalypse of Enoch*), as the God-like image of Metatron.[24] As Mowinckel analyzes, sources, such as *Gen. Rab.* i. 4, ii, 4, *Lev. Rab.* xiv, 1, and *Pes. Rab.* 152b, substantiate not only the pre-existence and eternality of the Messiah, who is identical with Metatron, but also his divine-like image as an indirect expression of God Himself.[25]

---

[21] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 43-44. This messianic image in a historical and national sense appears to be later marginalized in the late Jewish mystical sources, such as *3 Enoch*. See Gustaf Dalman, *The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), 256, 445.

[22] Mowinckel, 360-61.

[23] Ibid., 348-57.

Importantly, the image of Metatron, which combines the messianic and God-like images, is related to the God-like image of *shekhinah,* as expressed in the Wisdom centered hypostatic notions of Torah in the Second Temple, Tannaitic, and Enochic literature. The Son of Man, who existed (1 *En.* lxx, 1) "before the creation of the world and for evermore" (1 *En.* xlviii, 6), is not only described as a salvific figure who carries out "His purpose of eschatological judgment and salvation" (1 *En.* xlvi, 3; xlviii, 6), but also as a God-like image of the Son of Man who is a divine and heavenly Messiah (1 *En.* lv, 4, lxii, li, 3) sitting upon the Throne with the divine glory, who appears to be identified with the *shekhinah*.[26] In addition to the angelic and salvific images of *shekhinah* as part of *merkavah* imagery in the Mishnaic and Talmudic sources previously examined, the *shekhinah* also has a salvific and God-like image that represents the divine presence and divine redemption. The image of *shekhinah* as identical to Metatron, as the Son of Man, not only appears as a messianic and God-like image but also has an eschatological implication for the ultimate redemption by her salvific activities (e.g., t. *Kelim, B. Qam.* i, 12). Furthermore, in the Midrashic and Enochic literature, the image of Metatron (i.e., Enoch) as the Son of Man conveys not only a salvific function of "judgement and salvation" with the divine glory (*shekhinah*) (*1 En.* xlviii, 2-10, xli, 9), but also an eschatological vision (e.g., 2 *Esdras* xii, 32; xi, 36-45; xvi, 9; 2 *Bar.* lxxiv, 2; lxxvi, 2).[27]

---

[24] Hermann L. Strack, Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (Munchen: C. H. Beck, 1922-1928), 334.

[25] Mowinckel, 323, 334. The Messiah was born and contemplated from the beginning of the creation of the world (Ps 122:17) in *Gen. Rab*. i, 1-4; John E. Goldingay, *Daniel*, *Word Biblical Commentary*, vol. 30 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1989), 170. As Goldingay notes, the anointed as Daniel pictures him has a very transcendent dimension of a heavenly figure.

[26] Willy Staerk, *Soter: die biblische Erlösererwartung als religionsgeschichtliches Problem; eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung* I, *Teil: Der biblische Christus* (B.F.Ch.Th. II, 31) (North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany: Gütersloh Bertelsmann, 1933), 516.

[27] Mowinckel, 358-59.

This examination provides critical insight into the conceptual changes and development from a historical and apocalyptic image in the Talmudic sources into a spiritualized messianic image, which explicitly appears in a transition from late antique Jewish mystical traditions to the medieval kabbalistic traditions.[28] In particular, the move from an angelic image of the Messiah to a God-like image demonstrates a dynamic, innovative, and polymorphous expression of divine presence and hiddenness that is formed through a particular exegetical and hermeneutical strategy (e.g., the complicated combination of the hypostatic and anthropomorphic descriptions of *shekhinah* and Metatron). However, it is also notable that in accordance with a historical and ideological context, the messianic figures in late Jewish apocalyptic literature, such as *Sefer Zerubbavel*, dynamically appear to return to a historical, political, apocalyptical, and redemptive image, rather than an individual, spiritualized, or psychological image.[29] Nonetheless, in late antique Jewish mystical, late rabbinic, and early kabbalistic traditions, the messianic conception generally appears as de-historized, and the Messiah is personified and hypostatized as part of a trend of the ontologization of the Messiah in formulating the messianic ideas in late antique Jewish mystical, late rabbinic, and early kabbalistic traditions.[30]

The messianic images in the Hekhalot literature appear to intensify the features of a spiritualized and personalized (ethical and individual) redemption grounded in mystical experiences. A case in point is the story of R. Ishmael, in *Hek. Rab.*, as he ascends to the divine chariot, and meets two Messiahs, and asks them for the divine eschatological plan.[31] This story does not refer to an apocalyptic sense of messianism, but alludes to a personal and spiritualized redemption achieved through the mystical experience (i.e., apotheosis) of R. Ishmael's "chariot" vision.[32] This shows that the Hekhalot literature neutralizes the apocalyptic elements of older messianic views, and that there is a considerable conceptual change of the messianic images, which serve as a transitional point between an ancient and rabbinic messianic thought to a medieval mystical messianic thought.[33] It is notable that the messianic conceptions of *shekhinah* and Metatron in the Hekhalot and Hasidei Ashkenazi literature, which initially conveyed an angelic image of the divine countenance, also denote a messianic image spiritualized through the emanation from God in the inner process of "a divine continuum."[34] The images of Metatron, who is identified with Yaho'el in the Ashkenazi literature, conveys the motif of the divine redemptive act of saving the Israelites from Egypt, and thereby bears a salvific and divine (hypostatic or God-like) image.[35] This shows that the messianic image of Metatron-Yaho'el in Hekhalot and Hasidei Ashkenazi literature implies a sense of personalized and spiritualized redemption and eschatology in place of an immediate national and apocalyptic redemption.[36] It is also notable that these messianic features of Metatron, which are intertwined with the son-like, priestly, and salvific images, are reminiscent of the images of Philo's

---

[28] Idel, *Golem*, 15-16.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 46-47. The dual conception of Metatron in relation to the Logos, which I described earlier, plays a critical role in developing the apocalyptic and eschatological implications of messianic ideas in the Jewish mystical tradition.

[31] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 48; Dan, *Ancient Jewish Mysticism* (Hebrew; Tel Aviv: Misrad haBitahon, 1989), 134-43; Schäfer, *Synopse*, §§ 140-145. The notion of the ascension of the mystic on high where is holds a conversation with the Messiah and is even identified with the Messiah reappears in the works of Abulafia.

---

[32] Idel, *KNP*, 79.

[33] The ideological confrontation and fusion between rabbinic thought and philosophical approaches in the Middle Ages, therefore, led to a substantial transformation of messianic thought.

[34] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 46-50; Dan, "The Seventy Names of Metatron," *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Jerusalem, August 16-21 (1981): 19-23 (Hebrew).

[35] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 46-50. Idel notes that the messianic images of Metatron are a combination of much older *mythologoumena* with some features of the thought of Hasidei Ashkenaz. As Idel and Wolfson argued, these examples of Metatron, in the Ashkenazi literature, are clearly reverberations of an ancient Jewish or ancient Jewish-Christian *mythologoumenon* related to the messianic ideas of a hypostatic and messianic figure. This demonstrates a phenomenological relationship between ancient sources and later Jewish mystical and Kabbalistic (especially in Abulafia's works) sources regarding the nexus between a hypostatic being and a messianic figure. See Idel, *KNP*, 30-34, 114-6; Wolfson, *Along the Path: Studies in Kabbalistic Myth, Symbolism, and Hermeneutics* (SUNY Press, 2012), 63-88.

[36] Idel, "Defining Kabbalah: The Kabbalah of the Divine Names," 97-122. This feature reverberates in Abulafia's mystical techniques of manipulating the divine names in the letters of the Torah as part of a messianic enterprise. See Abulafia, *Sefer Ḥayyei ha-'Olam ha-Ba'*, 13a; Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, 16. As also noted earlier, the images of Metatron-Yaho'el, in relation to the Divine Name in the thought of Abulafia enhance the messianic concepts and images, which are associated with the God-like images of Torah. See also Jarl E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985), 81-82, 292-321; Scholem, *Major Trends*, 67-69; 87-90; Ivan G. Marcus, *Piety and Society: The Jewish Pietists of Medieval Germany,* (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 25, 29-35.

Logos, as noted earlier.[37] The priestly messianic image of Metatron-Yaho'el in *Sefer ha- Ḥesheq*, entitled *Commentary on Seventy Names of Metatron* by R. Nehemiah ben Shlomo, implies a sense of personalized and spiritualized redemption and eschatology in place of an immediate national and apocalyptic redemption.[38] Specifically, it is crucial to note that, as Idel points out, in the Ashkenazi literature, including *Sefer ha- Ḥesheq*, the messianic images of angelic figures, such as Elijah, Enoch, and Metatron, appears to be associated with the images of the *ẓaddik* (i.e., the righteous) and involve a religious experience and thereby a spiritualized redemption.[39] These features in the Ashkenazi literature reverberate in a messianic image of Torah, which is intertwined with the angelic and God-like images of Torah, formulated by Abulafia's mystical techniques of manipulating the divine names in the letters of the Torah, as noted earlier.[40]

In all, this examination shows that like the forms of messianic figures and images that mainly appear in a philosophical Jewish messianism, these messianic concepts and figures explicitly appear in a spiritual (i.e., intellectual) and psychological form, one which was significantly influenced by the interpretations of Neoplatonic and Aristotelian Greek philosophies which penetrated into Jewish thought in the Middle Ages.[41] The critical points of this examination are that the two types of messianic images, which are associated with an angelic image or a divine (or God-like) image of the hypostatic notions of Torah, are profoundly interlocked with the messianic ideas (e.g., historical or spiritualized).

---

[37] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2: 415; David Winston, *Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria* (Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College Press, 1985), 16, 42, 49-50.

[38] See *Sefer ha-Ḥesheq*, ed., Y. M. Epstein (Lemberg: n.p., 1865), fols. 7b-8a: "YHWH WHYH, gematria *Ben* [=Son] because he was a [or the] son of man, [namely] Enoch ben Yared. And the Tetragrammaton is hinted at two times twenty-six and also the gematria of 'Eliyahu [is 52] also Yaho'el… it is the prince of world, and in gematria it is *'Ana'*, because it is the High Priest and when the High Priest was pronouncing *'Ana'* he was first calling to the Prince of the Face, and this the meaning of *'Ana'* and only then he prays to the supreme Name." See the English translation and explanations in Idel, *Ben*, 199. The messianic images of Metatron, who is identified with Enoch and Yaho'el, appear in the explanations of their functions as a high priest, pronouncing the Tetragrammaton. Cf. b. *Qidd.* fol. 71a, 135.

[39] *Sefer ha-Ḥesheq*, par. 18. fol 3b; par. 8. 2a; par. 14. fol. 3a; Idel, *Ben*, 197-218; 646-7.

[40] Idel, "Defining Kabbalah: The Kabbalah of the Divine Names," 97-122. Abulafia and Gikatilla explain the presence and meaning of the Tetragrammaton through the affinity between the divine names and the names of angels, such as Metatron and Yaho'el. See Abulafia, *Sefer Ḥayyei ha-'Olam ha-Ba'* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001), 13a; Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, 16. Cf. Scholem, *Major Trends*, 87-90; Ivan Marcus, *Piety and Society* (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 25, 29-35.

[41] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 51-53.

Messianic Image of Torah related to the Ideas of Devekut and Unio Mystica

In the Thought of Medieval Jewish Philosophers

In order to further prove the continuity of the features of the messianic images of Torah and related messianic ideas, which are found in the Second Temple and late antique Jewish mystical literature, I selectively examine the full-fledged forms of the messianic images of Torah in the thought of medieval Jewish philosophers, such as Saadia Gaon, Ibn Gabirol, R. Abraham bar Hiyya, and Halevi and then delve into the messianic thought of Maimonides.

In *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, Saadia Gaon tries to present an apocalyptic approach based on his rationalist perspective, according to which true knowledge can be obtained from four roots: sense, intuition of the intellect, logical necessity, and authentic tradition.[42] In *Concerning the Redemption*, *Treatise VIII*, Saadia describes the "world to come" as a new creation brought about by the entire transformation of the natural order in keeping with the scriptural descriptions:[43]

> We are also informed by Scripture that all pestilence, diseases, and infirmity will disappear, and similarly sadness and sorrow. Their world will be one that is replete with joy and gladness, so that it will seem to them as though their heaven and their earth have been renewed for them. As for God's statement: For as the new heavens (Isaiah 66:22), since it applies to the world to come, it must literally refer to the place and the environment that God is destined to create for His servants upon the annihilation of our present center and surroundings.

This passage shows that Saadia Gaon justifies a specific apocalyptic tradition regarding the concepts of "world to come" and messianic era. Saadia also uses reason to justify apocalyptic elements, such as resurrection, in a physical and literal sense, as essential features of the messianic era.

---

[42] Saadia Gaon, *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, Introductory Treatise, v, 16-17; Dov Schwartz, *Messianism in Medieval Jewish Thought* (Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2017), 19-20.

[43] Saadia Gaon, *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, chapter vi, 246 (p. 311).

It is also notable that Saadia's messianic and apocalyptic doctrine had a direct impact on bar Hiyya's discussion of apocalyptic aspects in the messianic era.[44] As Dov Schwartz notes, bar Hiyya shows a tension between apocalyptic tradition and individual redemption in the discussion of the immortality of the human soul.[45] Thus, as Schwartz analyzes, this shows that bar Hiyya presents the idea of natural individual redemption, while not rejecting the apocalyptic messianic legacy.[46] In addition, a less apocalyptic and more spiritualized view of redemption can be seen in the *Bustan al-Ukal,* composed by Natan'el al-Fayyum in the twelfth century. This work describes the idea of the return of the human soul to the spiritual hypostasis emanated from God and adopts the idea of an individual and abstract immortality of the human soul.[47] The works of bar Hiyya and al-Fayyum, accordingly, shows not only the significance of Saadia's messianic doctrine, in the messianic thought of Jewish thinkers in Spain and Provence, but also, simultaneously, reflects a phenomenon of gradual disengagement with, or even a rejection of, an apocalyptic approach within Jewish thought toward the end of the twelfth century.

This more spiritualized messianic conception also appears to be profoundly related to Ibn Gabirol's innovative messianic ideas: the liberation (i.e., redemption) of the human soul from the realm of corporeality on the basis of a Neoplatonic system.[48] The emanation of the Active Intellect and its conjunction (*devekut*) with the human soul (or intellect), in a Neoplatonic sense, is related to an individual and spiritualized redemption of the soul and to an abstract conception of the messianic era. Interestingly, we also find a similar motif in Judah Halevi, who connects the messianic conception to the idea of *devekut*, achieved through the attainment of prophecy, as part of a spiritualized understanding of redemption. Halevi requires proper observance of the commandments of the Torah in the Land of Israel for the achievement of *devekut* (i.e., intellectual and halakhic perfection), as expounded in the *Kuzari* I. 99.[49] Halevi's messianic conception, in this sense, conveys both an apocalyptic view and an individual redemptive view.[50] Schwartz argues that these features are reminiscent of the "messianic tension" between Saadia's apocalyptic legacy and bar Hiyya's individual redemptive messianism.[51] On the basis of this understanding of prophecy, Halevi associates the theory of prophecy with the immortality of the soul after death as part of an individual spiritual redemption:[52]

---

[44] Abraham bar Hiyya, *Sefer Megillat ha-Megalleh*, ed. A. Poznanski and J. Guttmann (Berlin: Mekitsei Nirdamim, 1924), 48.

[45] Schwartz, *Messianism in Medieval Jewish Thought,* 37-3

[46] Ibid, 30-38. Like Saadia, bar Hiyya also supports some apocalyptic ideas, such as the eternal life of the body, the expansion of the Land of Israel over the entire world and so forth.

[47] Nathanael Ben Fayyumi, *The Bustan Al-ukul*, ed. David Levine (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2009), 135-37. The human soul "will inhale holy forms and be attached to the universal soul, so that light will shine upon her… [as will] the essence of the Merciful One for immortality and perfect happiness to all eternity." (135).

[48] Idel, "Types of Redemptive Activities in the Middle Ages," in *Messianism and Eschatology: A Collection of Essays*, ed. Z. Baras (Hebrew; Israel: Zalman Shazar Centre, 1984), 257-58. There is a phenomenological similarity between bar Hiyya, *Bustan al-Ukul*, and Gabirol's *Fons Vitae*. The core theme of Gabirol's *Fons Vitae* is the liberation of the human soul through conjunction with the Active Intellect emanating from God.

> Now all that our promises imply is that we shall become connected with the divine influence by means of prophecy, or something nearly approaching it, and also through our relation to the divine influence, as displayed to us in grand and awe-inspiring miracles (*Kuzari* I:75). But how can they [the members of other religions] boast of expectations after death to those who enjoy the fulfilment already in life? Is not the nature of prophets and godly men nearer to immortality than the nature of him who never reached that degree? (*Kuzari* I:77)[53]

Halevi explains that the immortality of the human soul appears as the result of the connection with spiritual and angelic beings (i.e., the Active Intellect) through the process of prophecy.[54] This shows that Halevi's messianic conception connects not only prophecy, understood as *devekut*, to an individual spiritual and intellectual redemption, but also associates it with the individual immortality of the soul. The evolutionary process of messianic conceptions which began in Saadia and continued in bar Hiyya and Halevi, is culminated in Maimonides' messianic conception, which is expressed within both his exegetical and halakhic thought.[55]

---

[49] Halevi, The *Kuzari* I. 99; III. 23, 162.

[50] Ibid., I. 109.

[51] Schwartz, *Messianism in Medieval Jewish Thought*, 48-50.

[52] Leo Strauss, "The Law of Reason in The Kuzari," in *Persecution and the Art of Writing* (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1952), 98-112.

[53] Halevi, *The Kuzari* I. 75, 77.

[54] Barry S. Kogan, "Who Has Implanted within Us Eternal Life: Judah Halevi on Immortality and the Afterlife," in *Judaism and Modernity: The Religious Philosophy of David Hartman*, ed. Jonathan W. Malino (Jerusalem: Shalom Hartman Institute, 2001), 473-95; Schwartz, *Messianism in Medieval Jewish Thought*, 49-55. This recalls Maimonides' notion that the "world to come" is achievable even in the present (*Mishneh Torah, Teshuvah*, viii, 8).

[55] Howard Kreisel, "Judah Halevi's Influence on Maimonides: A Preliminary Appraisal," *Maimonidean Studies* 2 (1991): 95-121.

It is notable that Maimonides' messianic naturalism primarily challenges apocalyptic messianism and an apocalyptic Messiah, such as the one depicted in the Hebrew Apocalypse *Sefer Zurubbavel* (ca. 628) which supposes an apocalyptic catastrophe at the end of history and the recreation of the world.[56] Maimonides transforms the apocalyptic prophecies and teachings in the scriptural and aggadic texts into a naturalistic messianic tradition by interpreting them allegorically.[57] However, it is notable that Maimonides acknowledges historical messianism that does not convey an apocalyptic aspect, while still emphasizing spiritualized redemption.[58] Maimonides theorizes the concept of '*Olam ha-Ba'* (i.e., the "world to come"), which will be available even in the present to philosophers as a result of achieving intellectual perfection through the acquisition of knowledge of God and Torah.[59] At the same time, Maimonides' messianic vision still has a political and national aspect, which eventually leads to the restoration of the dominance of a Davidic kingdom, under the maintenance of the "normal course" of the world and the fulfillment of the Torah in the gradual process of the messianic era.[60] This shows that Maimonides integrates a political messianic ideal into an intellectual ideal of individual and spiritualized redemption in accordance with Aristotelian and

---

[56] Schwartz, *Messianism in Medieval Jewish Thought*, 69-75. David Berger examines the origin and features of the typological (apocalyptic and eschatological) figures, such as the Messiah ben Joseph and Armilus in *Sefer Zurubbavel*. See Berger, "Three Typological Themes in Early Jewish Messianism: Messiah Son of Joseph, Rabbinic Calculations, and the Figure of Armilus," *AJS Review 10* (2): 141-164.
[57] Schwartz, 69-75; *Guide* II. 29; Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah* (=*The Code of Maimonides), The Book of Judges*, *The Book of Judges,* vol. 14, trans. Abraham M. Hershman (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949), *The Laws of Kings and Wars*, 11:1-4 (pp. 238-40); 12:1-2 (p.240-41). Maimonides neutralizes the apocalyptic element of the biblical stories of Gog and Magog (Ezek 38) and Elijah (Mal 3:23), and thereby emphasizes the "normal course" in the messianic era.
[58] See the Laws of Repentance 8:2-3 (pp. 90a-90b); 9:2 (p. 92a) in *Mishneh Torah: The Book of Knowledge*, vol. 1. ed. Moses Hyamson (Jerusalem: Boys Town, 1962). See also *The Laws of Kings and Wars*, 12:4 (p. 242) in *Mishneh Torah* (=*The Code of Maimonides), The Book of Judges*, vol. 14, trans. Abraham M. Hershman (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949). Cf. Joshua Abelson, "Maimonides on the Jewish Creed," *JQR* 19 (1906): 42-45, 55-56 (a translation of Maimonides' introduction to *Perek Helek* in his Commentary on the Mishnah); Schwartz, *Messianism in Medieval Jewish Thought*, 39-40.
[59] This idea is developed into the idea of becoming a kind of metaphysical entity, i.e., an angel through the intellectual perfection achieved by the human intellect when united with the Active Intellect. Cf. Pines, *Guide* III. 51, pp. 623-28.
[60] Abraham Nuriel, "Providence and Governance in Moreh ha- Nevukhim," *Tarbiz* 49 (1980): 348-53 (Hebrew); Maimonides, *Hilkhot Melakhim* xi, 1-4. For Maimonides, the biblical descriptions of the days of the Messiah (e.g., Isa 11:6) must be interpreted in allegorical and metaphorical ways. The messianic era in Maimonides' thought is a natural continuation of the natural order of the world.

Neoplatonic thought.[61] In this vein, Maimonides associates the immortality of the soul with the substantiation of the intellect:

> Great perfection will appertain to him that lives in those days [the days of the messiah], and he will be elevated through it to the life of the world to come.. [A] man whom no obstacle hinders from making the intellectual element in his soul live on after death. This is "the world to come."[62]

In this passage, we can see a dynamic interaction between historical messianism and individual spiritualized (or intellectualized) messianism, which is found in Maimonides' thought. Maimonides describes the immortality of the soul as the ultimate goal of knowledge of God and Torah, while explaining the intellectual process in the messianic era.[63] Implied here is that Maimonides develops a naturalistic messianic model, e.g., in *Hilkhot Melakhim* (=*The Laws of Kings and Wars*) into the ultimate human perfection through the idea of *devekut* to the Active Intellect, i.e., the attainment of human intellectual perfection.[64] Above all, Maimonides associates human intellectual perfection with the real intention of the Torah, while emphasizing the significance of continuous observance of the Torah in the messianic era, as noted in *Guide* II. 29 and in the *Mishnah Torah* (e.g., *The Laws of Kings and Wars* 11:1; 12:5).[65] This implies, in Maimonides's thought, a compatibility between practicing the commandments of the Torah and the achievement of intellectual perfection through the idea of *devekut* to the Active Intellect.

---

[61] Yoel L. Kraemer, "On Maimonides' Messianic Posture," in *Studies in Medieval Jewish History and Literature* 2, ed. Isadore Twersky (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), 109-142. Otherwise, in the gradual process of the messianic era, Maimonides comprehensively envisions a progressive development of the messianic (i.e., eschatological) visions. In other words, even if he emphasizes a spiritualized and individualistic redemption, the ultimate purpose of his messianic vision moves toward a perfect society, which presumes a nationalistic redemption. For this reason, Maimonides embraces both Christianity and Islam as playing a functional role in spreading the knowledge of God.

[62] Abelson, "Maimonides on the Jewish Creed," 43, 45.

[63]Pines, *Guide* II. 36; II. 45, Menachem Kellner, *Maimonides on Judaism and the Jewish People* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1991), 33-47.

[64] Isadore Twersky, *Law and Philosophy: Perspectives on Maimonides' Teaching*, vol. 2 (Ramat-Aviv: The Open University of Israel, 1992), 11-23.

[65] See, in *Mishneh Torah*, *The Laws of the Kings and Wars*, 11:1; 12:5: "In that era there will be neither hunger nor war, neither envy nor strife." (11:1) In the messianic age "all the ancient laws will be instituted ... sacrifices will again be offered; the Sabbatical and Jubilee years will again be observed in accordance with the commandments set forth in the Law." (12:5)

In addition, Maimonides depicts the images of a historical Jewish messiah and the belief in his eventual coming in Judaism's *Thirteen Principles of Faith*.[66] Additionally, in *the Laws of Kings and Wars* 1:8, 11:4, and 12:5, Maimonides first describes the messianic and salvific figure, not only as a "warrior (savior)- Messiah," who defends the nation and to fight the battles of the Lord, but also as a "national and universal redeemer," who establishes Israel, and then restores mankind into a utopian state in which all enjoy the widespread attainment of the knowledge of God and Torah.

It is worth noting that Maimonides' depictions of the Messiah reflect a messianic ideal, i.e., a messianic figure, who appears as a sage (scholar), a king (political leader), and a prophet (e.g., *the Laws of Repentance* 9:2), and who has the knowledge of God and Torah.[67] The kingly, priestly, and prophetic images in Maimonides' conception of the Messiah seem reminiscent of the features of the messianic figures (e.g., Davidic and Aaronic Messiahs and the Teacher of Righteousness) in the Qumran texts.[68] Moreover, we can find a similarity between Philo's idea of messianic era and Maimonides' naturalistic messianism. As noted earlier, Philo appears to assume a gradual messianic process, which combines a Stoic ideal and a rabbinic ideal through the idea of Logos, rather than an apocalyptic messianic vision.[69] Likewise, for Maimonides, a new messianic era is established in a gradual process of history becoming perfected, leading to the ultimate redemption by a historical figure who conveys the priestly, sage-like, and prophetic images, and will teach a greater knowledge of God and Torah during the messianic era.[70] It is beneficial to recall that the images of a "man," a figure who is an allegorical designator for Philo's Logos, implicitly represent a messianic and salvific figure, who will accomplish the teachings of the Torah (the Laws of Moses) in a messianic era.[71] The similarities between Philo's idea of messianism and Maimonides' messianism include not only projecting a messianic era, in which the teachings of Torah will have dominant status, but also pursuing a spiritualized and eschatological messianism, that is also manifest in early Jewish and Christian sources.

---

[66] Moses Maimonides, and Fred Rosner, *Maimonides' Commentary on the Mishnah, Tractate Sanhedrin* (New York: Sepher-Hermon Press, 1981), *Sanhedrin* 10:1; Pines, *Guide*, I. 35, 80; III. 28, 512. The statement of the coming of the Jewish Messiah in the *Thirteen Principles of Faith* strongly conveys historical, political, and national aspects.

[67] Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, *the Laws of Repentance* (=*Teshuva*), ix, 2. It says, "a great prophet, close to the level of Moses, our teacher," will "teach the entire nation and instruct them in the path of God."

[68] Jacob Liver, "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth," *HTR* 52, no. 3 (1959): 149-85.

[69] Philo, *Praem*, xxix, 169-171.

[70] Liebes, "The Messiah of the Zohar," 173; Schwartz, "The Neutralization of the Messianic Idea in Medieval Jewish Rationalism," 37-58. While Maimonides attenuates the apocalyptic elements, he emphasizes Neoplatonic and Aristotelian thought in his messianic vision.

In all, for Maimonides, the messianic era would further enhance not only a philosophical contemplation of the idea of *devekut*, i.e., achieving philosophical knowledge of God and Torah, but also a widespread phenomenon of greater knowledge of God. This shows that Maimonides implicitly integrates the concepts of the Messiah, Torah, and "world to come" into a particular framework of naturalistic messianism intertwined with the rabbinic and philosophical ideas. This also demonstrates that Maimonides's messianic vision is focused on an eschatological union through the idea of *devekut*, which plays a critical role in formulating the messianic images of Torah. The eschatological union through the idea of *devekut* is implicitly combined with an angelic or divine-like image symbolized in the images of the Active Intellect, which is identified with Torah. This substantiates that the images of the Messiah in Maimonides' naturalistic messianism are profoundly interlocked not only with the conceptions of the messianic era and "world to come," but also with the angelic, messianic, and divine-like images of Torah, which are based on the rabbinic and philosophical ideas.

In the Abulafian Tradition

More importantly, Maimonides' conception of messianism can be found in the messianic understanding of ecstatic Kabbalists, and it reaches its culmination in the manner in which Abulafia has conceived of messianism as related to individual and spiritualized redemption. Like Maimonides, for Abulafia, messianic redemption, understood as a natural process without an apocalyptic catastrophe, requires the state of *devekut* through which humans achieve intellectual perfection by interpreting the essence and secrets of the Torah, which will be revealed during the messianic era.[72] As Scholem explains, the mainstream of the thirteenth century Kabbalah appears to emphasize a spiritualized and individual redemption i.e., the return of the human soul to its source, on the basis of a Neoplatonic (emanative) system. As such, it marginalizes the critical features of apocalyptic messianism.[73] Specifically, we can see that Abulafia's messianism prioritizes an anthropocentric perspective that epitomizes a human intellectual perfection. Abulafia's messianism is also focused on a spiritualized and psychologized messianism as a new messianic model in the Jewish mystical tradition which synthesizes prophecy and messianism. He elaborates on the concept of the Active Intellect as it relates to the human soul or intellect (i.e., the idea of *devekut*) by utilizing the rabbinic, philosophical, and mystical ideas in order to articulate his messianic vision. Abulafia's noetic messianism is related to an individual's psychological and spiritual salvation accomplished through the noetic union understood as *unio mystica* and based on an ontic continuum between the human (material) intellect and the Active Intellect, which emanated the former.

---

[71] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:423-31.

As examined earlier, we can understand how Abulafia applies his noetic transformation theory to his theory of the unification of his intellect and the Active Intellect, and how the Active intellect is identical to the Torah and its Divine Name, i.e., the Tetragrammaton. In *Sefer Mafteaḥ ha-Ḥokhmot,* Abulafia emphasizes that to achieve prophecy and human perfection, the path of divine names which derive from the Active Intellect, is more significant than the path of commandments in the literal sense of the Torah.[74] By this logic, Abulafia pursues the *devekut* to the Tetragrammaton by employing the linguistic techniques of combining and meditating on the letters of the Torah.[75] As noted earlier, Abulafia's idea of *devekut* culminates in a unity between the human intellect and the Active Intellect through a synthesis of both Neoplatonic and Neo-Aristotelian elements.[76] What allows this unity is the fact that the human intellect flows from the Active Intellect, which flows from the First Cause, which contains everything, through the process of intellection.[77]

---

[72] Abulafia's conception of the messianic era for revealing the secrets of Torah can be gleaned from his works such as *Sefer Ḥayyei ha-'Olam ha-Ba',* 73a-b; *Sefer ha-Ḥesheq* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2002), 8-13.

[73] Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, 38-39; However, Pedaya shows that there are apocalyptic aspects in the thirteenth century Kabbalah, especially the Zohar. See Haviva Pedaya, "The Sixth Millennium: Millenarism and Messianism in the Zohar," *Da'at: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy & Kabbalah* 72 (2012): 60-75; 85-91 (Hebrew).

[74] Abulafia, *Sefer Mafteaḥ ha-Ḥokhmot* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001), 24. Abulafia notes that the *ẓaddik* (הצדיק) who completed the requirements of the commandments, needs to move forward to the hidden philosophical and kabbalistic paths of the divine names and the Active (or Divine) Intellect (השכל האלוהי).

On the basis of this theory, Abulafia theorizes that the Active Intellect is identified with the Messiah through the use of *gematrias*.[78] By this logic, he further develops the prophetic experience through the *devekut* to the Active Intellect into an experience of mystical union, which he understands as a self-messianization and an experience of being the anointed one.[79] Abulafia connects this concept to a prophetic experience of a messianic character that concerns the secret of the redemption.[80] Abulafia prioritizes the mystical experience (i.e., an ecstasy of the *devekut* to the Divine Name), which is identified with prophetic revelation, while neutralizing the apocalyptic elements (i.e., the actual coming of the Messiah). He thereby identifies the prophetic person with a messianic figure.[81] Abulafia further establishes the preconditions for the Messiah: prophecy through the intensity of *devekut* (i.e., a state of *unio mystica*) to the Divine Intellect and a universal recognition of being the Messiah.[82] Surprisingly, in *Ḥayyei ha-'Olam ha-Ba'*, Abulafia describes his own prophetic-mystical experiences as transforming his into a messianic figure.[83] Most importantly for my purposes, Abulafia's self-messianization also alludes to the personification or incarnation of the Torah itself, which is identified with the Active Intellect in his system.[84] In all, Abulafia himself becomes a messianic being united with the Active Intellect, and eventually an incarnate Messiah identified with Torah itself through his prophetic and apotheotic experience, i.e., the transformative and absorptive identification between Abulafia's intellect and the Active Intellect as a messianic entity.

---

[75] Idel, *Abraham Abulafia's Works and Doctrine* (Hebrew; PhD Diss.; Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1976), 16-50. Idel explains that Abulafia utilizes the kabbalistic terms stemming from his own type of esotericism to establish the authenticity of his self-internalization and messianization.
[76] Afterman, 117. This unity can explain the human intellect's incorruptibility and eternality.
[77] Abulafia, *'Or ha-Sekhel*, fol. 115a; 118a-119a. There is explicit explanation about the identification between "the ones receiving the flow," and "the Active Intellect," as one essence.
[78] Idel, *The Mystical Experience of Abraham Abulafia* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2012), 135; Scholem, *Major Trends*, 382. Cf. *Sefer Ḥayyei ha-'Olam ha-Ba'*, 12a.
[79] Scholem also compares the idea of *devekut* and prophecy to the messianic ideas. Abulafia's approach appears similar to Maimonides' approach to the anthropomorphic aspects of Biblical texts. See Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, 51, 185, 194, 204.
[80] Abulafia, *Ve-zot le-Yehudah* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2009), 23. Abulafia connects the knowledge of the Names and prophecy with the secrets of redemption. See also Idel, *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia,* 134-37, 141-43.
[81] Andre Neher describes the features of the Prophet-Messiah, such as "theopolitics" and performing the miracles. See Neher, *The Prophetic Existence*, trans. William Wolf (New York: AS Barnes, 1969), 225-26.
[82] Abulafia, *Sefer Ḥayyei ha--'Olam ha-Ba',* 8; idem, *Sefer Mafteaḥ ha-Shemot* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001), 81-82. Cf. Abraham Berger, "The Messianic Self-Consciousness of Abraham Abulafia: A Tentative Evaluation," in

Abulafia's self-messianization as a result of his prophetic-mystical experiences, combines an ecstatic and apocalyptic conception and alludes to the advent of a historical messianic agent of the type described in rabbinic and midrashic literatures.[85] Abulafia explicitly describes his self-messianization as an apotheotic experience, i.e., one that culminates in his becoming an angelic and messianic figure as the result of his prophetic experience.[86] Abulafia further describes how the apotheotic experience results in the messianic image of the anointment, which seems to refer to mystical experience, and leads to the transformation into Metatron, "the angel of the Lord."[87] This is a reverberation of the apotheotic motif in the Ashkenazi literature examined earlier, i.e., the transformation of the mystic into "the angel of the Lord" or the "son of God," possessing a salvific and hypostatic character through the combination of the divine names.

Essays on Jewish Life and Thought: Presented in Honor of Salo Wittmayer Baron, eds. Joseph L. Blau, Philip Friedman, Arthur Hertzberg, and Isaac Mendelsohn (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), 58-59.

[83] Abulafia, *Sefer Ḥayyei ha-'Olam ha-Ba'*, 12a. Abulafia identifies the names of patriarchs with the spiritual Divine Names (אֵל שַׁדַּי, אלהים, אדני and יהוה), while thereby identifying Abulafia himself with the Messiah. Abulafia mentions that he learned, through an epiphany that he will be "the Anointed of God and his messenger" and also be called "the angel of God." Cf. *Sefer ha-Melamed* (Jerusalem: n.p., 2001), 206a. "I called Sadday like My Name" and "and He is I and I am He." Through the examples of Ps 2:7 and Dt 32:29, the supernal Divine power and the human power are identified through the *devekut*.

[84] Afterman, *And they Shall be One Flesh*,125-29, 151-65. See also Scholem, *Major Trends*, 140-41.

[85] Idel, "Torah Ḥadashah - Messiah and the New Torah in Jewish Mysticism and Modern Scholarship," *Kabbalah* 21 (2010): 58; Scholem, *Major Trends*, 382; Abulafia, *Sefer Mafteaḥ ha-Shemot* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001), 150. Cf. Pedaya, "The Sixth Millennium," 74-75.

[86] Abulafia, *Sefer Ḥayyei ha-'Olam ha-Ba',* 16-17. See also *Sefer Sitrei Torah*, fols. 129b-130a; Idel, "Metatron: Notes towards the Development of Myth in Judaism," *ʾEshel Beʾer-Sheva* 4 (1996): 36-37 (Hebrew).

[87] Talmon, "The Concept of Messiah and Messianism in Early Judaism," 83.

Abulafia creates a messianic image that combines the angelic images of the hypostatic notions of Torah as is described in *Sefer Sitrei Torah*.[88] Interestingly, Abulafia identifies Metatron with various hypostatic notions, such as the Active Intellect, the Holy Spirit, and *shekhinah* and even *Elohim*.[89] According to the sages' dictum that "Enoch Is Metatron," Abulafia more develops the concept of Metatron into a biblical and messianic concept by connecting its name of Metatron to Yaho'el whose secret is Ben and is the Savior or Redeemer (גוא"ל). By this logic, Metatron, who encompasses the features of the Active Intellect, Yaho'el, and the *shekhinah*, appears as an eschatological and messianic figure who will redeem the human intellect and world.[90] On the basis of the messianic images combined with an angelic image of Metatron and the Active Intellect, Abulafia also evokes the son-like (or angelic) images of *shekhinah* in his interpretation of the divine names of the "son of God" and "Son of Man."[91] For Abulafia, a mystical experience of enjoying "the radiance of the Shekhinah" (מזיו השכינה) is related to revealing the secrets of the divine names of the "son of God" as they relate to the names of "Moses and 'Eliyahu" through the linguistic techniques of combination, permutation, and *gematria*.[92] Abulafia further connects the image of the *shekhinah*, which is identified with the Active Intellect, to the "Ben" i.e., a son-like (or angelic) image of "Son of Man," and to Metatron.[93] Through a metaphor of a "father-son,"—God is the father and the Active Intellect is the son—these comments explicitly elucidate the son-like and angelic images of the Active Intellect in its relationship with God (i.e., the divine essence).[94]

---

[88] Abulafia, *Sefer Sitrei Torah*, fols. 53.

[89] Ibid., 53-54.

[90] George H. Box, in *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, xxv, notes that the explicit identification of Metatron and Yaho'el with the *shekhinah* becomes convergent with the Tetragrammaton as the Divine Ineffable Name. Cf. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, 81-82.

[91] Abulafia, *Sefer Ḥayyei ha-'Olam ha-Ba'*, 28: וסוד שמות שניהם ידוע לנו והוא מצורף זה עם זה תחילה מש"ה אליה"ו ויוצא מצירופם ש"ם האלוה"י והוא בסודו ש"ם הב"ן שהוא ב"ן הש"ם ונסתרו בנשמ"ה. "And the secret of their two names is known to us, and he combines one with the other: first Moses, and then 'Eliyahu, and their combination comes out of a divine name, and he is the name of the Son, in its secret, and he is the Son of God and its secret meaning is in *neshamah*."

[92] Ibid, fol. 28: "Indeed, the hidden meaning of the name of Moshe is *me-'ayin* (מאי"ן), which represents *ani me-hashem* "I am from the Name (i.e., God)" and he is the Truth… The hidden meaning of 'Eliyahu… is *ben 'adam* (ב"ן אד"ם), "Son of Man"... in the interpretation of "Consecrate to me every firstborn male" (Ex 13:2) . . . and the *gematria* of 'Eliyahu is Ben and see that his secret is "Son of Man."

[93] Ibid. See also Idel, *Abraham Abulafia's Works and Doctrine*, 135.

In all, the intellectual perfection achieved in the process of the *devekut* to the Active Intellect or *shekhinah* plays a critical role in creating an apotheotic experience (becoming a spiritual and angelic being) and in elevating the human soul (or intellect) to a hypostatized messianic status. By this logic, Abulafia himself conveys a messianic image of Torah which appears close to an angelic figure incarnated and personified through *devekut* to the Active Intellect which, as I explained, is identical to the Torah. It also shows that Abulafia tries to portray a salvific and messianic figure, one who is associated with an angelic image as a result of the process of the *devekut* between the human intellect and the Active Intellect. This shows that Abulafia's self-messianization directly reflects the messianic image of the Active Intellect as a visualized (i.e., angelic and messianic) mediator that connects between God and the human soul (or intellect). Finally, it demonstrates that Abulafia's definitive goal of messianic visions was the intellectual perfection of the human soul (or intellect) through *devekut.* In so doing, he projects a messianic model, which synthesizes an angelic, salvific, and eschatological image, and combines them with the images of Torah.

On the other hand, as previously noted, unlike the messianic image that is closer to a son-like and angelic image as mediator, we can also find a messianic image that appears closer to the God-like image of Torah in Abulafia's system. It is critical to recall that for Abulafia, the human intellect can be subsequently identified with the Active Intellect and even God in a unique and radical union as becoming one essence.[95] This shows that like Maimonides, Abulafia's ultimate goal is the highest degree of the noetic union, which alludes to true human perfection in terms of the ideal of

---

[94] The relationship of the human intellect to the Active Intellect can be applied to the image of "son of a king" in Ps 1:2.

[95] Abulafia, *'Or ha-Sekhel,* 118-9, 141. Abulafia's radical idea is that the Active Intellect, the human intellect and God is one essence.

devekut, i.e., *unio mystica*. It becomes clear that Abulafia's profound implications of *unio mystica* appear as the idea of noetic union based on a Neo-Aristotelian platform, which serves for his radical mystical path leading to a complete union with the Active Intellect and eventually with God.[96]

By this logic, Abulafia appears to construct his mystical experience as a process of intellectualizing the human intellect, through the apotheotic experience. As Idel notes, Abulafia's conception of messianism conveys not only "the mystical path in the forms of *via perfectionis* with a strong quest for apotheotic experiences," but also "both apotheosis and theophany as having strong eschatological and messianic valences."[97] Indeed, Abulafia's description of the apotheotic experience is based on his conception of *unio mystica*, which presupposes an ontological continuum between the human (potential or material) intellect, the Active Intellect (and Metatron), and eventually with the Divine Intellect.[98] This implies that Abulafia schematizes two possibilities of *devekut*: cleaving to the Active Intellect, which has a God-like image, and thereby experiencing the level of *unio mystica* with God. This is opposed to Maimonides, who did not accept the feasibility of full union with the Active Intellect let alone the the possibility of union with God, even if he recognized the possibility of the human intellect's conjunction with the Active Intellect as "an object of thought."[99] Abulafia's position implies not only the possibility of achieving human intellectual perfection through a direct contact with the Active Intellect but also a possibility of the state of *unio mystica* as a full-fledged mystical experience between the human mystic and the Active Intellect. This corroborates that a spiritually and intellectually perfected human intellect itself reflects a hypostatized messianic entity.

Specifically, Abulafia further articulates the apotheotic experience by associating kabbalistic thought, which is embodied in his mystical experience, with ancient messianic themes and terminologies.[100] It is imperative to recall that the sage-like images of the messianic figure are reminiscent of the salvific and God-like (e.g., “prophet” and “sage”) images in the activities and rhetorics of Jesus in the Synoptics. It is also beneficial to recall the God-like images of various hypostatic notions of Torah, such as the Logos, Metatron, Yaho’el, and *shekhinah*, as they appear in the Second Temple, Enochic, Hekhalot, and Ashkenazi literature, as well as the medieval kabbalistic sources.[101] As Idel analyzes, in the Ashkenazi literature, including *Sefer ha-Ḥesheq*, Metatron appears to have a messianic and hypostatized image, which combines with a divine-like image derived from the divine names, such as Yaho’el in relation to the Tetragrammaton through the *gematria*.[102] Against this background, Abulafia also associates the Active Intellect with the God-like and messianic images of Metatron and *shekhinah.* As noted earlier, the images of the Active Intellect also convey a messianic image combined with a God-like image of the *shekhinah* and Metatron as “the Redeemer” (*ha-go'el*), who is a hypostatic deliverer, and the omnipresent and transcendent Messiah.[103] This shows that the Active Intellect appears as a hypostatic and transcendental Messiah who would teach the secrets of the Torah, and would eventually redeem the human intellect and world. In this vein, Abulafia conceptually associates the messianic figure with the image of an authentic interpreter, who functions as a God-like mediator.

---

[96] Idel, *Studies in Ecstatic Kabbalah*, 1-30.
[97] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 58-9.
[98] Ibid., 359; Abulafia, *Sefer Sitrei Torah*, 130a.
[99] See Herbert A. Davidson, "Maimonides on Metaphysical Knowledge," in *Maimonidean Studies* 3, ed. Arthur Hyman (New York: The Michael Scharf Publication Trust of Yeshiva University Press, 1995), 92-98. Davidson summarizes that for Maimonides, the human intellect can attain human "thought as a permanent object," it can enter "a state of permanent conjunction with the Active Intellect." (98). Pines, "The Limitations of Human Knowledge," 74-79.

Specifically, we can also find that in *Sefer Ḥayyei ha-‘Olam ha-Ba’* the image of the Active Intellect (which is identified with the Tree of Life through *gematria*) conveys a God-like image of Torah, in a manner similar to the case in the Zohar. In an anonymous note in *Sefer Ḥayyei ha-‘Olam ha-Ba’*, there is also allusion to the identification between the Messiah and the first sefirah, *keter*, which amplifies the relationship between the Messiah, the High Priest, and the Torah.[104] In *Sefer ha-'Ot*, we can see Abulafia's explanation of this relationship. As Abulafia and R. Isaac of Acre implied, the supernal Messiah, who is designated by the priestly image of *keter 'elyon*, ushers in the last sefirah, *shekhinah*, i.e., the lower Messiah, who is eventually identified with the human Messiah.[105] This model alludes to a possibility of the *devekut* to the divine intellect, i.e., a state of *unio mystica.*[106] This implies that just as the human intellect on a psychological level is transformed by the Active Intellect, on an ontological level, the human or lower Messiah as a lower *shekhinah* is transformed by Abulafia's system into the supernal Messiah, a transcendent savior and a higher s*hekhinah.* It is also reminiscent of the priestly and prophetic images of Jesus as the Messiah, and the "prophet" and "priest" images of the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel in the Qumran texts and Rabbinic literature. This implies that the state of the *devekut* and *unio mystica* means the returning of the human soul (or intellect) to the ultimate source of being, the first sefirah, *keter*, through his ultimate attainment of prophecy. This corroborates that Abulafia explicitly associates the priestly image of the supernal Messiah with a God-like image of the Tetragrammaton and the first sefirah, *keter*, on the basis of the identification between the Messiah, the high priest, and the Torah. These images reflect a

---

[100] Idel, “Hermeticism and Judaism,” in *Hermeticism and the Renaissance: Intellectual History and the Occult in Early Modern Europe*, eds. Ingrid Merkel and Allen Debus (Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1988), 59-76.
[101] See Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, 292-321; Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*, 531-34. Flusser analyzes the relationship between Enoch as Metatron in ancient Jewish literature and the concept of the Son of God in ancient Christianity. Cf. Amos N. Wilder, “The Rhetoric of Ancient and Modern Apocalyptic,” *Interpretation* 25 (1971): 436-53; John. J. Collins, “The Symbolism of Transcendence in Jewish Apocalyptic,” *Biblical Research* 19 (1974): 5-22.
[102] Idel, *Ben*, 200-214.
[103] Abulafia, *Sefer Sitrei Torah*, 132b.

---

[104] Abulafia, *Sefer Ḥayyei ha-'Olam ha-Ba'*, 13a. The unique role of the high priest, who pronounces the Divine Name (i.e., the Tetragrammaton) to receive the blessing, atonement, and the teachings of Torah, reflects a priestly and prophetic image of the Messiah. These images are connected to a salvific image, which accomplishes the messianic missions and redemption of the people of Israel. See Idel, "Defining Kabbalah: The Kabbalah of the Divine Names," in *Mystics of the Book: Themes, Topics, and Typology,* ed. Robert A. Herrera (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), 97-122; idem, *Messianic Mystics*, 94-96; idem, *Mystical Experience*, 105-108; idem, *Studies in Ecstatic Kabbalah*, 108-11, 125-26; Scholem, *Major Trends*, 379; Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines*, 20–22. Philo also sees a profound relationship between the roles of high priest and mystical (i.e., ecstatic) experience. See Philo of Alexandria, *The Contemplative Life, The Giants, and Selections* (Classics of Western Spirituality) trans. David Winston (New York: Paulist Press, 1981), 254; Maren R. Niehoff, "What Is a Name? Philo's Mystical Philosophy of Language," *JSQ* 2 (1995): 232-33.

[105] Abulafia, *Sefer ha-'Ot* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001), 129-130. Like Abulafia, R. Isaac of Acre, in *Me'irat 'Einayyim*, also connects the anthropomorphic image of supernal Messiah to the first sefirah, *keter 'elyon*, who is superior to Moses, who is, himself, designated by the sixth sefirah, *tiferet*. See Isaac of Acre, *Sefer Me'irat 'Einayim*, 113, 125-126, 150-154. See Idel, *Studies in Ecstatic Kabbalah*, 53; idem, *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia*, 118.

[106] See Idel, The *Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia*, 33, 73-89, 128-34, 200. Cf. Aviezer Ravitzky, "To the Utmost of Human Capacity: Maimonides on the Days of the Messiah," in *Perspectives on Maimonides: Philosophical and Historical Studies,* eds. Joel L. Kraemer and Lawrence V. Berman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 225.

God-like image of the Messiah, which is connected to the Active intellect and Torah. Furthermore, their combining of a God-like image of the hypostatic notions of Torah with a messianic image has an eschatological implication for the way in which the Active Intellect is understood.

As noted in Idel's article, *Torah Ḥadashah*, Abulafia particularly appears to propose the affinity between the Active Intellect and a supernal Messiah in terms of the close relationship between the Messiah and New Torah, the Torah of the messianic era.[107] Abulafia thereby portrays the New Torah as a messianic figure, who is quite different from a figure of the Messiah that appears in rabbinic sources.[108] The messianic images in the New Torah has not only an eschatological character but also reflects a God-like image of the Messiah.[109] In Abulafia's system, the New Torah of the Messiah symbolizes not only an eschatological salvation by God but also embodies a messianic image combined with a God-like image of Torah. At the same time, as noted earlier, Abulafia appears to create a messianic model for the human intellect intellectualized by the Active Intellect through the noetic union understood as *unio mystica*, while thereby applying the supernal messianic image of New Torah to the messianic model of the human Messiah who eventually will conduct a redemptive action *via passionis*.[110] This shows that Abulafia creates a dualistic concept of the Messiah: the human messiah as an individual who embodies the ideal of *devekut* through an apotheotic experience, and the supernal Messiah as the divine presence who will come down to the mundane world for an eschatological salvation.

In the Zoharic and Gikatillian Traditions

In a manner similar to Abulafia's conception of messianism, in de Leon's *Sekhel ha-Qodesh*, the identification of the human Messiah with *shekhinah* is symbolized as the "mystery of communion" (*sod ha-hidabbequt*) i.e., the communion between *shekhinah* and King David, who longs for *malkhut* (the tenth sefirah of *shekhinah*), the feminine divine power.[111] It is beneficial to recall that the theurgic expressions in the idea of *devekut* were already used by Hasidei Ashkenaz and the Bahiric circle.[112] De Leon also connects a mystical human king-Messiah to the supernal Messiah through the theurgical theory of *devekut*. This assumes an ontic continuum between the higher worlds (*shekhinah*) and lower worlds (human king-messiah) that is effected through a theurgical operation and eventually leads to a state of *unio mystica*.[113] Unlike an apocalyptic savior who breaks the historical processes, the image of a king-Messiah appears not only as an apotheotic messianic figure, who becomes one with the *shekhinah* but also a theurgical performer who conducts redemptive actions in a continuous and sustainable manner within the world.[114]

---

[107] Idel, The *Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia*, 70-78.
[108] Idel, "Torah Ḥadashah," 70-78.
[109] Ibid., 67, 78-81.
[110] Ibid., 70-78.

It is notable that Abulafia's ecstatic-prophetic experience, which is based on the noetic transformation and union theory (i.e., an approach that facilitates the *devekut* and eventual *unio mystica* to the Active Intellect), is profoundly related to Gikatilla's system of the theurgical activities of the *ẓaddik* in the ascending and descending processes.[115]

---

[111] Moses ben Shem Tov de Leon, *Sefer Sheqel ha-Qodesh*, ed. C. Mopsik (Hebrew; Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 1966), 71-74; Scholem, *Studies and Texts Concerning the History of Sabbetianism and Its Metamorphoses* (Hebrew; Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1974), 245.

[112] Afterman, *Devequt,* 227-70; R Ezra of Gerona, "Commentary on the Song of Songs," 521-22. R. Ezra and R Azriel of Gerona, and R. Isaac the Blind support the idea of *devekut* (Deut. 13:5) leading to theurgical action, i.e., prayer cleaving to the Divine Name in relation to the sefirotic system. See Seth Brody, "Human Hands Dwell in Heavenly Heights: Contemplative Ascent and Theurgic Power in Thirteenth Century Kabbalah," in *Mystics of the Book: Themes, Topics, and Typologies*, ed. Robert A. Herrera (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), 123-58.

[113] Moses de Leon, *Sheqel haQodesh*, 27, 33, 84, 91-95; Liebes, "The Messiah of the Zohar," 185; Caroline W. Bynum, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley; LA: University of California Press, 1984), 110-69.

[114] Idel, *Mystical Experience*, 200-201, 223-24; idem, *Studies in Ecstatic Kabbalah*, 66. The hypostatic status of the king-Messiah conveys not only an individual but also a divine manifestation. For Abulafia, the image of a king-Messiah is reminiscent of the image of the son of God as an embodiment of a divine power in a manner similar to the ancient Near Eastern royal ideology, especially in the ancient Egyptian religion. By contrast, for de Leon, the image of a king-Messiah appears closer to the concept of a messianic figure adopted by gods in the Babylonian religion.

[115] Despite their profound relationships, as noted earlier, Gikatilla's theurgic and theosophic messianism in *Sha'arei Ẓedek* is categorically different from Abulafia's prophetic messianism, which culminates in an ecstatic union with the divine names. Idel, *KNP*, 62-73; idem, "Maimonides' Guide of the Perplexed and the Kabbalah," *Jewish History* 18, no. 2/3 (2004): 197-226. See also Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek* (Cracow: Druck and Verlag von Fisher & Deutscher 1881), fols. 21b-22b.

On the one hand, as the first pattern in Gikatilla's *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, the *ẓaddik*, who is identified with the ninth sefirah, *yesod* in the sefirotic system, appears as a messianic figure cleaving to the tenth sefirah, *shekhinah.* The messianic image of the *ẓaddik*, when attached to *shekhinah*, ascends and conveys an angelic image that appears close to a visual and angelic mediator, like the Active Intellect.[116] As Federico Dal Bo notes, Gikatilla, in *Sha'arei Ẓedek,* explicitly associates the human *ẓaddik* and the divine (sefirah) *ẓaddik,* while connecting the human realms to the supernal realms through a linguistic and sefirotic symbolism.[117] As Dal Bo notes, Gikatilla interprets the famous biblical and historical events (e.g., Exodus) in order to explain metaphysical and redemptive events (i.e., the restoration of the sefirot and the salvation of the mundane world).[118] Gikatilla explicitly associates the theurgical actitivity of the human *ẓaddik* (or *ẓaddikim*) with the sefirah *ẓaddik*.[119] On the basis of this logic, as Dal Bo explains, for Gikatilla, the human *ẓaddik* who performs and fulfills prayers and *mitzvot*, not only mediates between the supernal and mundane world but also brings blessings and peace to the mundane world.[120] The theurgical act (and righteous behavior) of the human *ẓaddik* (prayers and *mitzvot*) ultimately causes not only the restoration of the supernal world of the sefirot but also the restoration of the mundane world, i.e., the human perfection through the theurgical actions.[121] This is implicitly similar to Abulafia's conception of an ontic identification of the human intellect with the Active Intellect, and eventually leads to the ideal of *devekut*, i.e., *unio mystica.* Above all, on the basis of the relationship of the divine *ẓaddik* to the human *ẓaddik* through the sefirotic symbolism, we can infer that the theurgical activities of the human *ẓaddik* appear to convey not only a salvific and messianic image, but also an angelic image in relation to the images of *shekhinah* in the sefirotic system, which were discussed earlier.

---

[116] Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, fols. 21b, 22b; Scholem, *Major Trends,* 80, 173. Abulafian influence can be found non only in *Ginnat 'Egoz* but also in *Sha'arei Ẓedek.* It is also notable that even in *Sha'arei Orah*, the messianic image of the *ẓaddik* conveys an angelic image in a human figure, who experiences the noetic union (i.e., *devekut*) based on the prophetic experience in a theurgical direction.

[117] Federico Dal Bo, *Emanation and Philosophy of Language: An Introduction to Joseph ben Abraham Giqatilla* (LA: Cherub Press, 2019), 148-164, 181-83. Dal Bo notes that Gikatilla's hermeneutical strategies is based on the assumption that "language is ontologically connected to metaphysical realities" (183). In this sense, *Sha'arei Ẓedek* plays a transitional role in connecting his early writing, *Ginnat 'Egoz*, to his later writing, *Sha'arei Orah*, which explicitly reflects the sefirotic symbolism.

[118] Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, 15-16; Dal Bo, *Emanation and Philosophy of Language,* 148-65.

[119] Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, 12 (*sha'ar* 2).

[120] Dal Bo, *Emanation and Philosophy of Language,* 174-75.

[121] Ibid., 174-183.

On the other hand, as Dal Bo explains, Gikatilla's use of the term *shefa* (influx), related to the theurgical acts of the *ẓaddik* in *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, conveys a conception of bidirectional (ascending and descending) emanation.[122] In this sense, as the second pattern, the sefirah *ẓaddik*, after attaching to *binah* moves in descending order. This pattern of *ẓaddik*, which reflects a symbolic process of divine emanation, appears to convey not only a divine-like image in the higher sefirot, but also a salvific image. Then, the act of the divine *ẓaddik* is focused on the union with *shekhinah* (or *malkhut*) in descending order from *keter* to *shekhinah.*[123] The *ẓaddik* brings down the *shefa* from the three higher sefirot, and then from *binah* (i.e., *teshuvah*) to *tiferet*, and finally to *shekhinah* (or *malkhut*), thereby entirely combining all ten sefirot.[124] The fractured status of the sefirotic system appears to be united through the theurgical acts and *devekut* of the *ẓaddik*, which play an important role in the process of creating the unifications between *binah* and *shekhinah*. In this process, the *ẓaddik*, who descends from the higher sefirot to redeem the lower realms, appears to play a redemptive role in unifying himself with *shekhinah* (or *malkhut*) through sexual symbolism.[125] As noted earlier, Gikatilla connects the images and activities of the divine *ẓaddik* as a model for the human *ẓaddik* to the theurgical activities (prayers and *mitzvo*t) of the human *ẓaddik.* Gikatilla further creates a symbolic system for the theurgical activities of *ẓaddik*, and reconceptualizes the hypostatic symbols, *yesod* and *shekhinah* as two entities: prayer of the human soul (or intellect) and redemption.[126] The human *ẓaddik* thereby appears to have a theurgical impact on both the restoration of the sefirot and the ultimate redemption of the mundane world.[127]

---

[122] Dal Bo, "The Theory of 'Emanation' in Gikatilla's Gates of Justice," *JJS* 62, no. 1 (2011): 79-104. As Dal Bo suggests, Gikatilla transforms a single (i.e., descending) direction of the emanation into "spatial coordinates," i.e., pouring down from above to below and circulating from below to above. This explains why Gikatilla prefers to use the mystical term *shefa* which is also compatible with the ascending direction. As examined earlier, Abulafia used the term *shefa*, which implies "a divine overflow" of prophecy in a Neoplatonic sense. The term *atsilut,* in contrast, seems to represent one direction from above to below.

[123] Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, 11b, 46a; Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 110.

[124] Idel, "On the Intention of Silent Prayer in R Isaac the Blind," 28.

[125] Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, 3b (*sha*'*ar* a). Cf. *Sha'arei Orah*, 5:33. *Tiferet* represents a male symbol as the source of the divine energy, and *shekhinah* represents a female symbol, which receives the flows of the power of life from *tiferet* and *yesod*. As noted earlier, in the works of Geronese Kabbalists, we can also see, in descending order, sexual symbolism in the unification of the sefirot.

[126] Idel, *Messianic Mystics,* 104-5; Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, 20 (*sha*'*ar* 2).

In all, Gikatilla puts a special emphasis on the theurgical functions and meanings of the *ẓaddik* as a salvific and divine image who visualizes the divine reality from the third sefirah, *binah*, and the higher sefirot. The sefirah *ẓaddik* in descending order, when attached to *binah*, which conveys a divine-like image in the higher sefirot, also appears to convey not only a salvific image, but also close to a divine-like image, who fills in for God Himself. Furthermore, Gikatilla further connects the image of *ẓaddik*, combined with *binah,* to the divine images of *ḥokhmah* and *keter* in an ideal state of divine unity. He thereby appears to create a messianic image of *ẓaddik* as a non-visual and divine mediator. Interestingly, we can also find that the angelic image of the *ẓaddik,* in the eventual stage of ascending process, by unifying with the higher sefirot, such as *binah*, *ḥokhmah,* and even with the first sefirah *keter* or with '*Ein Sof*, shows a gradual (i.e., apotheotic) change into a divine-like image.[128] This is very reminiscent of the case of Abulafia, who connects the supernal Messiah and the first sefirah, *keter 'elyon* as noted earlier. This also shows that Gikatilla formulates the divine-like images of *ẓaddik*, by connecting them to the divine-like images of *binah* (and *ḥokhmah*) in proximity with *Ein Sof*, and thereby creates a messianic and divine-like image of Torah as a non-visualized and ultimate mediator.[129] The messianic image of the divine *ẓaddik* in *Sha'arei Ẓedek* appears as an ideal model for the theurgical actions (and religious behaviors) of the human *ẓaddik* through the mythic and anthropomorphic strategies. By this logic, the images of the human *ẓaddik* also conveys a salvific image, who exercises a theophanic and redemptive action for the ultimate vision of a messianic era, and who will reveal the secrets of the Torah, and thereby conveys a divine-like image of Torah.[130]

---

[127] Dal Bo, *Emanation and Philosophy of Language,* 177-186. Dal Bo analyzes, the "double direction" in the thought of Gikatilla, that creates a metaphysical and organic nexus between "the inferior and the superior world" which can allow the process of restoration and salvation of the two worlds.

[128] Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, fols. 90-101 (שערי ט).

[129] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 103, 109.

[130] Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, fols. 37-44. There is a similar idea in the Zoharic sources. Gikatilla conceptualizes a theurgical doctrine of the *ẓaddik*, i.e., recognizing the existence of superior individuals with the spiritual level

More significantly, through Gikatilla's symbolic system, which is based on the mythic and anthropomorphic strategies, the image of the sefirah *ẓaddik* coming down from the divine realms at a higher level in the sefirotic system, explicitly reemerges in the divine-like and salvific images of a human figure, who comes down for the spiritual redemption of the human soul and for the ultimate redemption, i.e., the ideal of *devekut*. In this sense, it is beneficial to note that these messianic and divine-like features of *ẓaddik* are reminiscent of the poetic-mythic or linguistic-anthropomorphic descriptions which map the theurgical powers of prayer and *mitẓvot* in a matrix of the sefirotic symbols, which were already developed by the early Kabbalists of Provence and Gerona, such as R. Isaac the Blind and R. Ezra of Gerona, as we have discussed earlier.[131] As also noted earlier, this implies that the ecstatic and philosophical features of Abulafia's idea of *devekut* have a great impact on Gikatilla's hermeneutical methodology. In a manner similar to Abulafia's conception of the theurgical activities, the sefirah *ẓaddik* appears as a divine-like and salvific figure as an ideal model for the *devekut* of the human soul (or intellect).[132] This substantiates that Gikatilla associates the theosophic and theurgic conceptions with an (individual) mystical experience of *devekut* and *unio mystica*.[133] Moreover, it is crucial to note that, in a manner similar to Abulafia, Gikatilla's approach, which facilitates a theurgical *devekut* and eventual *unio mystica*, is implicitly related to an esoteric knowledge of the divine names (especially the Tetragrammaton) in the Torah. As Idel also notes, Gikatilla's theosophic Kabbalah appears to contain "the view of the divine name as a symbol of the

---

of *devekut*, which is higher than those of other human beings. Cf. Rapoport-Albert Ada, "God and the Ẓaddik as the Two Focal Points of Hasidic Worship," *History of Religions*, no. 4 (1979): 318-20.

[131] Eitan P. Fishbane, *As Light before Dawn: The Inner World of a Medieval Kabbalist* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009), 203-17; Scholem, "The Name of God and the Linguistic Theory of the Kabbalah," *Diogenes*, 79 (1972): 59-80, 164-94; Idel, "On the Intention of Silent Prayer in R Isaac the Blind," in *Massuhot: Studies in Kabbalistic Literature and Jewish Philosophy in Memory of Prof. Ephraim Gottlieb*, eds. M. Oron and A. Goldreich (Hebrew; Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1994), 25-52.

[132] Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, 36, 43. Interestingly, unlike the early Kabbalists who preserved the mystical ideas of *devekut* and divine unity for a small number of elite and esoteric groups, in the thought of Gikatilla, even the unlearned, who cannot properly exercise the prayer and *mitzvot*, are advised to contemplate the *ẓaddik* through the idea of *devekut.*

[133] Idel, "Torah Ḥadashah," 58, 70-78; Scholem, *Major Trends*, 382; Idel, *Abraham Abulafia's Works and Doctrine*, 135. As noted earlier, Abulafia's messianic conception is primarily based on the idea of *devekut,* which implies a communion or union between the human intellect and the Active Intellect on the basis of the synthesis of both Neoplatonic and Neo-Aristotelian elements.

divine structure," which derives from "an older esoteric tradition," i.e., practices of pronunciation of the letters of the divine names and their interpretations.[134] Indeed, Gikatilla's *Sha'arei Ẓedek* shows a significant relationship between practices of pronunciation of the letters of the divine names in the Torah and prayers along with *mitẓvot*.[135] This explicitly reverberates the influences of Abulafia's approach to the *mitẓvot* (in relation to the *devekut* and *unio mystica* to the letters of the Tetragrammaton).[136]

In this context, we can also infer that in *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, the divine-like image of *ẓaddik* attached to either *shekhinah, binah* or *hohkmah* appears to play a critical role in revealing the secrets of the Torah in the sefirotic symbolism.[137] The messianic descriptions of *ẓaddik*, as a messianic and divine-like image, are reminiscent of the messianic descriptions of revealing the knowledge and secrets of the Torah of the Tree of Life in the messianic age, while being liberated from the yoke of the Torah of the Tree of Knowledge, as described in the Zoharic sources.[138] In Gikatilla's symbolic (i.e., mythic and anthropomorphic) system, the *ẓaddik*, as a messianic figure connected to *binah*, appears as a supernal messianic and salvific figure, who, through the process of the *devekut*, redeems the *shekhinah* (*malkhut* or kingdom) and performs the *ẓedek 'elyon* (supreme justice) of the giving of the Torah.[139] In this sense, the *ẓaddik* appears not only as a mythically symbolized messianic figure in the sefirotic system but also as divine-like figure in an anthropomorphic form of the Messiah.[140] This also implies that the messianic and divine-like images of *ẓaddik* eventually appear to be absorbed into God Himself without a mediator between God and human beings.

---

[134] Idel, "Defining Kabbalah: The Kabbalah of the Divine Names," 106.
[135] See Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, 1-13; Abulafia, *'Imrei Shefer* (Jerusalem: A. Gros, 1990), 194-195.
[136] See Abulafia, *Ner 'Elohim* (Jerusalem: A. Gros), 170a; *Sefer Ḥayyei ha-'Olam ha-Ba'*, 7a. Wolfson notes that the "mystical rationalization of the commandments" allows for narrowing the gap between the theosophic and ecstatic streams of Kabbalah, and between their interpretations of the *mitẓvot*. See Wolfson, "Mystical Rationalization of the Commandments in *Sefer Ha-Rimmon*," *HUCA* 59 (1988): 217-51.
[137] Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, fols. 43-45.
[138] Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 1106-12.
[139] Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, 43-45.
[140] This feature also appears in *Sha'arei Orah* and the Zoharic sources. Cf. Gikatilla, *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, 16, 36.

Furthermore, it is crucial to note that Gikatilla's messianic conception, which conveys the influences of Geronese Kabbalists, Abulafian, and zoharic traditions, mainly represents an individual and spiritualized redemption through the theurgical conception of *ẓaddik* in the sefirotic system.[141] This messianic image symbolizes an ahistorical and spiritual process of individual redemption, which transcends a political and historical reality and is removed from expectation of an apocalyptic figure and redemption.[142] The main messianic image of *ẓaddik* in Gikatilla's system indubitably appears similar to a salvific and God-like image, one who is personified and anthropomorphized as a result of the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica*, and thereby theophanically manifests a salvific and divine-like image of Torah. In Gikatilla's symbolic system, as Scholem notes, the *ẓaddik* as a God-like messianic figure accomplishes, through the theurgical activities, a messianic era, in which the secrets of the Torah are revealed.[143] Gikatilla's theurgical doctrine of the *ẓaddik* reflects a comprehensive theological system, which combines philosophical, theurgical, theosophical, and even messianic aspects. These features create an abstract or God-like messianic image of the *ẓaddik* and messianic era conceived by the sefirotic symbolism. As noted earlier, through Gikatilla's symbolic system, which is based on the mythic and anthropomorphic strategies, the messianic image of the *ẓaddik,* which is close to a God-like image, appears as a personified messiah who is a theophanic manifestation of the divine achieved through *unio mystica* and is representative of divine immanence. In all, the messianic images of the *ẓaddik*, formulated by the sefirotic symbolism, appears not only as a personified (i.e., anthropomorphic), symbolized, and salvific messianic figure but also are convergent with a God-like image of Torah reflects a God-like image of Torah as an ultimate object and subject of *unio mystica*.

In summary, this examination shows that Geronese, Abulafian, zoharic, and Gikatillian traditions relatively attenuate the features of apocalyptic (or even political) features of redemption of the messianic figures, while emphasizing a spiritualized and individualized (or psychologized) messianism through the sefirotic symbolism. As Scholem explains, the focus on the divine unity, cosmogony, and cosmology in philosophical and kabbalistic thought in the thirteenth century Kabbalah marginalized the critical features of apocalyptic messianism, while emphasizing a spiritualized and individual redemption, i.e., the return of the human soul to the source in a Neoplatonic (emanative) system.[144] Specifically, the messianic characteristics in the Geronese and Zoharic sources are primarily concerned with a theosophical-theurgical approach, which emphasizes the redemptive and restorative impact of the theurgical activities on the divine and human realms.[145] These features of the messianic image mainly create an abstract or God-like messianic figure and a similarly abstract messianic era conceived by the sefirotic symbolism. The messianic figure mostly appears as both a salvific being, one who comes down for the spiritual redemption of the human soul from the divine realms in the sefirotic system. It is notable that their messianic reading of the sefirot as the hypostatic notions of Torah conveys an imaginative creativity and hermeneutical innovation in the manner in which they change a variety of hidden divine entities into messianic motifs through sefirotic symbolism, and the central mode of theosophical and theurgical expressions. In this context, the messianic images appear both as a combined form of midrashic, mythical, and theosophic concepts formed by the sefirotic symbolism, and, more centrally, as a messianic figure who understands and reveals the secrets of the Torah.[146] By this logic, the strategic descriptions of the messianic figures, which appear close to a God-like and salvific image of Torah, strongly create and preserve a spiritualized and psychologized messianism, instead of an apocalyptic messianism.

---

[141] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 106-8.

[142] Liebes, "The Messiah of the Zohar," 91, 99, 195-203.

[143] Scholem, *Origins of Kabbalah*, 59. Scholem also sees a profound influence of the *Sefer haBahir* on Gikatilla's conception of the *ẓaddik* and especially on the messianic implication of this figure in *Sha'arei Ẓedek.*

Nevertheless, as Pedaya claimed, the apocalyptic and mythological aspects in Abulafia's works and the Zohar undeniably appear in their conceptions of cosmos, history, and God, as well as

---

[144] Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, 38-39.

[145] Idel, *KNP*, 57; Unlike Scholem, Idel regards personal redemption as a messianic term. Cf. Liebes, *Studies in the Zohar*, 1-12.

[146] Idel, "Torah Ḥadashah," 58.

Torah.[147] Unlike Scholem, Pedaya investigates a new apocalyptic sense in the Kabbalistic sources, which conveys a strong emphasis on a level of praxis and history beyond a theosophic focus.[148] In this vein, this examination shows that the Geronese, Abulafian, zoharic, and Gikatillian traditions convey both apocalyptic messianism and spiritualized (symbolized) messianism. This corroborates a synthesis between an apocalyptic and a spiritualized (symbolized) conception, both of which are intertwined in various kabbalistic traditions. As such, my analysis provides a critical insight into various messianic conceptualizations of the hypostatic notions of Torah, which are intertwined with the philosophical and mystical ideas of their respective historical and ideological contexts. In all, this shows that the messianic images of Torah, in Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions, convey not only historical, apocalyptic, and eschatological features, but also ahistorical, spiritualized, and symbolized ones.

Above all, this examination demonstrates that the messianic images variously emerged in the different kabbalistic traditions, including Geronese Kabbalah, Abulafia, the zoharic circle, and Gikatilla. Despite the considerable differences between them, there are recurrent detectable patterns involing the messianic images of Torah. These patterns are dynamically formulated by identifying the messianic images and figures with the hypostatic notions of Torah as symbolic values as part of the sefirotic system in relation to the Torah. As examined earlier, a messianic image, which appears close to the angelic image of Torah, mainly appears as a historical and apocalyptic figure or concept, which is a materialized mediator, and can be achieved through the idea of *devekut.* By contrast, a messianic image, which appears close to the God-like image of Torah, significantly appears as an eschatological and symbolic figure or concept, which is a spiritualized, symbolized, or hidden mediator, and can be accessed through the *unio mystica*. This shows that the dual conception of a messianic image, which appears close to both the angelic and God-like images of Torah, prominently emerges in the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions. This implies that the authors tried to create these messianic images of Torah, which are conjoined with either an angelic mediator or a God-like, hidden performer, as apparatuses for experiencing the divine realms and God, which are accessible by the operations of *devekut* and *unio mystica.* This further substantiates that in order to express their religious experiences, they utilized a hermeneutic strategy (i.e., the philosophical allegory and sefirotic symbolism), which connects the infinite divine and finite human intellect through the linguistic tools of the sefirot and in relation to letters of Torah.

---

[147] Pedaya, "The Sixth Millennium," 60-75; 85-91.

[148] Ibid. Cf. Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, 38-39.

Chapter VI: Phenomenological Analysis of Images of Torah from the Second Temple Period through the Middle Ages

As noted in the Introduction, following Idel's methodology of models and his panoramic approach of phenomenology, I investigated the religious phenomena of the three (angelic, God-like, and messianic) images of Torah as mediators between God and human beings. The development of the three images of Torah as a model, as I have traced in this study, transpired from the Second Temple period to the Middle Ages. Following the "two senses of phenomenology" of models, I conducted research combining philological-intertextual analysis and philosophical-theological examination. In accordance with the first sense of the phenomenology of models (i.e., cross-fertilization between various models and traditions), I examined the relationships between the images of Torah in multi-faceted traditions within the history of Jewish thought (Jewish philosophy and mysticism). My examination proved the existence and development of the early forms of the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah as a mediator: an angelic mediator in the Logos-centered tradition, a God-like mediator in the Wisdom-centered tradition, and a messianic mediator which combines the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions. In addition, I have traced, in accordance with the second sense of the phenomenology of models (i.e., subjective impressions), the continuity of the religious experiences of *devekut* and *unio mystica* as an inner structure within the Logos-centered (and later Jewish philosophical) tradition and the Wisdom-centered (and later Jewish mystical) tradition throughout the history of Jewish thought. Furthermore, I have identified the particular hermeneutical strategies for expressing the mystical experiences of *devekut* and *unio mystica* within the theological intentions and philosophical frameworks, which eventually formulate the images of Torah manifest within the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions from the Second Temple period through the Middle Ages.

On the Angelic Image of Torah

As examined earlier, the intertextual, exegetical, and theological relationships between personified Wisdom and Torah in early Jewish sources, especially the Wisdom literature, substantiate the interactions between various hypostases that are identified with Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, and the Johannine Logos, within various early Jewish and Christian sources. As examined earlier, the Second Temple and Rabbinic period depictions of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah in a son-like and angelic image were echoed by medieval depictions of Metatron and Active Intellect as angelic images of Torah in the Jewish philosophical tradition. As such, the Torah functions as a materialized mediator that connects God and human beings through the idea of *devekut*. The idea of *devekut* not only plays a critical role in allowing human beings to connect to the angelic image of Torah as a visual mediator, but also encompasses a possibility of transforming the human soul (or intellect) into an angelic being while still preserving divine transcendence.

The angelic image of Torah, in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods, is mainly derived from a son-like or angelic description of Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos and *memra*. In particular, Philo's Logos primarily appears as a son-like and angelic figure mediating between God and human beings, and thereby creates an angelic image of Torah. Philo's Logos influenced other Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as the Johannine Logos, Jesus, and *memra*, each of which, on the basis of the allegorical hermeneutics, take on the the image of an angelic mediator accessible through *devekut*. As noted earlier, Philo's Logos, which combines Jewish Wisdom and Greek Logos, provides a critical vantage point for understanding the intertextual and theological relationships between the images and activities of personified Wisdom and Incarnate Logos (i.e., Jesus) in the Gospels. As examined earlier, like Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos is allegorically presented, in the Fourth Gospel, in a son-like or angelic image of Torah.

As examined earlier, the idea of *devekut* necessitates a mediator to fill the gap between God and human beings, but still maintain the philosophical framework of divine uniqueness and divine transcendence. This implies that the idea of *devekut* operates in a hermeneutic mechanism based on the allegorical approach, which formulates a son-like or angelic image in a visualized and materialized form of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah. As previously noted, the philosophical allegory, which expounds certain spiritual phenomena and truths by allegorizing concrete biblical images into scientific and universal principles, is used for elucidating the interrelationships between human beings, the creation of the world, and God in the realms of physics and metaphysics. This hermeneutic strategy of allegory activates and formulates an angelic and visualized image of Torah, which serves as a mediator connecting God and human beings, and as the object of noetic union, or *devekut*, in substitution of the transcendent divine who is beyond the possibility of *devekut*. The idea of *devekut* to the angelic images of Torah illuminates a particular structure of thought that allows for indirectly experiencing divine transcendence. The angelic image of Torah materialized in a proximity with God allows for the possibility of a mystical experience of the transcendent divine through the idea of *devekut* on the basis of a sophisticated allegorical rendering of the Logos as angelic beings and Torah within the context of a philosophical framework of divine transcendence.

The discussion regarding the angelic images of Torah in the Logos-centered tradition gives critical insight into the developmental process of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah as a mediator. Like Philo's Logos as an angelic allegorical mediator, the angelic images of Torah appear in the images of Metatron and *shekhinah*, which are manifest in Rabbinic and late antique Jewish mystical literature and later in the Jewish philosophical traditions in the Middle Ages. Likewise, Maimonides also allegorically associates the Active Intellect with the biblical concept of angels and the philosophical concept of Torah, and eventually creates an angelic image of Torah. Using this logic, Maimonides explains the idea of *devekut* to the Active Intellect as a mystical experience.

Specifically, it is notable that the philosophical (i.e., allegorical) approach had a huge impact on the formulation of the angelic images of Torah in Abulafia's conception of the Active Intellect, which could be accessed through *devekut*. As noted earlier, in the realm of medieval Jewish philosophy, the idea of *devekut* appears not only as a mechanical tool for the conjunction or union between the human intellect and the Active Intellect but also appears crucial in understanding the concept of a mediator between them. In this context, Abulafia, who was influenced by the philosophical and late antique rabbinic traditions, further elaborates the idea of *devekut* through a larger kabbalistic standpoint and hermeneutic strategy. Abulafia not only associates this idea of *devekut* with prophecy but also thereby develops his interpretation of the mysteries of the divine names of the Torah. Abulafia deals with the linguistic techniques of achieving the state of *devekut*, which involve the combinations of the letters of the divine names in the Torah. Abulafia explains an allegorical and semantic relationship between the secrets of *ma'aseh merkavah*, which correspond to the angelic powers or celestial beings in the cosmological realm, and the inner entities of the letters of the divine names in the Torah. In this manner, Abulafia appears to formulate an angelic image of Torah based in the divine names that are related to the *merkavah* imagery through linguistic techniques of letter combination and *gematriot.* On the basis of this logic, Abulafia establishes his theory of the noetic union with the Active Intellect, by identifying the Active Intellect with Torah through the *gematriot*, and eventually with the letters of the Tetragrammaton which is part of the *merkavah* imagery. Through the combination of his philosophical and kabbalistic conceptions of *devekut*, Abulafia further identifies the concept of Active Intellect with the *shekhinah* (or *malkhut*) while creating the angelic images of both the *shekhinah* and Active Intellect, which is identified with Torah, and thereby producing the angelic image of Torah.

Abulafia's creative and radical approach appears to contradict Maimonides' non-negotiable principle of the ultimate impossibility of the unity of the human intellect and God. For Abulafia, the state of ecstasy radically means overcoming the boundaries between the human intellect and the

Active Intellect, and even God. As examined earlier, this appears similar to the paradigm of Islamic philosophers who allow for the unity of the human intellect and the Active Intellect. Nevertheless, Abulafia's system still requires a clear distinction between human beings and God that is grounded in an Aristotelian system of the divine transcendence. This proves that, despite a strong desire for the noetic union, i.e., union with the Active Intellect, Abulafia remains faithful to the monotheistic concept as formulated in Maimonidean theology. On the basis of this logic, Abulafia formulates the angelic image of Torah in the concept of Active Intellect as a mediator between human beings and God that can be accessed through *devekut* to the letters of divine names—especially the Tetragrammation—of the Torah.

In Gikatilla's early work, *Ginnat 'Egoz*, we can also see both a combination between Maimonidean (or Aristotelian) metaphysics and kabbalistic (or Neoplatonic) metaphysics as well as the influence of Abulafia's ideas of *devekut* and prophecy. Abulafia's idea of *devekut* to the letters of the divine names of the Torah is crucial not only for understanding Gikatilla's hermeneutical methodology but also for comprehending Gikatilla's intellectual development regarding an angelic image of Torah in relation to the sefirotic system. Like Abulafia, Gikatilla, in *Ginnat 'Egoz*, concretizes the relationship of the *merkavah* imagery to the four letters of the Tetragrammaton through the idea of *devekut*. Under the influence of Abulafia's idea of *devekut*, which focuses on the ecstatic and prophetic experiences, Gikatilla also identifies the letters of the Tetragrammaton with the Active Intellect (i.e., an angelic being) and with the last sefirah, *shekhinah* or *malkhut*. In Gikatilla's system, *allegoresis* plays a critical role not only in interpreting *ma'aseh merkavah* as the cosmological emanative system but also in identifying an angelic being (i.e., Metatron) with the Active Intellect. For instance, in *Ginnat 'Egoz*, using philosophical allegory, Gikatilla allegorizes the divine name *Elohim* as an angelic being (i.e., Metatron or the Active Intellect) who serves as an intermediary between God and nature in the creation processes. By this logic, on the basis of the combination of the philosophic and rabbinic conceptions, Gikatilla eventually identifies Metatron with the divine names in the Torah. In this process, the image of the Active Intellect, as an angel who is part of the *merkavah* imagery and is equivalent with the divine names of Torah, appears, as in Abulafia's system, as a mediator accessible by *devekut*.

For Gikatilla, beyond Abulafia's linguistic techniques, which are based on the philosophical allegory, the idea of *devekut* through the letter combination of the Tetragrammaton has a symbolic dimension related to mystical union and divine unity. Gikatilla's description of the Tetragrammaton as a non-created being, concealed in the creation from *Elohim*, also appears to describe a symbolic realm, which is ineffable and unknowable. He thereby creates a particular formula of divine unity that involves the unification between the Active Intellect, Metatron, and the Tetragrammaton. Gikatilla utilizes a sophisticated approach that combines the philosophical allegory and linguistic symbolism, in order to express an inner state of the divine unity and to achieve a state of *unio mystica*, as well as mystical experiences of the human soul's immediate contact with the unknowable and inaccessible divine**.** This corroborates that the conceptualization of the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* becomes a philosophically, theologically and epistemologically bifurcating point between early ecstatic and prophetic Kabbalists, such as Abulafia and R. Isaac of Acre, and medieval Jewish philosophers, such as Maimonides. In all, this examination substantiates that the son-like or angelic image of Torah in the Logos-centered hypostatic notions in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods continues in the angelic images of the Active Intellect and sefirah of the *shekhinah* in the sefirot, which are found in the Jewish philosophical, Abulafian, and Gikatillian traditions in the Middle Ages.

On the God-like Image of Torah

The God-like image of Torah mainly appears in the Jewish Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah in the Jewish mystical tradition in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. As a representative example, personified Wisdom in Proverbs has implications for the dynamics of revelation and concealment of the secrets of the Torah.[1] As noted earlier, the image of personified

---

[1] H. Wolfson, *Studies in the History of Philosophy and Religion* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 2:127-28.

Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31 primarily appears as a father or sage with wisdom and authority who grew up with God—i.e., who is implicitly connected to a divine-like image in the creation context. The images and activities of personified Wisdom also appear in Proverbs 1, 8, and 9 as a sage or as a master in a banquet. Personified Wisdom, as a hypostatic entity, conveys not only an inner or concealed wisdom but also a revealed practical wisdom. This implies that personified Wisdom symbolically appears as a God-like image, who is present in closest proximity to God in the Jewish Wisdom-centered tradition. This feature can be found in the self-narrative of the personified Women figures of the Wisdom literature (e.g., Wis 7:25-8:1). Similarly, in the rabbinic tradition, in sources such as in *Gen. Rab.*, there is a nexus of personified Wisdom and Torah, which is conveyed in the image of a sage as a mature, heavenly, or authoritative figure teaching the wisdom of the Torah. In this manner, the image of personified Wisdom is symbolically or poetically expressed as a hypostatized Torah. In all, the personification and hypostatization of the mystical concept of wisdom gives a critical insight into the symbolization and mythologization of the concept of Torah as a God-like image. This shows that the personification and mythologization of wisdom requires a process accomplished through a unique literary and hermeneutic strategy that utilizes the idealization and symbolization of the concept of Torah as a God-like image.

As examined earlier, in a manner similar to personified Wisdom, the images of Jesus in the Synoptics and *shekhinah* mainly appear as a God-like figure, who has a relationship with the mystical concepts of Torah in the Wisdom-centered tradition. The image of Jesus in the Synoptics appears to resemble a God-like figure, which implicitly symbolizes God Himself. This is the result of a literary and exegetical strategy that employs symbolism using the poetic and mythic (or anthropomorphic) expressions to describe Jesus as a God-like figure. Unlike the son-like and angelic images of Jesus, as found in the Johannine Logos in the Logos-centered tradition, the images and activities of Jesus in the Synoptics appear analogous to those of personified Wisdom, as a sage or God-like. As examined earlier, this corroborates not only the intertextual and semantic relationships between personified Wisdom and Jesus but also shows the theological and hermeneutical implications (i.e., anthropomorphic and mythic strategy based on the theological intention of the authors) of the personification and hypostatization of wisdom as a sage and a God-like being.

As noted earlier, in a manner similar to the God-like image of personified Wisdom, the God-like images of Torah also appear in the images of Metatron and *shekhinah* in mythic and anthropomorphic (or anthropopathic) expressions**,** which are found in Rabbinic and late antique Jewish mystical literature and later in the kabbalistic traditions in the Middle Ages. The God-like image of Torah, as a non-visualized mediator, appears in the interactions with the sefirotic system through the hermeneutic strategy of the poetic and sefirotic symbolism, which is prominently found in rabbinic and late antique Jewish mystical traditions, and sefirotic symbolism in later medieval kabbalistic traditions. The image of personified Wisdom—*hokhmah*, which emanated from *Ein Sof*—which is identified with the primordial Torah, appears to be formulated by an exegetical and hermeneutical strategy within a theological and philosophical framework. Above all, the God-like images of Torah are thereby formulated in the sefirotic system as mythic symbols in human language, which reflect the hidden essence of God.

As noted earlier, the God-like image mainly appears in the concept and image of *ḥokhmah* in the sefirotic system. The concept of *ḥokhmah* conveys not only mythopoetic, symbolic, and metaphysical meaning but also a philosophical and cognitive one.[2] This substantiates that the concept of the sefirah of *ḥokhmah* reflects the interactions between the philosophical Logos and mystical Wisdom. As such it demonstrates the manner in which the Second Temple period Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah developed in the medieval sefirotic system. It is worth noting that, as Wolfson analyzed, the concept of *ḥokhmah* in the Bahir appears to derive from an internal Hebraic (or mythopoetic) origin, which becomes associated with a Hellenic (or logocentric) element in a mythic and linguistic symbolism.[3] As is the case in Philo's dual conception of Logos and Wisdom, this demonstrates a crucial interplay of two different conceptions and depictions of *ḥokhmah*.[4] This shows that the philosophical conception of the immanent Logos, which is related to the Hellenic depiction of *sophia*, was gradually assimilated with a Hebraic conception of Wisdom in which Wisdom is identified with Torah in the ancient Jewish mystical tradition, and eventually concretized an inner Hebraic idea of transcendent Wisdom that is expressed through a mythopoeic and sefirotic symbolism.[5]

---

[2] E. Wolfson, "Hebraic and Hellenic Conceptions of Wisdom in Sefer ha-Bahir," 170-1.

[3] Ibid., 170-1; Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 67, 91-97, 234; Abrams, *The Book Bahir*, 1-54.

The dialectic process of weakening the Hebraic-Hellenic dichotomy substantiates the idea that the concept of *ḥokhmah* was appropriated and internalized in the kabbalistic (i.e., theosophic) system in the transition from the Rabbinic period to the early kabbalistic period in the Middle Ages. The theosophic structures and mystical experiences of the sefirotic system, based on the images of *ḥokhmah,* are grounded in internal rabbinic tradition. The symbolic and mythopoetic (or Hebraic) approach to the Biblical and Rabbinic (i.e., aggadic) sources enables an innovative way of merging Hebraism and Hellenism, while maintaining the divine transcendence and incorporeality of God. Above all, under the strong influence of Maimonides' esotericism and to some extent under the influence of Halevi's approach, the medieval Jewish mystics created a sophisticated hermeneutical method of combining Jewish philosophical and mystical interpretations. The early and thirteenth-century Kabbalists utilized both philosophical allegory and linguistic symbolism regarding the secrets of the Torah to both understand the divine ontology (e.g., divine unity in the sefirotic system) and practical teachings, e.g., a theurgical practice of the commandments of the Torah (i.e., *ta'amei mitẓvot*). As examined earlier, the Geronese tradition prioritizes a theosophic (i.e., inner-divine) union in the process of the unification of the sefirot, and then the participation and absorption of the human soul with the Godhead (i.e., the *devekut* and *unio mystica*) is accomplished through theurgical prayers and *mitẓvot*. It is notable that the Geronese Kabbalists focused on an esoteric meaning of the divine unity mostly inaccessible to human beings, whereas Abulafia appears to neutralize the esoteric characteristic of the complex system of divine powers in the sefirotic system and instead understands them in a human psychological manner. In this sense, Abulafia's ecstatic Kabbalah appears different from the theosophic Kabbalah, including that of the Geronese Kabbalists, in its understanding of the divine unity in the sefirotic system as well as in its ideas of *devekut*, *unio mystica*, and the images of Torah. As also examined earlier, Abulafia and Gikatilla appear to create a synthetic system, which combines an allegorical and mystical (theosophical and theurgical) understanding of the concepts and images of the Torah. In particular, they thereby foster a new ethos of experiential symbolism. The operation of the *devekut* for Abulafia is primarily based on an intellectual concept of Torah allegorically identified as Active Intellect. Abulafia's concept of noetic union, which is based on Maimonides's notion of eschatological union, describes the path toward intellectual perfection and the acquisition of the immortality of the human intellect. In this process, Abulafia attempts to achieve the ideal of *devekut* i.e., a state of *unio mystica* of the human intellect becoming one with the Active Intellect, by utilizing the linguistic techniques, which implicitly identify the letters of divine names in the Torah with the divine unity of the sefirotic system.

---

[4] E. Wolfson, *Along the Path*, 187-88; As Wolfson suggests, the demiurgical Logos appears in a philosophic characterization as wisdom, while divine Wisdom appears in the mythically characterized hypostasis of wisdom as part of the interaction between Hellenism and Hebraism. Cf. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 162-70.

[5] For instance, the parable of the daughter as the gift given by the king to his son in the Bahiric texts (Abrams, *The Book Bahir*, sec 64-65) explains the emanative process from the upper *ḥokhmah* (divine Wisdom and masculine potency) to the lower *ḥokhmah* (*shekhinah* and feminine potency). Regarding the symbolic identification between Torah and *ḥokhmah*, which is further associated with the *shekhinah* as a feminine hypostasis, see the parables and theosophic reworkings in the Book Bahir (secs. 3, 7, 54-55, 63, 93, 142, 162) along with the rabbinic and aggadic motifs (e.g., *b. B. Bat.* 16b). The mythopoetic and sefirotic symbolism synthesizes the transcendent (and masculine) and the immanent (and feminine) elements. The symbolic and kabbalistic exegesis regarding divine unity significantly appears in the Jewish mystical and Kabbalistic sources.

As noted earlier, through his methodology, which combines the philosophical and kabbalistic conceptions of *devekut*, Abulafia also connects the Active Intellect to the sefirah, *keter* in the sefirotic system while creating the divine-like image of the Active Intellect, which is identical with Torah, and thereby producing a God-like image of Torah.[6] Through this process, we can see that Abulafia's idea of *devekut* is radicalized into a noetic union with God, i.e., achieving a state of *unio mystica*, which significantly influenced ecstatic Kabbalah and later Jewish mystical traditions. Especially in

---

[6] Idel, *Hasidism: Between Ecstasy and Magic*, 59, 278; Afterman, *And they Shall be One Flesh*, 221.

Abulafia’s linguistic paradigm, the concept of Torah appears as an absorbing being, which encompasses the corporeal and spiritual in the essence of the letters of the Torah. The inner structure of language in the letters of the Torah serves as a crucial instrument for explaining aspects of the cosmogonic process. At the same time, this understanding of the letters of the Torah also serves to narrow the gap between God and the primordial Torah by connecting the letters and the sefirot.

Gikatilla’s linguistic technique and his ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* appear similar to those Abulafia. Gikatilla plays a critical role in generating a God-like image of Torah as part of the sefirotic system by employing linguistic symbolism in interpreting the letters of the Torah. In *Ginnat ’Egoz*, Gikatilla combines an ecstatic and philosophical conception based on the linguistic techniques with a theosophical conception, thereby forging an integrative and broader hermeneutic system. As previously examined, in *Ginnat ’Egoz* and *Sha‘arei ’Orah,* the idea of *devekut* allows for a completely harmonious divine unity by integrating the Torah with the sefirot (especially *shekhinah* and *ḥokhmah*). Gikatilla also utilizes symbolism for the explanation of the process of emanation and to describe the connection between the sefirot, as well as for the interpretation of the esoteric topics of *ma‘aseh bereshit* and *ma‘aseh merkavah*. Gikatilla first describes in the creation of the world, by means of the emanation overflowing below to the spring of *shekhinah*, the final stage within the sefirot which he represents as a demiurge responsible for the creation.

As examined earlier, the images of *shekhinah*, which we examined in the Second Temple and Rabbinic sources as well as in late antique Jewish mystical literature, now appear as part of the sefirotic system in Kabbalistic sources, where *shekhinah* is depicted not only as a symbolic manifestation of the “indwelling” of the divine presence in the world but is also identified as a hypostatic notion of Torah. This implies that like the upper *ḥokhmah*, *shekhinah*, also known as the lower *ḥokhmah*, is similarly symbolized as a mystical or God-like image of Torah. Furthermore, Gikatilla in *Sha‘arei ’Orah* develops a symbolic mode and exegesis to explain the sefirot, including the sefirah of *ḥokhmah*. In his discussion of cosmogony and cosmology, he figures *ḥokhmah* as the *yod*, which he understands as the beginning point of creation in a hierarchical theory of emanation.

The images of *ḥokhmah* not only appear in closest proximity to the highest sefirah, *keter* but also appear to have an ontological connection with *Ein Sof*. Gikatilla, in this context, highlights manner in which *ḥokhmah* embraces and unites all other sefirot to *Ein Sof*. The second sefirah, *ḥokhmah*, which interconnects the sefirot with *Ein Sof* as the locus of divine unity, also extends its divine power and realms to the created world through the emanative process of the sefirotic system—a process which is incomprehensible rationally. Through the theme of the emergence of *yod*, that is, *ḥokhmah* as the beginning in the creation, Gikatilla also describes the relationships of the *yod* as the sefirah, *ḥokhmah* to the Tetragrammaton, and thereby turns it into an intra-divine mediator with a God-like image of primordial Torah, which is, at the same time, identified with personified Wisdom on the basis of the biblical and kabbalistic interpretations. Taken together, this substantiates that *ḥokhmah* is absorbed into a God-like being as a linguistic entity symbolized by the letter *yod*, and it becomes the hypostatization of the Torah itself.

On the basis of this theory, like the Geronese Kabbalists, Gikatilla places special significance on the ultimate restoration of the unity of the sefirot, which are intended to be in a state of perfect unity (symbolically a state of a sexual union). The interconnectivity and divine unity of the sefirot does not guarantee a consistent relationship between divine infinity and the finite world of human beings. In this context, Gikatilla, in *Sha'arei 'Orah*, radically describes a metaphysical connection between God and human beings by making a symbolic and metaphoric nexus between them. By this logic, Gikatilla elaborates the mystical experiences of *unio mystica* with one aspect of the Godhead, the sefirah of *ḥokhmah*. This allows the mystic to participate in the divine unity. In *Sha'arei 'Orah*, he utilizes the creative power of linguistic techniques, similar to the ones he employed in *Ginnat 'Egoz* and in a manner similar to Abulafia's linguistic techniques and his idea of *devekut*. At the same time, he maximizes the mystical and infinite power of language by identifying the letters of the Torah, conceived as sefirot, and God Himself. He thereby creates a connection and even identification between the finite human soul and the infinite of the living God through linguistic and kabbalistic symbolism. Specifically, Gikatilla attempts to experience the divine reality directly, i.e., God Himself as a linguistic entity, which is manifest in the letters and texts of the Torah, without a mediator. He does this by employing kabbalistic symbolism which allows for *devekut* and *unio mystica* to God Himself.[7] The eternal nature and power of language activates a transformative process blurring the boundary between the finite human and the infinite divine leading into an inner mystical experience.

Nonetheless, Gikatilla's system ultimately presupposes divine transcendence instead of the divine immanence that removes the distinction between God and human beings. For Gikatilla, a separation between God and the world still remains, although the creation of the world can be explained by the emanative process of the infinite divine actions, which unifies divine infinity and the finite world. In all, Gikatilla places particular emphasis on divine unity and harmony in the sefirotic system in terms of a theurgical-theosophical dimension and then shows the possibility of an ultimate union of the human soul with God realized in the ideal of *devekut*, i.e., a state of *unio mystica*, while, nevertheless, maintaining divine transcendence. On the basis of this innovative theory, the mystical concept of Torah as a God-like image is absorbed into God Himself through the dynamics of the sefirotic system. The God-like Torah functions as an organic link between the human world and the secrets of God. In all, this examination shows that a God-like image of Torah mainly appears in the image of *ḥokhmah*, establishing the unity of the sefirotic system, and is the site of the mystical experiences of *unio mystica* to the sefirah of *ḥokhmah.*

On the Messianic Image of Torah

As examined earlier, the primitive forms of the messianic images of Torah, which emerge from the interactions between the Logos-centered and the Wisdom-centered traditions in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods, appear in all of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos, the Johannine Logos, Jesus, *memra*, and *shekhinah***.** The messianic images of Torah reappear in the descriptions of a historical messianic figure, Jesus, who synthesizes the rabbinic, philosophical, and mystical features, and embodies eschatological salvation. As previously discussed, the messianic figures in the Second Temple sources and contexts are deeply interlocked with a particular historical and ideological context. These messianic figures were further developed by the hermeneutic innovations in rabbinic tradition into a personified and hypostatized form that is identified with Torah. As noted earlier, the messianic images of Torah, which were implicitly present in the Greek Logos-centered and the Jewish Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods, continued in the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, such as the Active Intellect and the sefirot in the medieval Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions. They later reemerged in a new combined form that developed from the dynamic interrelationships between the angelic image of Torah as a visual mediator and the God-like image of Torah as a non-visual mediator in the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions of the Middle Ages.

---

[7] Idel, *KNP*, 146-53.

This shows that the primitive forms of the messianic images of Torah were dynamically developed into their full-fledged and diverse forms, combining the rabbinic tradition and the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions. It is worth noting that the messianic images of Torah were methodically devised and developed in a particular hermeneutical system that combines philosophical allegory and linguistic symbolism throughout the history of Jewish philosophy and mysticism. Through these allegorical and symbolic apparatuses, the messianic images of Torah repeatedly continued to emerge in a framework that combined Jewish mystical and philosophical traditions, thus appearing as a synthetic form that connects the angelic and God-like images of Torah. This shows that the messianic image and figure mainly influenced by the Greek Logos-centered tradition is similar to the angelic image of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions, such as Philo's Logos and Incarnate Logos, while the messianic image and figure influenced by the Jewish Wisdom-centered tradition appears close to a God-like image of the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions, such as personified Wisdom and the sefirot.

In the first place, the messianic images of Torah, influenced by the Logos-centered tradition, mainly appear to be related to an angelic mediator, which a human can reach through *devekut*, that is by aspiring to a mystical and salvific experience of the transcendent divine that is achieved through cleaving to the messianic figure who is a mediator between human beings and God. As examined earlier, the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as personified Wisdom, Philo's Logos, Incarnate Jesus, and *memra*, appear as a combined form of the allegorical angelic and messianic images of Torah. Like Philo's Logos, we can see that the angelic or son-like images of the Johannine Logos and of *memra* and *shekhinah* are allegorized as a messianic figure, insofar as they are combined with messianic notions, such as "the Son of God" (e.g., Jn 11:27, 20:31), that are involved in the eschatological salvation. This substantiates that the messianic image of Torah mainly appears in a synthetic form of angelic and messianic images of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Philo's Logos and the Johannine Logos.

Specifically, as noted earlier, the messianic image of Torah in Philo's Logos, which is an allegorical designator for a historical messianic figure, appears in a combined form of the historical, biblical, and rabbinic images of the Messiah and the image of the Logos as an angelic mediator. The messianic image of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah appears as an object and apparatus for the *devekut*, which connects God and human beings through a particular hermeneutic strategy. This feature explicitly can be found in the concept and image of the Active Intellect, which is manifest in the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition and sources, such as the works of Maimonides, Abulafia, R. Isaac of Arce, and the early Gikatilla. In particular, we have seen that the messianic image of the Active Intellect in relation to Torah, in Abulafia's system, which is close to the son-like and angelic images of Philo's Logos, appears in a combined form of the philosophical and rabbinic hypostatic notions of Torah, such as Metatron and *shekhinah*. The messianic image of Torah as the Active Intellect in Abulafia's system is profoundly related to the idea of *devekut*, which, following Maimonides, leads to eschatological noetic union through the system of the Active Intellect and to intellection. Through his particular linguistic and hermeneutic strategies, Abulafia explains an apotheotic experience of the human soul, i.e., experiencing along with a move from the lower Messiah (*shekhinah*), to the supernal Messiah as a transcendent savior. In the process of this experience the human Messiah becomes identified with the lower Messiah, i.e., *shekhinah*. Abulafia's conception of the apotheotic experience, which conveys messianic and eschatological significance, presupposes a dualistic concept of the Messiah: the human messiah figure who is messianized through the ideal of *devekut*, and a supernal Messiah, which can be described as the divine presence which takes on the form of a salvific figure.

On the basis of this theory, Abulafia utilizes linguistic techniques, such as *gematria* and the combinations of the letters of divine names in the letters of the Torah, for his idiosyncratic idea of *devekut*, which allows for the identification between the Active Intellect as an angelic being and the human Messiah, and thereby messianizes the human intellect of an individual when it is in a state of the *devekut* to the Active Intellect. This, in other words, is Abulafia's self-messianization. This implies that Abulafia attempts to legitimate his theory regarding the highest level of his prophetic and mystical experiences by mobilizing the exegetical and interpretive methods. As examined earlier, Abulafia's noetic messianism implies an intellectual perfection accomplished through *devkeut* and noetic union. Specifically, in Abulafia's self-messianization, a messianic image of Torah dramatically appears not only in the messianic image of the Active Intellect but also in Abulafia's intellect as he is spiritualized and hypostatized by the Active Intellect. By this logic, the messianic image of Torah appears not only as a visualized angelic mediator but also appears close to a salvific, and eschatological image, who is hypostatized through the ideas of *devekut* and noetic union.

As emphasized earlier, Abulafia's ecstatic-prophetic experience based on the noetic union theory is profoundly connected to the messianic thought and system of the early Gikatilla. Unlike *Ginnat 'Egoz*, which is influenced by Abulafia's philosophical approach, we have seen a synthesis of philosophic, theosophic, and theurgic conceptions, which Gikatilla uses to conceptualize his messianic ideas, in *Sha'arei Ẓedek*.[8] As Idel notes, Gikatilla, in *Sha*'*aeri Ẓedek*, conceptualizes the messianic ideas by utilizing the whole range of linguistic and sefirotic systems.[9] This also reflects a crucial phase in the evolution of Gikatilla's theological system, since it involves the combination of philosophical, theurgical, theosophical, and even eschatological aspects. Specifically, as examined above, Gikatilla's bi-directional conception of the theurgical activities and images of *ẓaddik* implies a new way of combining theosophical and theurgical systems with a mystical and experiential focus, which are essentially based on the infinite and mystical natures of the language of the Torah.

---

[8] Gottlieb, "The Concluding Portion of R. Joseph Chiqatella's Sha'arei Ẕedeq," *Tarbiz* 39, no. 4 (1970): 359-89 (Hebrew); Idel, *KNP*, 63-73. As Idel and Gottlieb analyzed, we can infer a transitional point in *Sha'arei Ẓedek* from Abulafia's ecstatic (or philosophic) and prophetic focus to Gikatilla's theosophic-theurgic focus. Cf. Yadin, "Theosophy and Kabbalistic Writings," 1-2; Afterman, *And they Shall be One Flesh*, 125-29.

As noted earlier, in a manner similar to Abulafia and de Leon, a bidirectional conception of the theurgical activities also appears in Gikatilla's system. The conception of bidirectional (ascending and descending) emanation in relation to the images of *ẓaddik* in *Sha'arei Ẓedek* are interlocked with the images of *ẓaddik* attached to *shekhinah* in ascending order and *binah* in descending order. In particular, in a manner similar to Abulafia's dual conception of *devekut* of the Messiah, we have seen, in *Sha'aeri Ẓedek*, two patterns of the *devekut* of *ẓaddik* (i.e., *yesod*). The first pattern is the connection to the last sefirah, *malkhut* (or *shekhinah*), with *yesod* which appears in ascending order. The second pattern is the connection to the third sefirah, *binah* with *yesod*, which appears in descending order.[10] As examined earlier, in the first pattern, the sefirah *ẓaddik*, attached to the last sefirah, *malkhut* (or *shekhinah*), eventually accomplishes the unification with the highest sefirot in ascending order. As emphasized earlier, Gikatilla's mythic and anthropomorphic strategies, based on the linguistic and sefirotic symbolism, associate the divine *ẓaddik* with the human *ẓaddik*. On the basis of this logic, the human *ẓaddik* in *Sha'arei Ẓedek* appears close to a visual (i.e., angelic) image, when attached to *shekhinah* (or *malkhut*) in ascending order, in the context of *devekut*. This is similar to an idea that appears as part of Abulafia's noetic union theory. These images of the human *ẓaddik* in *Sha'arei Ẓedek* convey both the messianic and angelic images of the Logos or Active Intellect as a mediator, which is identified with Torah, and thereby produce both a messianic and angelic (visualized) image of Torah.

---

[9] Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 103, 109. There are other symbolic valences of a messianic figure relating to the sefirotic system (e.g., *netzah* and *hod*, and *yesod* as well as *keter*).

[10] *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, 46 (*sha'ar* 8); Idel, *Messianic Mystics*, 103-16; Idel, "Torah Ḥadashah," 58. The *ẓaddik* in the first pattern, which is related to New Torah and a supernal Messiah (king-Messiah), similarly appears in the Zohar, as well as in *Sheqel ha-Qodesh.*

The previous examination also shows that, unlike the messianic image that is closer to an angelic medium that connects God and human beings through *devekut*, the messianic image of Torah, influenced by the Wisdom-centered tradition, appears close to a God-like image as a non-visual mediator reached through *unio mystica*. As discussed above, we have seen that the images of personified Wisdom and Torah in the creation context appear as God-like images, which are almost identical to God, in the Jewish Wisdom tradition of the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. Philo's Logos, which mainly appears as the angelic image of an allegorical mediator, also appears as the God-like image of an abstract and symbolic figure teaching the Torah in a symbolic allusion to a messianic era. In addition, the messianic image close to a God-like image can be found in the images and activities of personified Wisdom and Jesus in the Synoptics, where they appear not only as close to a sage or master teaching the Torah but also as a messianic figure who performs a salvific action. For instance, the symbolical narratives of personified Wisdom in "to my bread" and "my mixed wine" in Prov 9 are quite similar to the rhetoric of Jesus in the metaphor of "bread" (e.g., Jn 6:35) and "water" (e.g., Jn 4:13-14), which symbolizes "flesh" and "blood" of Jesus himself, and to his prophetic sayings in the Last Supper in the Gospels. The rhetorical similarity between the activities of personified Wisdom and Jesus of giving "bread or meat" and "water or wine" demonstrates a salvific conception (i.e., the ultimate purpose of a divine salvation) of giving life, truth, and wisdom.

In addition, we have seen that the messianic ideas in the Wisdom-centered tradition in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods were dynamically developed in the kabbalistic sefirotic system, which was grounded in rabbinic and medieval mystical sources, such as Hekhalot, *Sefer Yetsirah*, and *Sefer ha-Bahir*. The images of Torah mainly identified with the higher sefirot *shekhinah*, *ḥokhmah* or *keter* in the sefirotic system appear as a personified or hypostatized God-like image and exist in intrinsic intimacy with God. For instance, as noted earlier, a messianic image of Torah, which is related to the image of primordial Torah in an equivalent status and unity with God, appears close to a God-like image of *hohkmah*. This shows that the messianic images of Torah are intertwined with a God-like image of the hypostatic notions of Torah in relation to the higher sefirot, in the medieval Jewish mystical tradition. As noted earlier, for Abulafia and R. Isaac of Acre, the priestly messianic figure, combined with the first sefirah, *keter*, conveys a redemptive image of the Messiah, who not only pronounces the Tetragrammaton for the blessing and atonement of the Jewish people, but also accomplishes a salvific mission through the teachings of a New Torah of the Messiah. Abulafia thereby connects a messianic figure to the features of a New Torah insofar as the God-like interpreter teaches the New Torah. As noted earlier, Abulafia, as a messianic figure himself, attempts to present himself as an authentic interpreter of the New Torah and as a messianic mediator between God and human beings, a status which he achieves through the idea of noetic union understood as *unio mystica*. This shows an exegetically combined form of the image of a priestly messianic figure and a God-like image of Torah. On the basis of this logic, we can infer that the messianic image of Torah, which appears close to a God-like image, is dynamically formulated in relation to the idea of *unio mystica* to the hypostatic notions of Torah in the medieval Jewish mystical tradition.

It is notable that Gikatilla, in his mature thought, in a manner similar to Abulafia's conception of the messianic image of Torah as close to a God-like image, combines the messianic and God-like images of Torah. Gikatilla's view is intertwined with the theurgic and theosophic aspects of the medieval Jewish mystical tradition. As noted earlier, Gikatilla theorizes his messianic conception through theurgical activities (e.g., *mitzvot* and prayer to the divine names) in a theosophical system, while involving the messianic images of Torah in the divine unity characterized by the harmonization of the sefirot through sefirotic symbolism. The theurgical actions of the *ẓaddik*, attached to *binah* for the union of *yesod* and *shekhinah* in descending order, reflect a redemptive role in unifying the sefirotic system with *shekhinah* in the sense of a sexual symbolism.

Unlike the first pattern that connects *malkhut* (or *shekhinah*) with *yesod*, which appears in ascending order, as mentioned earlier, the second pattern that connects *binah* with *yesod*, appears in descending order. As noted earlier, through the mythic strategies, the human *ẓaddik* in *Sha'arei Ẓedek* is symbolically connected to the the divine-like image of *ẓaddik*, as the sefirah *yesod*, which is attached to *binah*. This implies that Gikatilla conceptualizes two kinds of messianic images of Torah through the two patterns of *devekut*, which are formulated by the descending and ascending process through the theurgical activities of the *ẓaddik*. On the basis of this logic, in a manner similar to the works of Geronese Kabbalists and Zoharic literature, the divine *ẓaddik* attached to *binah* in descending order also conveys a redemptive image when he unites with *shekhinah* (or *malkhut*), a union that is described with sexual symbolism. This shows that in *Sha'arei Ẓedek*, Gikatilla creates a messianic image of the *ẓaddik*, which conveys both a salvific and God-like characteristic as a result of an ideal model of human behaviors (i.e., theurgical actions), and in a theophanic and redemptive action for the ultimate vision of a messianic era, in which the secrets of the Torah will be revealed. On the basis of this theory, we can infer that the salvific and messianic image of the *ẓaddik*, formulated by the sefirotic symbolism, is related to a God-like image of Torah, which is absorbed into God Himself without a visual mediator between God and human beings. In fact, the messianic image eventually appears as a mystical and abstract figure implicitly linked to the other sefirot in a state of divine unity. This corroborates that the messianic image of the *ẓaddik* in *Sha'arei Ẓedek* is profoundly associated with the God-like image of Torah as an invisible and hidden mediator that reveals an ultimate purpose of messianism, and eventually represents God Himself. In all, we can infer that, through the two patterns of the *devekut* of the *ẓaddik*, Gikatilla tried to create the dual conception of the messianic images of Torah, which are associated with both the angelic and God-like images of Torah, utilizing the concepts of the human ascent to achieve the ideal of *devekut* and the divine descent to provide salvation.

In summary, the messianic images of the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah mainly appear in combination with an angelic image as a mediator between human beings and God through the allegorical approach and thereby divine transcendence and uniqueness is preserved in the Jewish philosophical tradition. By contrast, the messianic images of the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah mainly appear in connection with a God-like image as a hidden mediator through the linguistic symbolism and thereby divine immanence is to some extent assumed in the Jewish mystical tradition. This shows that the messianic images of Torah appear to be formulated not only by the interactions with the angelic and God-like images of the hypostatic notions of Torah in relation to the sefirot but also by the particular hermeneutic strategies (i.e., allegory and symbolism) along with the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica*. As examined earlier, this also demonstrates that the messianic images of the hypostatic notions of Torah are dynamically formulated by the combination of the rabbinic, philosophical, and mystical concepts of Torah in the sefirot and the messianic images of the hypostatic notions as mediating apparatuses for implicitly expressing the mystical experiences of *devekut* and *unio mystica*. In addition, the particular hermeneutical strategies, based on the theological intentions of the authors, contribute to not only revealing the reality of the divine realm (the relationship between the hypostatic notions in the sefirotic system, which correspond to the biblical concepts of Torah and God), but also to connecting the messianic concepts of the hypostatic notions of Torah in the sefirotic system to the eschatological and messianic ideas, such as an abstract God-like figure or a messianic era.

Reconsidering Idel's Panoramic Approach: The Images of Torah as Model and Phenomenology

In a comprehensive manner, in keeping with Idel's panoramic approach, this study presents the phenomenology of the images of Torah in a wide swath of Jewish thought, including Second Temple period, rabbinic, Jewish philosophical, and mystical traditions. As noted earlier, this study principally follows Idel's synthetic approach towards historical criticism and phenomenology, which is based on a methodological eclecticism that utilizes various methodologies (e.g., historical, philological, psychological, and phenomenological), and welcomes new perspectives from various areas of Jewish philosophical and mystical thought and experience. While it is important to acknowledge, as Idel himself does, the limitation of the methodology of models in holistically interpreting religious systems of thought, I focused on the phenomenological significance of the images of Torah as a novel "model" of models. In this sense, I tried to contrast the various religious phenomena in diverse models and traditions to the three images of Torah as a novel model through "relativization" and "distanciation."[11] This study, thus, encompasses not only the historical and intertextual examinations of the three images of Torah but also the phenomenological analysis of religious experiences, which provides a critical insight into grasping the core foundations of the images' formulation and development. This study also provides the philological and intertextual evidence to not only demonstrate the existence and continuity of the history of ideas of the images of Torah but also to describe the mystical, psychological, and experiential aspects of the three images of Torah, which are central in the religious experiences and perspectives of the Rabbis, Jewish philosophers and mystics. This study further elucidates the historical, literary, theological, and philosophical backgrounds, which are related to the formulation of the three images of Torah, and offers an account of the history of an inner dynamic and recurring set of religious images.

Through this examination based on these theoretical principles, I evaluated in detail the phenomenological features of the three images of Torah by analyzing the dynamic relationships between them, the idea of *devekut* and *unio mystica*, and the hermeneutic strategies used throughout the history of Jewish philosophy and mysticism. I have also shown that the complex hypostatic notions of Torah emerge in the interactions of the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions of the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. In the course of my analysis, I compared the primitive forms of the three images of Torah as they appear in Jewish philosophical and mystical texts with the various images of the hypostatic notions that appear in Christian texts. My examination further demonstrates not only the centrality of Torah, within the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions but also the development of the primitive forms of the images of Torah from the Second Temple period through the Rabbinic and medieval periods. I thereby corroborated the continuity between the primitive forms of the three (angelic, God-like, and messianic) images of Torah as they emerge in the Greek Logos-centered tradition and the Jewish Wisdom-centered tradition of the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods, and their full-fledged forms as they are found in the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions of the Middle Ages.

---

[11] See Idel, *Ascension on High*, 11-13; Abrams, "Phenomenology of Jewish Mysticism," 81-6, 90.

Rather than a clear-cut demarcation between the development of the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, I have found that extensive interactions between them can be traced in the Jewish mystical and kabbalistic traditions and sources. The Wisdom-centered hypostatic notion of Torah, through its profound interactions with the Logos-centered hypostatic notion, appears in the Jewish philosophical traditions and sources, while the Logos-centered hypostatic notion of Torah, through its interactions with the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notion, appears in the Jewish mystical and kabbalistic traditions and sources. Moreover, the concepts and images of Torah are based on differing hermeneutic approaches. Their functions as mediators between the divine essence and human beings allow for different levels of *devekut* and *unio mystica*. By analyzing the development of the hypostatic notions of Torah from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods through the Middle Ages, I showed the continuity of the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* in their interactions with the images of Torah.

Through this examination, the critical features of the three images of Torah examined earlier creatively and continuously appear in the interactions and relationships between the Logos-centered and the Wisdom-centered traditions and, as such, reflect an inner continuity of the core ideas of the three (angelic, messianic, and God-like) images of Torah in the model throughout the history of Jewish thought. In this sense, I tried to investigate the structures of ideas in the model of the three images of Torah and their interrelationships, not only by avoiding subjectively and reductively conceptualizing them as a preconceived system based on the regnant scholarly perspectives but also by not artificially imposing a particular hermeneutic system (e.g., a historical and psychological analysis). In particular, it is notable that the primitive forms of the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica*, in relation to the hypostatic notions of Torah, emerge as a recurring phenomenon in the structure of thought of Jewish philosophers and mystics who formulate the images of Torah. This demonstrates that the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* play a critical role as a “structure” of thought, which was implicitly and dynamically present from ancient sources to medieval sources.

Additionally, we have also seen some elements (e.g., patterns and orders), which would function as building blocks for the model in this research. For instance, Gikatilla, according to his intellectual interests, shows a pattern and order, i.e., starting with the formation of an angelic image of Torah by using the philosophical terms and concepts of the hypostatic notions in the sefirot, and then moving forward to the formulation of a God-like image of Torah by using the mystical terms and concepts in the sefirot. In addition, we can see that the three images of Torah phenomenologically appear to be interlocked in an orderly way with Idel’s account of three models (i.e., ecstatic, theosophic-theurgic, and magical) of Kabbalah in the Jewish mystical traditions. As shown earlier, in the two patterns of *devekut*, the idea of *devekut* in the ascending order prominently functions along with an angelic, visualized, and personified image of Torah as a mediator in order to achieve a state of *unio mystica*, whereas the idea of *devekut* in the descending order mainly functions along with a God-like, non-visualized, and hypostatized image of Torah in order to achieve a state of *unio mystica*. This shows the dynamic interactions and relationships between the descent position (descending order) and the ascent position (ascending order) in the theosophic and theurgic systems along with the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica*. This examination shows that the images of Torah as a model corroborate not only the preexisting models, such as the three models of Kabbalah outlined by Idel, but are also developed into a more comprehensive model by synthesizing and absorbing older and newer organizations (i.e., structures, patterns, and orders) of thought and practice. I hope to offer, in a separate study, a fuller analysis of the phenomenological features of the ascending order and descending order while analyzing, in greater detail, the relationships and operations within the structures and patterns of thought in order to discover a broader picture of the phenomenology of the three images of Torah.

CONCLUSION

A critical implication of this research is that one model can contribute to, or be developed into, a more comprehensive model through the sophisticated syntheses of the historical, thematic, semantic, and phenomenological features of the images of Torah. This research thereby demonstrates the features of various hermeneutical systems (rabbinic, philosophical, and Jewish mystical) related to the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* in order to corroborate a missing link connecting ancient, rabbinic, and medieval Jewish sources. In this sense, as concluding remarks, I will further summarize some critical ideas and elements of this examination.

The idea of *devekut* to the (mainly Logos-centered) hypostatic notions of Torah implies the human soul or intellect's mystical experience of God through the angelic image of Torah as visible mediator. The angelic image of Torah is mainly revealed in the context of *devekut* to the Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah. The biblical idea of *devekut* primarily means the human soul's direct attachment to God. However, as examined earlier, this idea of *devekut* necessitates an angelic image of the (Logos-centered) hypostatic notions of Torah as a visible mediator between God and human beings. Accordingly, in this idea of *devekut*, the gap between the human intellect and God still remains, and God also remains as a transcendent and non-integrated being. By contrast, the idea of *unio mystica* means a more radical concept in which the human soul is directly connected and unified with God without a mediator. The idea of *unio mystica* to the (mainly Wisdom-centered) hypostatic notions of Torah mainly implies the human soul or intellect's mystical, unitive, and absorptive experience of God. In this context, a state of *unio mysica* seems to be possible without a mediator, and, accordingly, the border between God and the human soul radically seems to be blurred.

However, as examined earlier, strictly speaking, the idea of *unio mystica*, especially in the thought of medieval Jewish mystics, is also supposed to be united with God through the God-like image of Torah as an invisible and hidden mediator in a mythic and anthropomorphic strategy based on a sefirotic symbolism. In this sense, even in the idea of *unio mystica*, the boundaries between transcendent God and human soul can be maintained, while allowing for the human soul or intellect's unitive and absorptive experience with/within God in the sense of divine immanence.

In addition, the idea of *devekut* to the messianic image of Torah primarily means the human soul or intellect's mystical experience of God, who has a messianic and salvific image, through the messianic image of Torah. As examined earlier, in the process of *devekut*, the human soul's experiences God through the prism of the messianic images, which are combined with an angelic or a God-like image of Torah. The messianic image, which appears close to an angelic image of Torah, is formulated in the operation of the *devekut* to an exegetically and conceptually combined form of the angelic and messianic images of the hypostatic notions of Torah. In this case, the human soul experiences God through an angelic and messianic image of Torah. By contrast, the messianic image, which appears close to a God-like image of Torah, strongly appears in the operation of the *unio mystica* as a conceptually and hermeneutically combined form of the God-like and messianic images of the hypostatic notions of Torah. In this case, the human soul experiences God through a God-like and messianic image of Torah. Specifically, as noted earlier, Abulafia develops the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* into a unique form realized in himself through a messianic image of Torah, which combines the angelic and God-like images of Torah.

The intertextual, theological, and philosophical nexuses between the hypostatic notions of Torah elucidate not only the hermeneutical, theological, and philosophical backgrounds of these early Jewish and Christian sources but also the developmental process of the primitive forms of three images of Torah in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. These nexuses demonstrate how the Torah-centered conception reflected in the hypostatic notions of Torah was centralized in rabbinic tradition, as well as how it played an influential role in formulating the three images of Torah throughout the history of Jewish thought. As previously examined, the intertextual and theological examinations of the hypostatic notions that are similar to the concept of Torah demonstrate that the primitive forms of the Greek Logos-centered and the Jewish Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah had an important influence on the formation of the three images of Torah, and that the three images of Torah, as a model, were continuously developed in ancient, Rabbinic, and medieval Jewish sources. The primitive forms of the three images of Torah, identified as hypostatic entities in the Second Temple period, were, therefore, developed through the innovations of rabbinic exegetical practices and were dynamically developed into their full-fledged forms as a result of the interrelationships between the rabbinic tradition and the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions in the Middle Ages.

The particularly significant point of my findings is that all the hypostatic notions of Torah are conceived of in a dualistic (philosophical and mystical) manner, and in accordance with their distinctive conceptual features, the three images of Torah were dynamically formulated by hermeneutic, philosophical, and theological perspectives. It is notable that the hypostatic notions of Torah in the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions are condensed in the sefirotic system in a manner which reflects their interactions and interrelationships. As examined earlier, the interactions and interrelationships between the Wisdom-centered and the Logos-centered hypostatic notions in the highest sefirot (*keter*, *ḥokhmah*, and *binah*) in the Geronese tradition shed light on the dynamic interactions between the lower sefirot in relation to other hypostatic notions of Torah. For instance, the tenth sefirah, *malkhut*, dynamically interacts with both the Logos-centered hypostatic notions (such as Logos, Metatron, and Active Intellect) and the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions (such as personified Wisdom, *ḥokhmah*). As emphasized by these investigations, the God-like image of the Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions (such as *shekhinah*) mainly creates a God-like image of Torah which appears in the Wisdom-centered tradition, whereas the angelic image of the Logos- centered hypostatic notions (such as Metatron and Active Intellect) mainly generates an angelic image of Torah, which appears in the Logos-centered tradition.

These angelic and God-like images of Torah emerge as the full-fledged forms in the sefirot as a total system comprised of the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah. The messianic image of Torah is a combination of the angelic and God-like images, that is Logos and Wisdom-centered, hypostatic notions of Torah, that emerges from the dynamic interaction of the Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions. These features eventually show the priority and centrality of Torah over the Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah. The priority and centrality of Torah, buttressed by both the Wisdom and Logos traditions, plays a critical role not only as the source of Wisdom (i.e., *ḥokhmah*) and Logos (i.e., *binah*) on behalf of God but also as an ultimate agent of Wisdom and Logos, which encompasses all the sefirot as the hypostatic notions, and gives them meaningful functions in the sefirotic and metaphysical realms. It is notable that the sefirah of *ḥokhmah* plays a role as a route in transitioning from an incomprehensible realm into a comprehensible realm, while the sefirah of *binah* plays a role as a pathway for transforming the comprehensible realms into the expressible, visualized, and materialized realms. The dynamic relationships and functions of Wisdom and Logos appear in the tenth sefirah, *malkhut,* at the lowest level of sefirotic system, which dynamically interacts with the Wisdom-centered (e.g., *shekhinah*) and Logos-centered (e.g., Metatron) hypostatic notions of Torah, as examined earlier. This demonstrates the process of transitioning from an invisible and immaterialized realm, i.e., the highest sefirot (*keter, ḥokhmah,* and *binah*), which are identified as a God-like image of Torah, to a visualized and materialized realm accessible to the rational and imaginative faculties, which are identified as the angelic image of Torah. By this logic, the messianic image of Torah, which appears as a combination of the angelic and God-like images of Torah, emerges from the dynamic interactions between the visible and invisible realms. This proves that the sefirot are a unified totality and a full-fledged form of the hypostatic notions of Torah. It further shows the roles of the sefirot as mediators that bridges the gaps between God and human beings. Ultimately, the medieval kabbalists intended to explain a particular mechanism of the divine realm that would reflect the interactions between Logos and Wisdom, but at the same time would express the preexistence and superiority of Torah over Logos and Wisdom. This also shows that they conceptualized the sefirot as a system partially produced through the interactions between the Wisdom-centered and Logos-centered hypostatic notions of Torah, which already existed in ancient and late antique sources since the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods.

Specifically, the model of three images of Torah substantiates an inner continuity of the core ideas and elements, which continuously appear in the interactions and relationships between the Logos-centered and the Wisdom-centered traditions throughout the history of Jewish thought. This proves not only the continuity and development of the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* and the concept of a mediator in relation to the images of Torah, manifest from their primitive forms in the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods to their full-fledged forms in medieval Kabbalistic sources, but also the continuity of the Logos and Wisdom-centered traditions reflected in the hypostatic notions throughout the history of Jewish thought. This substantiates that the phenomena of the images of Torah emerges from the systematic functions and complicated collaborations of the core factors, i.e., the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica*, which operate along with each image of Torah as a mediator through the hermeneutic strategies, which were manifest among the rabbinic, Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions. Above all, my examination authenticates that the images of Torah, in the thought of the authors, appear as critical apparatuses for the mystical experiences of *devekut* and *unio mystica*. This further elucidates how the concepts and images of Torah are variously formulated and based on differing hermeneutic approaches with regard to the ideas of the *devekut* and *unio mystica* and how they function as mediators between the divine essence and human beings in the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered traditions.

As noted earlier, an angelic image of Torah as a mediator is mainly formulated in the context of a noetic union (the human intellect's conjunction with the Active Intellect) as described in the Jewish philosophical tradition. The idea of *devekut* (i.e., a noetic union) necessitates a visualized mediator of an angelic image of Torah, such as Logos as an allegorical apparatus, which fills the gap between God and human beings within a philosophical framework that preserves divine transcendence. By contrast, a God-like image of Torah mainly appears in the context of a unitive and absorptive experience (i.e., *unio mystica*). The idea of *unio mystica* necessitates an invisible (i.e., symbolized and linguistic) mediator (or seemingly no mediator) of a God-like image of Torah, such as Wisdom as a mythic and symbolic apparatus, which allows for the direct access to God. The idea of *unio mystica* involves human participation and absorption into the unity between the symbolically described sefirot of the Jewish mystical tradition. This position has a strong tendency towards the divine immanence even if it still maintains the distinction between God and human beings, within a theosophically and philosophically combined framework of divine immanence and divine transcendence. This corroborates that the three images of Torah as a mediator were dynamically formulated by the authors' theological intentions and philosophical frameworks to explain the mystical experiences of *devekut* and *unio mystica* to the divine realms.

This further substantiates that the hermeneutical strategies (i.e., allegory and symbolism) implicitly play a critical role in formulating the three images of Torah as hypostatic mediators in the hypostatic notions, which were manifest within the Logos-centered and the Wisdom-centered traditions from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods through the Middle Ages. This shows that the mystical experiences of *devekut* and *unio mystica* were developed in accord with the particular hermeneutical systems of philosophical allegory and linguistic symbolism of the various Rabbis, philosophers, and mystics. This also corroborates that these mystical experiences play critical roles not only in associating the hypostatic notions of Torah with the divine entities but also in formulating the angelic and God-like images, which represent the divine realms and God. This also proves that they tried not only to understand and explain the relationship between God and human beings through various literary and exegetical strategies based on philosophical allegory and kabbalistic symbolism but also to experience and achieve an ideal of *devekut*, i.e., noetic union or *unio mystica*, to the hypostatic notions of Torah.

Consequently, this phenomenological analysis details not only the interrelationships of the three images of Torah, and offers explicit evidence and continuity of an inner and channel transmitting the shared core ideas and elements, which manifest among the ancient Jewish, rabbinic, Jewish philosophical, and mystical traditions from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods through the Middle Ages. This also provides a critical insight into not only the development of various religious phenomena and traditions but also the phenomenology of God, Torah, and various hypostatic notions as mediators, which were recurrent from the ancient (Second Temple) sources through the medieval Kabbalistic sources. Above all, it is phenomenologically notable that the images of Torah appear as mediators connecting God and human beings and for making God available to human comprehension, even while the divine essence remains unchanged. This study authenticates that the images of Torah, which were deeply rooted in their sub-consciousness, were significantly used for explaining the mystery and secrets of God and Torah and of an inner-divine mechanism to the human world. The images of Torah convey a theological intention to reveal, in an elaborate way, the secrets and centrality of Torah in the various hypostatic notions which were manifest throughout the history of religious thought and Jewish thought.

As discussed earlier, this examination also elucidates the literary and hermeneutic methodologies that were implicitly inherited from the views of ancient philosophers and mystics, who formulated the three images of Torah as mediators through the mechanism of *devekut* and *unio mystica*. The three images of Torah provide a vital foundation in understanding the theological and philosophical implications of the divine unity and divine essence, which are expressible through the literary and hermeneutic strategies. Specifically, the concrete examples and characteristics of the primitive forms of the three images of Torah formulated by the ideas of *devekut* and *unio mystica* provide not only a critical understanding of the hermeneutic methodologies (i.e., allegory and symbolism) employed by the rabbinic, Jewish philosophical, and mystical traditions throughout the history of Jewish thought, but also elucidate evidence of their continuity and development throughout the history of Judeo-Christian thought. In addition, the religious phenomena of the images of Torah illustrate not only the implicit existence of the concepts of Torah in the similar religious phenomena of other religions but also offer more comprehensive evidence of the developmental process of the concepts and images of

Torah through the comparative analyses of other religions. This, therefore, corroborates that the three images of Torah can serve not only as a more extensive and comprehensive model but also as one which can be confirmed and clarified by the recurring ideas derived from different religious systems (i.e., Christian traditions) and their texts and thoughts.

Consequently, the further phenomenological examination of the three images of Torah will provide a groundbreaking insight for unfolding a new horizon of creative perspectives in understanding and reinterpreting the conceptions of the images of God and mediators. It will provide not only an innovative theological implication of the three images of Torah, which illuminates a flexible approach to scriptural interpretations from various creative theological perspectives but also a new and more advanced understanding and theological reflection regarding the monotheistic nature of Jewish philosophy and Jewish mysticism. Eventually, it will not only broaden the understanding of the continuity of an inner channel of the shared ideas regarding the three images of Torah and the recurrence of the related religious phenomena continuing from ancient Jewish thought through contemporary Jewish thought but also will shed light on an innovative theological and philosophical implication of the phenomenology of Torah in Jewish philosophy and Jewish mysticism.

AFTERWORD

In a future study, it would be worthwhile to examine and discover more implications of the operations of *devekut* and *unio mystica* and the hermeneutic strategies, which formulate the images of Torah in various religious traditions from a new and broader perspective through an in-depth examination of the related sources in terms of a panoramic approach. It also would be meaningful to examine more specific evidence of the developmental process of the hypostatic notions of Torah in rabbinic midrash and Jewish philosophical and mystical sources while discovering the similar religious phenomena and features of the three images of Torah throughout the history of Jewish mysticism and philosophy in accordance with Idel's panoramic approach. This future study would also elucidate the significance of the further study of the phenomenology of Torah and the dynamic development of the three images of Torah by reexamining their theological and phenomenological implications on a deeper and broader level. Such an examination also could illuminate the evidence of the dynamic interactions of rabbinic, Jewish mystical, and philosophical traditions in the discourse of the development of modern Jewish thought, e.g., the ideological, philosophical, and theological debates between the two intellectual traditions of *Hasidim* and *Mitnagedim* regarding the concepts and images of Torah. In addition, it is important to remark that the Torah, which is a linguistic and scriptural concept, is related to the concept of God as a universal idea in the philosophical and mystical traditions of multiple religious traditions: Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and others. In this sense, it would be interesting and meaningful to reappraise the similarities and differences between the three images of Torah described here and related phenomena in other religions. As noted earlier, the images of Torah were continued in various forms as the Logos-centered and Wisdom-centered hypostatic notions of Torah throughout the trajectories of the history of Jewish thought, just as Philo's Logos was continued in the Johannine Logos of the Gospel of John and the Church Fathers, and, as Wolfson notes, passed on to the idea of the Active Intellect in Islamic philosophy, and later medieval Jewish philosophy.[1] This substantiates that these phenomenological features regarding the three images of Torah constantly reappeared in various Christian, Jewish, and even Islamic sources from the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods through the Middle Ages. Specifically, the interfaces and relationships of the three images of Torah, which arose commonly within both early Jewish and Christian sources, provide critical insight into the religious and theological interactions between Rabbinic Judaism and early Christianity. In this regard, the three images of Torah as a model, which is based on this comprehensive concept of Torah, appears to be critical and useful for explicating the philosophical and mystical concepts of God, the teachings regarding the divine nature (which is the essential content of all religions), and the concept of a mediator between human beings and the divine in other religions.

---

[1] H. Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:457.

This approach would allow us not only to reevaluate their significance and profound understanding of each religious tradition and belief system in the history of religious thought but also to recognize the limitations of each system as well as to refine an attitude of scholarly receptivity to various religious phenomena in other traditions, beliefs, and cultures from a broader perspective. In this regard, a consecutive and in-depth examination of the phenomenology of three images of Torah will provide not only a broader and deeper understanding of the images of Torah in terms of the diversity of hermeneutic and interpretative methods but also a more analytical and comprehensive foundation for the understanding of the philosophical and theological relationships between Judaism and other religions. For instance, the earlier examination of the three images of Torah embodied in the images of Jesus in relation to the hypostatic notions gives a critical insight not only into their developmental process, in the contexts of nascent Christianity and Late Antiquity but also into their relationships in the history of Jewish and Christian thought. This implies that the three images of Torah, as a model, can also be found in the images of the hypostatic notions of Torah, which appear in the history of the philosophical and mystical traditions of Christianity. Specifically, the relationship of the three images of Torah to the images of Jesus, which were manifest in specific forms in the Gospels, provides not only critical insight into the background of the Trinitarian doctrine which involves three persons and three images of God but also provides a creative perspective from which to consider Christian theological doctrines about the divine nature—that is of reevaluating the manner in which the three images of Torah intertwined with three aspects and images of the Trinity in a symbolic and hermeneutic form. This provides an important foundation for understanding the theological and philosophical structures of the divine essence, despite the epistemological limitation and impossibility of appreciating the divine essence. In this regard, the phenomenology of the three images of Torah could play a critical role in orienting the direction of the theological interpretations of other religions, including Christianity, while offering a creative perspective for their religious teachings, e.g., especially for the concept of the Trinity emphasized in the Christian theology.

Furthermore, this approach will lead us not only to a deeper and broader understanding of religious thought, which can reconcile the seemingly conflicting views formulated by a superficial level of one-sided interpretations, but also to an authentic way of appreciating the essence of various religious experiences of different religions and traditions in the spirit of mutual respect. It will also provide a critical insight into a variety of perspectives regarding the images of Torah and God and their functions and roles in developing a doctrinal flexibility and affordability into religious thoughts and systems. This implies that an appropriate and comprehensive understanding of the three images of Torah can assist in not only avoiding a doctrinal rigidity by embracing the possibility of a multifaceted understanding and interpretation of the divine essence but also in overcoming the limits of religious doctrines, as well as ensuring the diversity and autonomy of religious beliefs.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Abulafia, Abraham ben Samuel. *Sefer Sitre Torah*. Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001.

___. *Sefer ’Or ha-Sekhel*. Jerusalem, A. Gros, 2001.

___. *‘Imrei Shefer*. Jerusalem: A. Gros, 1999.

___. *Ḥayyei ha-Nefesh*. Jerusalem, A. Gros, 2011.

___. *Mezuraf ha-Sekhel* and *Sefer ha-’Ot.* Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001.

___. *Ner ’Elohim*. Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001.

___. *’Oẓar ‘Eden Ganuz.* Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2000.

___. *Sefer ha-Ḥesheq*. Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2002.

___. *Sefer ha-Ge’ulah*. Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001.

___. *Sefer ha-Melamed*. Jerusalem: n.p., 2001.

___. *Sefer Haftarah*, Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001.

___. *Sefer ha-Tzeruf*, Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2003.

___. *Sefer Ḥayyei ha-‘Olam ha-Ba’*. Jerusalem A. Gros, 2001.

___. *Sefer Mafteaḥ ha-Ḥokhmot*. Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001.

___. *Sefer Mafteaḥ ha-Shemot*. Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2001.

___. *Ve-zot le-Yehudah*. Jerusalem: A. Gros, 2009.

Abraham bar Hiyya. *Sefer Megillat ha-Megalleh*. Edited by A. Poznanski and J. Guttmann. Berlin: Verein Mekitsei Nirdamim, 1924.

___. *Hegyon ha-Nefesch ha-Atzuvah*. Edited by Geoffrey Wigoder. Jerusalem: Mosad Byalik, 1971.

Aristotle. *Metaphysics, Volume II*. Translated by Hugh Tredennick and George Cyril Armstrong. LCL 287. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

___. *De Anima* (=On the Soul). Translated by Walter. S. Hett, LCL 288. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Asher ben David. "*Sefer ha-Yihud*." In *His Complete Works and Studies in His Kabbalistic Thought, Including the Commentaries to the Account of Creation by the Kabbalists of Provence and Gerona,* edited by Daniel Abrams, 49-145. Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 1996.

Azriel ben Menahem of Gerona. *Commentary on the Talmudic Aggadoth*. Edited by Isaiah Tishby. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1982.

___. *Kabbalistic Works of R. Azriel of Girona*. Edited by Oded Porat. Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2019.

___. *Perush le-Sefer Yesirah* (=*Commentary on Sefer Yetsirah*) in *Kitve Ramban*. Vol. 2, edited by Charles B. Chavel, 451-461. Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1967.

Charlesworth, James H., Frank M. Cross, et. al., trans. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994-2011.

Ezra ben Solomon of Gerona. *Perush le-Shir ha-Shirim* (=*Commentary on the Song of Songs*). In *Kitvei ha-Ramban*. Vol. 2, edited by Charles B. Chavel, 476-518. Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1967.

Eleazar ben Judah of Worms. *Sodei Razaya: Sefer Alfa Beta = Secrets of Raziel: Book of the Alphabet*. Edited by Fabrizio Del Tin. Trieste, Italy: eUniversity Pub., 2018.

Frank, Richard M. *The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach* (Sinai Ar. 155. IXth-Xth Cent.). Louvain: Corpus SCO, 1974.

Gikatilla, Joseph ben Abraham. *Ginnat 'Egoz*. Hanau: n.p., 1605.

___. *Sha'are ha-Niqqud*. Printed in *Sefer 'Arzei Levanon*. Venice: Giovanni di Gara, 1601.

___. *Sha'arei Ẓedek*. Cracow: Druck and Verlag von Fisher & Deutscher, 1881.

___. *Sha'arei 'Orah*. 2 vols. Edited by Yosef (Joseph) Ben Shlomo. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1970.

___. *Sha'arei 'Orah* (Gates of Light). *Sacred Literature Series*, translated by Avi Weinstein. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1994.

___. *Sheloshah Sefarim Niftaḥim: Sefer Sha'are'Orah; Sefer Sha'are Tsedeḳ; Sefer Ha-Niḳud Ṿeha-Ḥashmal*. Edited by Yosef Kohen. Tel Aviv: Hafatsah Rashit, Barazani u-veno, 775, 2014.

Isaac ben Shmuel of Acre. *Sefer Me'irat 'Einayim*. Edited by Amos Goldreich. Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1984.

Jacob ben Sheshet. "Sefer ha-'Emunah we-ha-Bittahon." In *Kitvei ha-Ramban*, vol. 2., edited by Charles B. Chavel, 342-448. Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1967.

Klein, Michael L., ed. and trans. *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to Their Extant Sources*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980.

Moses ben Shem Tov de Leon. *Sefer Sheqel ha-Qodesh*. Edited by Charles Mopsik. (Hebrew) Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 1966.

Midrash Rabbah. Translated by Harry Freedman and edited by Maurice Simon, S. M. Lehrman, J. Israelstam, Judah J. Slotki, Joseph Rabbinowitz, A. Cohen, and Louis I. Rabinowitz. London: Soncino Press, 1961.

Maimon, Moses ben (Maimonides). *The Guide of the Perplexed*. Translated by Shlomo Pines. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

___. *Mishneh Torah* (=*The Code of Maimonides): The Book of Judges.* Bk. 14. Translated by Abraham M. Hershman. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949.

___. *Mishneh Torah: The Book of Knowledge*. Edited by Moses Hyamson. Jerusalem: Boys Town, 1962.

___. *Maimonides' Commentary on the Mishnah: Tractate Sanhedrin*. Translated by Fred Rosner. New York: Sepher-Hermon Press, 1981.

Moses ben Nahman (Nahamnides). *Kitvei ha-Ramban.* 2 vols. Edited by Charles B. Chavel. Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1963.

___. *Commentary on the Torah.* Translated and Edited by Charles B. Chavel. Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1959.

Moses ben Shem Tob de Leon. *Or Zaru'a*. Edited by Alexander Altmann. *Qovez 'al Yad*, n.s. 9 (1980): 219-93.

Nathanael Ben Fayyumi. *The Bustan Al-ukul*. Translated and edited by David Levine. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2009.

Neusner, Jacob. *Genesis Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis: A New American Translation.* Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1985.

Philo of Alexandria. *Philo*. Translated and Edited by Ralph Marcus, and F. H. Colson, and G. H. Whitaker. 10 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

___. *The Contemplative Life, The Giants, and Selections*. Classics of Western Spirituality, translated by David Winston. New York: Paulist Press, 1981.

Plotinus, *Enneads.* Translated by Arthur. H. Armstrong. LCL 440-445. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015.

Simon, Maurice, and Isidore Epstein. *The Babylonian Talmud*. New York: Traditional Press, 1979.

Solomon Ibn Gabirol. *The Kingly Crown* (= *Keter Malkhut*). Translated and edited by Bernard Lewis and Andrew L. Gluck. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 2003.

Sefer ha-Ḥesheq, Commentary on Seventy Names of Metatron by R. Nehemiah ben Shlomo. Edited by Y. M. Epstein, Lemberg: n.pH, 1865.

Sefer ha-Zohar: *Zohar to the Pentateuch*. Edited by Reuven Margalioth. Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1964.

Sefer Zohar Ḥadash to the Pentateuch, *Megillot*, and *Tikkunim*. Edited by Reuven Margalioth. Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1964.

The Book Bahir. Edited by Daniel Abrams. (Hebrew) Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 1994.

Tiqqunei Zohar. Edited by Margaliot, Reuven. Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1978.

Vermès, Géza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. London: Penguin Books, 2004.

Secondary Sources

Abelson, Joshua. *Jewish Mysticism: An Introduction to the Kabbalah*. New York: Sepher-Hermon, 1981.

___. "Maimonides on the Jewish Creed" (a translation of Maimonides' introduction to *Perek Helek* in his Commentary on the Mishnah). *JQR* 19, no. 1 (1906): 24-58.

___. *The Immanence of God in Rabbinic Literature*. London: MacMillan, 1912.

Abrams, Daniel. "Phenomenology of Jewish Mysticism: Moshe Idel's Methodology in Perspective." In *Kabbalah* 20, no. 215 (2009): 7-146.

___. "The Literary Emergence of Esotericism in German Pietism." *Shofar* 12 (1994): 67-85.

___. *Ten Psychoanalytic Aphorisms on Kabbalah*. Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2011.

Ada, Rapoport-Albert. "God and the Ẓaddik as the Two Focal Points of Hasidic Worship." *History of Religions*, no. 4 (1979): 318-20.

Adams, Samuel L. *Proverbs, Book of*. In *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, 1103. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; 2010.

Adler, Reinhard. *Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft*, http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/online-bibeln/ueber-die-online-bibeln/.

Adriana, Destro and Mauro Pesce. "The Gospel of John and the Community Rule of Qumran: A Comparison of Systems." In *Judaism in Late Antiquity, vol. 2: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Alan J. Avery-Peck, Jacob Neusner, and Bruce D. Chilton, 201-229. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Afterman, Adam. *And they Shall be One Flesh: On the Language of Mystical Union in Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

___. "From Philo to Plotinus: The Emergence of Mystical Union." *The Journal of Religion* 93, no. 2 (2013): 177-96.

___. *Devequt: Mystical Intimacy in Medieval Jewish Thought*. (Hebrew) Los Angeles: Cherub, 2011.

Aitken, Kenneth T. "Proverbs." *The Daily Study Bible Series*. Louidville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1986.

Al Farabi. *On the Perfect State* (*Mabadi Ara Ahl Al-Madinat Al-Fadilah*). Edited by Richard Walzer. Great Books of the Islamic World. Chicago, IL: KAZI Publications, 1998.

___. *Political Regime* (*Kitāb al-siyāsa al-madaniyya*) or *The Treatise on the Principles of Beings*. Edited by F. M. Najjar. Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1964.

___. "On the Intellect." In *Classical Arabic Philosophy: An Anthology of Sources*. Translated by Jon McGinnis, and David C. Reisman. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub., 2007.

___. "The Letter Concerning the Intellect." In *Philosophy in the Middle Ages: The Christian, Islamic, and Jewish Traditions*. Translated by Arthur Hyman. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub., 2010.

Albright, William F. "The Supposed Babylonian Derivation of the Logos." *JBL* 39 (1920):143-51.

___, and C. S. Mann. *Matthew*. Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday &, 1971.

Alexander, Philip S. "3 Enoch and the Talmud." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 18, no. 1 (1987): 40-68.

___. "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch" in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren, 87-122. Harrisbrurg, PA: Trinity, 1998.

___. "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch." *JJS* 28 (1977): 156-180.

Alexandru, Stefan. *Aristotle's Metaphysics Lambda: Annotated Critical Edition Based upon a Systematic Investigation of Greek, Latin, Arabic and Hebrew Sources*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Allegro, James M. *Qumran Cave 4.1*. DJD 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

Alon, Gedalia. *The Jews in Their Land in the Talmudic Age, 70-640 C.E*. Edited by Gershon Levi. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Altmann, Alexander. "'Homo Imago Dei' in Jewish and Christian Theology." *The Journal of Religion* 48, no. 3 (1968): 254.

___. "3 Enoch and the Talmud." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 18, no. 1 (1987): 40-68.

___. "Ibn Bajja on Man's Ultimate Felicity." In *Studies in Religious Philosophy and Mysticism*, 73-107. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1969.

___. "Moses de Leon's *Sefer Or Zaru'a*: Introduction, Critical Text, and Notes." *Qovetz al Yad* 9 (1980): 219-293 (Hebrew).

___. "Problems of Research in Jewish Neoplatonism." *Tarbiz* 27 (1958): 501-507 (Hebrew).

___. *Faces of Judaism*. Edited by A. Shapira. (Hebrew) Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1983.

Amir, Yohoshua. "The Messianic Idea in Hellenistic Judaism." *Mahanayim* 124 (1970): 54-67 (Hebrew).

Anderson, Gary A. "The Interpretation of Gen 1:1 in the Targums." *CBQ* 52 (1990): 21-29.

Anton, John P. "Some Logical Aspects of the Concept of Hypostasis in Plotinus." *The Review of Metaphysics* 31 (2) (1977): 258-71.

Ashton, John. *Understanding the fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Farber-Ginat, Asi. "A New Passage from Rabbi Joseph Gikatilla's Introduction to Ginat Egoz." *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* I (1981): 159-60 (Hebrew).

___. "On the Sources of Rabbi Moses de Leon's Early Kabbalistic System." In *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 3 (1983): 67-96 (Hebrew).

Aune, David. "Oral Tradition and the Aphorisms of Jesus." In *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Jewish and Greco-Roman Antiquity: Collected Essays II*, 256-302. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Bar-Asher, Avishai. "New Fragments from 'Sefer *'O*r Zaruʿa' and 'Sefer Ha-Neʿlam.'" *Tarbiz* 83, no. 4 (2015): 635-642.

Barret, Charles K. "Jews and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius." In *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity, Essays in Honor of W. D. Davies*, 133-158. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Barthélemy, Dominique, Józef T. Milik, and Roland De Vaux, eds. *Qumran Cave 1*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Arndt, William F. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* 3rd ed. Edited by Walter Bauer and Frederick W Danker. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Beattie, Derek R. G., and Martin J. McNamara. *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context*. JSOTSup 166. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Belkin, Samuel. "Philo and the Zohar." *JJS* 10 (1959): 23-44, 113-35.

Ben-Sasson, Haim H. *A History of the Jewish People*, 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press., 2002.

Berger, Abraham. "The Messianic Self-Consciousness of AbrahamAbulafia: A Tentative Evaluation." In *Essays on Jewish Life and Thought: Presented in Honor of Salo Wittmayer Baron*, edited byJoseph L. Blau, Philip Friedman, Arthur Hertzberg, and Isaac Mendelsohn, 55-62. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Berger, David. "Three Typological Themes in Early Jewish Messianism: Messiah Son of Joseph, Rabbinic Calculations, and the Figure of Armilus," *AJS Review 10* (2): 141-164.

Blickstein, Shlomo. *Between Philosophy and Mysticism: A Study of the Philosophical-Qabbalistic Writings of Joseph Gikatilla*. PhD Diss. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1983.

Blumenthal, David R. “Maimonides' Intellectualist Mysticism and the Superiority of the Prophecy of Moses.” *Studies in Medieval Culture* 10 (1981): 51-67.

___. “Maimonides’ Philosophic Mysticism.” In *David R. Blumenthal: Living with God and Humanity*, 85-109. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. *Redemption and Resistance: The Messianic Hopes of Jews and Christians in Antiquity*. Edited by James C. Paget. London: T & T Clark, 2008.

Bokser, Baruch M. “Changing Views of Passover and the Meaning of Redemption according to the Palestinian Talmud.” *AJS Review* 10, no. 1 (1985): 1-18.

___. “Messianism, the Exodus Pattern, and Early Rabbinic Judaism.” In *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, et. al., 239-58. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

___. “Rabbinic Responses to Catastrophe: From Continuity to Discontinuity.” *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 50 (1983): 47-50.

Bonitz, Hermann. *Index to Aristoteles*. Berolini: G. Reimer, 1831.

Borgen, Peder. “Philo of Alexandria as Exegete.” In *The Ancient Period: A History of Biblical Interpretation,* edited by Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson, 114-143. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.

___. “Observation on the Midrashic Character of John 6.” *ZNW* 54 (1963): 232-40.

___. et al., *The Philo Index: A Complete Greek Word Index to the Philo’s Works.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.

Boyarin, Daniel. “Beyond Judaisms: Metatron and the Divine Polymorphy of Ancient Judaism.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 41, no. 3 (2010): 333.

___. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judeo-Christianity.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2004.

___. “The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John.” *HTR* 94, no. 3 (2001): 243-84.

Box, George H. “The Idea of Intermediation in Jewish Theology: A Note on Memra and Shekinah.” *JQR* 23 no. 2 (1932): 103-119.

___. and Joseph I. Landsman. *The Apocalypse of Abraham*. Translations of Early Documents. Series 1, Palestinian Jewish Texts (Pre-Rabbinic) 10. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918.

Brant, Jo-Ann A. *John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011.

Braslavy, Sara K. “Bible Commentary.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Maimonides,* edited by Kenneth Seeskin, 245-272. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Breech, James and Amos N. Wilder, *Jesus' Parables and the War of Myths: Essays on Imagination in the Scripture.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.

Brody, Hayim. “Shire Meshulam ben Shelomo Dapiera,” *Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry in Jerusalem* 4 (1938): 1-117.

Brody, Seth L. “Human Hands Dwell in Heavenly Heights: Contemplative Ascent and Theurgic Power in Thirteenth Century Kabbalah.” In *Mystics of the Book: Themes, Topics, and Typologies*, edited by Robert A. Herrera, 123-158. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.

Brooke, George J. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*. Sheffield: *JSOT* Press, 1985.

___. “Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran.” In *The Wisdom texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, 201-220. Leuven: Leuven University Press, Uitgeverij Peeters, 2002.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John*. Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday &, 1966.

Bruce K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.

Budge, E. A. Wallis. *The Gods of the Egyptians: Or, Studies in Egyptian Mythology* Chicago: Open Court Pub., 1904.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1971.

Burke, Kenneth. “Four Master Tropes.” *The Kenyon Review* 3, no. 4 (1941): 421-38

Burrus, Virginia. “Creatio Ex Libidine: Reading Ancient Logos Differently.” In *Derrida and Religion: Other Testaments,* edited by Yvonne Sherwood and Kevin Hart, 141-156. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Burstein, Stanley M. *The Babyloniaca of Berossus.* Sources and Monographs. Sources from the Ancient Near East 1:05. Malibu: Undena Publications, 1978.

Burton L. Visotzky, *Golden Bells and Pomegranates: Studies in Midrash Leviticus Rabbah Texte Und Studien Zum Antiken Judentum 94.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Burney, Charles F. *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922.

Bynum, Caroline W. *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*. Berkeley; LA: University of California Press, 1984.

Byrne, Brendan. *‘Sons of God’-‘Seed of Abraham’-A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of all Christians in Paul Against the Jewish Background*. PhD Diss., Oxford: Oxford University, 1977.

Cady, Susan. *Wisdom's Feast: Sophia in Study and Celebration*. Edited by Marian Ronan, and Hal Taussig. Kansas City, MO: Sheed & Ward, 1996.

Caplice, Richard J. *Background of Old Testament History: Mesopotamian Texts*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1982.

Cassirer, Ernst. *The Myth of the State*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.

Cazelles, Henri. "Ahiqar, Umman, and Amun, and Biblical Wisdom Texts." In *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield,* edited by Ziony Zevit, Seymour Gitin, and Michael Sokoloff, 45-55. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.

Charlesworth, James H. *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

___. "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects." In *The Messiah,* 3-35. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

___. "The Jewish Roots of Christology: The Discovery of the Hypostatic Voice." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 39, no. 1 (1986): 23.

___. and Frank M. Cross, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994-2011.

___. "The Fourth Evangelist and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Assessing Trends over Nearly Sixty Years." In *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sixty Years of Discovery and Debate*, edited by Tom Thatcher, 161-182. Atlanta: *SBL*, 2011.

Chesnutt, Randall D. "Wisdom of Solomon." In *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism,* 1243. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; 2010.

Chilton, Bruce. *Judaic Approaches to the Gospels.* University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.

Clarke, Ernest G. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.

Clifford, Richard J. "Proverbs 1-9 as Instruction for a Young Man and for 'Everyman.'" In *When the Morning Stars Sang,* edited by Scott C. Jones, Christine R. Yoder, and Choon L. Seow, 129-142. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2018.

___. et. al., "Woman Wisdom in the Book of Proverbs." In *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel*: *Für Norbert Lohfink SJ,* edited by Georg Braulik, Walter Gross, and Sean McEvenue, 61-72. Freiburg: Herder, 1993.

___. "Proverbs 9: A Suggested Ugaritic Parallel." *VT* 25 (1975): 299.

___. *Proverbs: A Commentary.* 1st ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999.

___. *The Wisdom Literature*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1998.

Cohen, Boaz. *Jewish and Roman Law: A Comparative Study*. 2 vols. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1966.

Cohen, Martin S. *The Shiur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. “The Destruction: From Scripture to Midrash.” *Prooftexts* (1982): 39-41.

___. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987.

___. *The Shiur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

Collins, John J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.

___. “The Symbolism of Transcendence in Jewish Apocalyptic.” *Biblical Research* 19 (1974): 5-22.

Crenshaw, James L. *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010.

Creuzer, Friedrich. *Symbolik Und Mythologie Der Alten Völker, Besonders Der Griechen: in Vorträgen Und Entwurfen.* Edited by Franz J. Mone. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Heyer Und Leske, 1816.

Dale C. Allison. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Dalley, Stephanie. *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Dan, Joseph. “Gershom Scholem and Jewish Messianism.” In *Gershom Scholem: The Man and His Work*, edited by Paul Mendes-Flohr, 73-86. New York: SUNY Press; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1994.

___. “The Seventy Names of Metatron.” *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Jerusalem, August 16-21 (1981): 19-23 (Hebrew).

___. *Ancient Jewish Mysticism*. Tel Aviv: Misrad haBitahon, 1989.

___. “Three phases of the History of the Sefer Yezira.” *Frankfurter Judaistiche Beitrage* 21 (1994): 7-29.

___. *Torat ha-Sod shel Ḥasidut Ashkenaz*. Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1968.

Dal Bo, Federico. “The Theory of ‘Emanation’ in Gikatilla's Gates of Justice.” *JJS* 62, no. 1 (2011): 79-104.

___. *Emanation and Philosophy of Language: An Introduction to Joseph ben Abraham Giqatilla*. LA: Cherub Press, 2019.

Dalman, Gustaf. *The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.

Daube, David. “Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric.” *HUCA* 22 (1949): 239-64.

Dauber, Jonathan V. *Standing on the Heads of Philosophers: Myth and Philosophy in Early Kabbalah.* PhD Diss. New York: New York University, 2004.

___. “Competing Approaches to Maimonides in Early Kabbalah.” In *The Cultures of Maimonideanism: New Approaches to the History of Jewish Thought*. Supplements to The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy 9, edited by James T. Robinson, 57-88. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

___. “‘Pure Thought’ in R. Abraham Bar Hiyya and Early Kabbalah.” *JJS* 60, no. 2 (2009): 185-201.

Davidson, Herbert A. *Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Averroes on Intellect: Their Cosmologies, Theories of the Active Intellect, and Theories of Human Intellect*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

___. “Alfararbi and Avicenna on Active Intellect.” *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 3 (1972): 109-178.

___. “Gersonides on the Material and Active Intellects.” *Studies on Gersonides* (1992): 195-265.

___. “Maimonides on Metaphysical Knowledge.” In *Maimonidean Studies* 3, edited by Arthur Hyman, 49-103. New York: The Michael Scharf Publication Trust of Yeshiva University Press, 1995.

Davies, William D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*. 2nd ed. London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1995.

___. “Reflections on the Spirit in the Mekilta: A Suggestion.” *JANESCU* 5 (1973): 72.

Davila, James R. *Hekhalot Literature in Translation: Major Texts of Merkavah Mysticism*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Deutsch, Nathaniel. *Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity*. Brill’s Series in Jewish Studies. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Díez Macho, Alejandro. “El Logos y el Espfritu Santo.” *Atlántida 1* (1963): 381-96.

___. *Neophyti 1: Targum Palestinense ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana: edición príncipe, introducción general y versión castellana*. Vol. 4. Spain: Editorial CSIC-CSIC Press, 1974.

Dillon, John M. “The Transcendence of God in Philo: Some Possible Sources.” *Center for Hermeneutical Studies* 16 (1975): 1-8.

Dimant, Devorah. “Dualism at Qumran: New Perspective.” In *Caves of Enlightenment*: *Proceedings of the American Schools of Oriental Research Dead Sea Scrolls Jubilee Symposium (1947-1997)*, edited by James H. Charlesworth and North R. Hills, 55-73. TX: BIBAL Press, 1998.

Dodd, Charles H. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1996.

___. *The Parting of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. London: SCM Press and Trinity Press International, 1991.

Edwards, Marion J. "Justin's Logos and the Word of God." *JECS*, no. 3 (1995): 262-67.

Epp, Eldon J. "Wisdom, Torah, Word: The Johannine Prologue and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel." In *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by His Former Students*, edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne, 128-146. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975.

Elior, Rachel, and Shalom Carmy. *The Mystical Origins of Hasidism*. Oxford; Portland, OR: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2006.

Evans, Craig A. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Edited by Baker Academic Paperback. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011.

___. "Messianic Hopes and Messianic Figures in Late Antiquity," *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 3 (2006): 9-40.

Even-Shmuel, Yehuda. ed., *Midreshei Ge'ulah: Chapters in Jewish Apocalypse from the Closure of the Talmud until the Early Sixth Century.* (Hebrew) Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1954.

Harrison, Everett F. "A Study of John 1:14." In *Unity and Diversity in NT Theology: Essays in Honor of G.E. Ladd*, edited by Robert A. Guelich, 23-35. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.

Faierstein, Morris. "God's Need for Commandments in Medieval Kabbalah." *Conservative Judaism* 36 (1982): 45-59.

Fakhry, Majid. *Al-Fārābi: Founder of Islamic Neoplatonism: His Life, Works and Influence*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2002.

Fahlbusch, Erwin, and G. W. Bromiley. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity.* Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Feldman, Louis H. "Torah and Greek Culture in Josephus." *The Torah U-Madda Journal* 7 (1997): 41-87.

Feldman, Seymour. *Gersonides: Judaism within the Limits of Reason*. Oxford; Portland, OR: *Littman Library of Jewish Civilization*, 2010.

Filson, Floyd V. *The Gospel According to John.* Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press,1963.

Fine, Steven. "From Meeting House to Sacred Realm*:* Holiness and the Ancient Synagogue." In *Sacred Realm: The Emergence of the Synagogue in the Ancient World*, edited by Steven Fine and Yeshiva University Museum, 21-47. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Fiorenza, Elisabeth S. “Wisdom Mythology and the Christological Hymns of the New Testament.” In *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*, edited by Robert L. Wilken, 17-41. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, c1975.

Goff, Matthew J. “Wisdom Literature at Qumran.” In *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism,* 1342-1345. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; 2010.

Goodblatt David M. *Rabbinic instruction in Sasanian Babylonia*, Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Goodenough, Erwin R. *The Politics of Philo Judaeus*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.

___. *The Theology of Justin Martyr: An Investigation into the Conceptions of Early Christian Literature and Its Hellenistic and Judaistic Influences.* Amsterdam: Philo, 1968.

Guttman, Alexander. *Rabbinic Judaism in the Making: The Halakhah from Ezra to Judah I*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2018.

Fishbane, Eitan P. *As Light Before Dawn: The Inner World of a Medieval Kabbalist*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Fishbane, Michael A. “The ‘Measures’ of God's Glory in the Ancient Midrash.” In *Messiah and Christos: Studies in Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser*, edited by Ithamar Grunwald, 53-74. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.

___. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, c1979.

Fohrer, Georg. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Translated by David E. Green. New York: Abingdon, 1968.

Forti, Tava. “The *Isa Zara* in Proverbs 1-9: Allegory and Allegorization.” *Hebrew Studies* 48 (2007): 89-100.

Fossum, Jarl E. *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985.

Fox, Michael V. “’Amon Again.” *JBL* 115, no. 4 (1996): 699-702.

___. *Proverbs 1-9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* 1st ed. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Frank, Richard M. *The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach* (*Sinai Ar. 155. IXth-Xth Cent.*) Louvain: CorpusSCO, 1974.

Frank, Daniel. “Maimonides and Medieval Jewish Aristotelianism.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Jewish Philosophy,* 142-54. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Funkenstein, Amos. “Gershom Scholem: Charisma, Kairos and the Messianic Dialectic.” *History and Memory* 4 (1992): 123-39.

Garb, Jonathan. *Manifestations of Power in Jewish Mysticism: From Rabbinic Literature to Safedian Kabbalah.* (Hebrew) Jerusalelm: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2005.

Gottlieb, Ephraim. *Studies in the Kabbalistic Literature*. Edited by Joseph Hacker. (Hebrew) Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, 1976.

___. “The Concluding Portion of R. Joseph Chiqatella’s Sha'arei Ẕedeq.” *Tarbiz* 4 (1970): 359-89 (Hebrew).

Greenfield, Jonas C., George J. Brooke, John J., Collins, Torleif Elgvin, Lawrence H, Schiffman, and Michael E. Stone, eds. *Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 22. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Georgi, Dieter. *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Gerhardsson, Birger. “If We Do not Cut the Parables out of their Frames.” *NTS* 37, no. 3 (1991): 329-32.

Gersonides and Seymour Feldman. *The Wars of the Lord.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1984.

Glicksman, Andrew T. *Wisdom of Solomon 10: A Jewish Hellenistic Reinterpretation of Early Israelite History through Sapiential Lenses.* Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2011.

Goetschel, Roland. “‘Ehyeh Asher Ehyeh’ in The Works of the Gerona Kabbalists.” *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 6 (1987): 293-96 (Hebrew).

Goldingay, John E. *Daniel.* Word Biblical Commentary 30. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1989.

Green, Arthur G. “Shekhinah, the Virgin Mary, and the Song of Songs: Reflections on a Kabbalistic Symbol in Its Historical Context.” *AJS Review* 26, no. 1 (2002): 32-35.

Graetz, Heinrich. *Geschichte Der Juden Von Den ältesten Zeiten Bis Auf Die Gegenwart. Aus Den Quellen Neu Bearb*. Leipzig: O. Leiner, 1897-1911.

Greenberg, Moshe. “On the Refinement of the Conception of Prayer in Hebrew Scriptures.” *AJS Review* 1 (1976): 76-80.

Greenfield, Jonas C. “Apkallu.” In *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 2nd ed., revised by Kevin van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst, 72-74. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999.

___. “The Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels: A Comparison with the Narrative Meshalim in the Old Testament.” *NTS* 34(3) (1988): 339-63.

Gruenwald, Ithamar. "'The Visions of Ezekiel': Critical Edition and Commentary." *Termirin* 1 (1972): 128-9.

___. "Reflections on the Nature and Origins of Jewish Mysticism." In *Gershom Scholem's Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism 50 years after: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on the History of Jewish Mysticism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.

___. *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, *AGAJU 14*. Leiden-Köln: Brill, 1980.

Guttmann, Julius. *Philosophies of Judaism: The History of Jewish Philosophy from Biblical times to Franz Rosenzweig*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1964.

Halbertal, Moshe. *Concealment and Revelation: Esotericism in Jewish Thought and its Philosophical Implications*. NJ: Princeton University Press; 2009.

Halevi, Judah. *The Kuzari: An Argument for the Faith of Israel*. Translated by Hartwig Hirschfeld. New York: Schocken, 1964.

Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament,* Society for New Testament Studies. Monograph Series 21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Harrington, Daniel J. *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*. London: Routledge, 1996.

___. *Studies in the History of Philosophy and Religion*. Vols. 2. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Harvey, Steven. "Islamic Philosophy and Jewish Philosophy." In *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy*, edited by Peter Adamson and Richard C. Taylor, 349-69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Harvey, Warren Z. "A Third Approach to Maimonides' Cosmogony-Prophetology Puzzle." *HTR* 74, no. 3 (1981): 287-301.

___. "Maimonides' Critical Epistemology and 'Guide' 2:24." *Aleph* 8 (2008): 213-35.

Hayman, Peter. "The Temple at the Center of the Universe: Some Observations on Sefer Yetsirah." *JJS* (1984): 176-82.

Hayward, Robert. *Divine Name and Presence: The Memra*. Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies; Totowa, NJ: Allanheld, Osmun, 1981.

___. "The Memra of YHWH and the Development of Its Use in Targum Neofiti." *JJS* 25 (1974): 411-18.

Hecht, Richard D. "Philo and Messiah." In *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, edited by Ernest S. Frerichs, William S. Green, and Jacob Neusner, 139-168. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Heintz, Jean G. "Royal Traits and Messianic Figures: A Thematic and Iconographical Approach." In *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, 52-66. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Hellner-Eshed, Melila. *A River Flows from Eden: The Language of Mystical Experience in the Zohar*. Translated by Nathan Wolski. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

___. "Messainische Hoffnung und politischer 'Radikalismus' in der judisch-hellistischen Diaspora: Zur Frage der Voraussetzungen des judisch-hellistischen Diaspora: Zur Frage der Voraussetzungen des judischen Aufstanders unter Trajan 115-17 n. Chr." In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*: *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, edited by D. Hellholm, 655-686. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

___. *The Johannine Question.* Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM, 1989.

Hidary, Richard. "The Rhetoric of Rabbinic Authority: Making the Transition from Priest to Sage." In *Jewish Rhetorics: History, Theory, Practice*, edited by Michael B. Donals and Janice W. Fernheimer, 16-45. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2014.

___. *Dispute for the Sake of Heaven: Legal Pluralism in the Talmud*. Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2010.

Himmelfarb, Martha. *A Kingdom of Priests*: *Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism, Jewish Culture and Contexts.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Hoekema, Anthony A. *The Bible and the Future.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979.

Hoenig, Sidney B. *The Great Sanhedrin: A Study of the Origin, Development, Composition and Function of the Bet Din Ha-gadol during the Second Jewish Commonwealth.* Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1953.

Hurowitz, Victor A. "Nursling, Advisor, Architect? and the Role of Wisdom in Proverbs 8, 22-31." *Biblica* (1999): 398-99.

Huss, Boaz. "Rabbi Joseph Gikatilla's Definition of Symbolism and it Influence on Kabbalistic Literature." *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 12 (1996): 157-76 (Hebrew).

Hurwitz, Siegmund. "Some Psychological Aspects of the Messianic Idea in Judaism." In *The Well-Tended Tree; Essays into the Spirit of Our Time,* edited by Hilde Kirsch, 130-33. New York: Putnam, 1971.

Idel, Moshe. "Notes on Medieval Jewish-Christian Polemics." *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 3 [4] (1984): 689-98 (Hebrew).

___. "'The Window of Opportunities' of Kabbalah: 1270-1290," *Da'at: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy & Kabbalah* 48 (2002): 5-32.

___. "'Unio Mystica' as a Criterion: Some observations on 'Hegelian' Phenomenologies of Mysticism." *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* 1 (2002): 19-41.

___. “Abulafia’s Secrets of the Guide: A Linguistic Turn.” *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* 4 (1998): 495-528.

___. “Allegory and Divine Names in Ecstatic Kabbalah.” In *Interpretation and Allegory*, 317-348. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

___. “Defining Kabbalah: The Kabbalah of the Divine Names.” In *Mystics of the Book: Themes, Topics, and Typologies*, edited by Robert A. Herrera, 97-122. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.

___. “Hermeticism and Judaism.” In *Hermeticism and the Renaissance: Intellectual History and the Occult in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Ingrid Merkel and Allen Debus, 59-76. Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1988.

___. “Historical Introduction,” in *Joseph Gikatilla*, *Sha‘arei Orah: Gates of Light*, trans. Avi Weinstein (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1994), xxviii.

___. “Jewish Kabbalah in Christian Garb.” In *Kabbalah in Italy, 1280-1510: A Survey*, 227-35. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

___. “Jewish Mysticism among the Jews of Arab/Moslem Lands.” *Journal for the Study of Sephardic and Mizrahi Jewry* 1 (2007): 14-38.

___. “Jewish Mysticism and Muslim Mysticism.” *Mahanayyim* 1 (1992): 28-33 (Hebrew).

___. “Kabbalah, Hieroglyphicity and Hieroglyphs.” *Kabbalah* 11 (2004): 11-47.

___. “Maimonides’ Guide of the Perplexed and the Kabbalah.” *Jewish History* 18, no. 2/3 (2004): 197-226.

___. “Metatron: Notes towards the Development of Myth in Judaism.” *ʾEshel Beʾer-Sheva* 4 (1996): 29-44.

___. “Notes on Medieval Jewish-Christian Polemics.” *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 3 [4], 1984 (Hebrew).

___. “On Binary ‘Beginnings’ in Kabbalah Scholarship.” *Aporemātha. Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte Band* 5 (2001): 313-337.

___. “On Some Forms of Order in Kabbalah.” *Da‘at: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy and Kabbalah* 50-52 (2003), xxiv.

___. “On the Intention of Silent Prayer in R Isaac the Blind.” In *Massuhot: Studies in Kabbalistic Literature and Jewish Philosophy in Memory of Prof. Ephraim Gottlieb*, edited by M. Oron and A. Goldreich 25-52. Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1994 (Hebrew).

___. “On the Meanings of the Term *Kabbalah*- Between the Ecstatic and the Sefirotic Schools of Kabbalah in the 13th Century.” *Pe’amim* 93 (2002): 38-76 (Hebrew).

___. “Orienting, Orientalizing or Disorienting the Study of Kabbalah: ‘An Almost Absolutely Unique’ Case of Occidentalism.” *Kabbalah: Journal for the Study of Jewish Mystical Texts* 2 (1997): 13-47.

___. “Rabbinism versus Kabbalism: On G. Scholem's Phenomenology of Judaism.” *Modern Judaism* 11, no. 3 (1991): 281-96.

___. “Radical Hermeneutics: From Ancient to Medieval and Modern Hermeneutics.” *Atti Dei Convegni Lincei-Accademia Nazionale Dei Lincei* 135 (1998): 165-201.

___. “Reification of Language in Jewish Mysticism.” In *Mysticism and Language,* edited by Steven T. Katz, 42-79. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

___. “Subversive Catalysts: Gnosticism and Messianism in Gershom Scholem’s View of Jewish Mysticism.” In *The Jewish Past Revisited: Reflections on Modern Jewish Historians*, edited by D. Myers and D. Ruderman, 133-153. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

___. “The Attitude to Christianity in Sefer ha-Meshiv.” *Immanuel* 12 (1981): 77-95 (Hebrew).

___. “The Concept of the Torah in Hekhalot Literature and Kabbalah.” *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 1 (1981): 23-84.

___. “The Contribution of Abraham Abulafia’s Kabbalah to the Understanding of Jewish Mysticism.” In *Gershom Scholem's Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism 50 Years After: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on the History of Jewish Mysticism,* edited by Peter Schäfer and Joseph Dan, 117-143. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.

___. “The Magical and Neoplatonic Interpretations of the Kabbalah in the Renaissance.” In *Jewish Thought in the Sixteenth Century*. Harvard Judaic Texts and Studies 2, edited by Bernard D. Cooperman, 186-242. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.

___. “The Sefirot above the Sefirot.” *Tarbiz* 51 (1982): 239-80 (Hebrew).

___. “Torah Ḥadashah - Messiah and the New Torah in Jewish Mysticism and Modern Scholarship.” *Kabbalah* 21 (2010): 57-109.

___. “Torah: Between Presence and Representation of the Divine in Jewish Mysticism.” *Religion* 89 (2001): 197-235.

___. “Types of Redemptive Activities in the Middle Ages.” In *Messianism and Eschatology: A Collection of Essays,* edited by Z. Baras, 264-265. Israel: Zalman Shazar Centre for the Furtherance of the study of Jewish history, 1983/4 (Hebrew).

___. *Abraham Abulafia: An Ecstatic Kabbalist*. Lancaster, CA: Labyrinthos, 2002.

___. *Abraham Abulafia's Works and Doctrine*. (Hebrew) PhD Diss. Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1976.

___. *Absorbing Perfections: Kabbalah and Interpretation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

___. *Ascensions on High in Jewish Mysticism: Pillars, Lines, Ladders*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2005.

___. *Ben: Sonship and Jewish Mysticism*. London: Continuum; Jerusalem: Shalom Hartman Institute, 2007.

___. *Enchanted Chains*: *Techniques and Rituals in Jewish Mysticism*, eds. Harold Bloom and Daniel Abrams. Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2005.

___. *Golem: Jewish Magical and Mystical Traditions on the Artificial Anthropoid* (SUNY Series in Judaica, Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1990.

___. *Hasidism: Between Ecstasy and Magic* Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1994.

___. *Kabbalah and Eros*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

___. *Language, Torah and Hermeneutics in Abraham Abulafia*, Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1989.

___. *Messianic Movements in Israel* Edited by Aharon Z. Eshkoli. (Hebrew) Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1987.

___. *Messianic Mystics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

___. *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia*. Edited by Jonathan Chipman. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1998.

___. *Studies in Ecstatic Kabbalah.* New York: SUNY Press, 1988.

___. *The Angelic World: Apotheosis and Theophany*. (Hebrew) Tel Aviv: Miskal-Yedioth Ahronot, 2008.

___. *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1988.

Jenni, Ernst, and Claus Westermann. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.

Jobes, Karen H. “Sophia Christology: The Way of Wisdom?” In *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke,* edited by James I. Packer and Sven Soderlund, 226-250. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000.

Jonas, Hans. “Myth and Mysticism: A Study of Objectification and Interiorization in Religious Thought.” *The Journal of Religion* 49 (1969): 328.

Jonge, Marinus de. *Jesus, the Servant-Messiah*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.

Kaplan, Lawrence J. “Maimonides on the Miraculous Element in Prophecy.” *HTR,* no. 3/4 (1977): 233-256.

Katz, Steven T. “Language, Epistemology, and Mysticism.” In Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis, 22-74. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Kaufman, Stephen A. “Dating the Language of the Palestinian Targums and Their Use in the Study of First Century Texts.” In *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context,* JSOTSup

166, edited by Derek R. G. Beattie, and Martin J. McNamara, 118- 141. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary.* Vol. 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.

Kellner, Menachem. *Maimonides on Judaism and the Jewish People*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1991.

Kittel, Gerhard, G. W. Bromiley, and Gerhard Friedrich. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* vol. 4. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964.

Klingler, David R. *Validity in the Identification and Interpretation of a Literary Allusion in the Hebrew Bible.* PhD Diss. Dallas Theological Seminary, 2010.

Kloppenborg, John S. "Wisdom Christology in Q." *Laval Theologique et Philosophique* 34, no. 2 (1978): 129-147.

Kogan, Barry S. "Who Has Implanted within Us Eternal Life: Judah Halevi on Immortality and the Afterlife." In *Judaism and Modernity: The Religious Philosophy of David Hartman,* edited by Jonathan W. Malino, 473-95. Jerusalem: Shalom Hartman Institute, 2001.

Kraemer, Joel L. "The Islamic Context of Medieval Jewish Philosophy." In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Jewish Philosophy,* edited by Daniel H. Frank and Oliver Leaman, 38-68. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

___. "On Maimonides' Messianic Posture." In *Studies in Medieval Jewish History and Literature* 2, edited by 109-142. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Kreisel, Howard. "Judah Halevi's Influence on Maimonides: A Preliminary Appraisal." In *Maimonidean Studies* 2, edited by Arthur Hyman, Alfred L. Ivry, James Diamond, and Maimonides, 95-121. New York: The Michael Scharf Publication Trust of Yeshiva University Press, 1992.

Kugel, James L. "4Q369 'Prayer of Enosh' and Ancient Biblical Interpretation." *DSD* 5 (1998): 119-48.

Lachter, Hartley. *Kabbalistic Revolution: Reimagining Judaism in Medieval Spain*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2014.

Ladd, George E. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974.

Lease, Gary. "Jewish Mystery Cults since Goodenough." *ANRW* 20 (1987): 858-880.

Lenzi, Alan. "Proverbs 8:22-31: Three Perspectives on Its Composition." *JBL* 125.4 (2006): 700-3.

___. "The Uruk List of Kings and Sages and Late Mesopotamian Scholarship." *JANER* 8 (2008): 137-69.

Levenson, Jon D. "The Sources of Torah: Psalm 119 and the Modes of Revelation in Second Temple Judaism." In *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross,* edited by Patrick D. Miller, Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride, 559-74. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Levine, Lee I. *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence, Samuel and Althea Stroum Lectures in Jewish Studies.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998.

Lieberman, Saul. *Greek in Jewish Palestine/Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1994.

___. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I century BCE-IV century CE*. Vol. 18. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962.

Liebes, Yehuda. "De Natura Dei: On the Development of the Jewish Myth." In *Studies in Jewish Myth and Jewish Messianism*. Translated by Batya Stein. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1993.

___. "How the Zohar was written." *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 8 (1989): 20-25 (Hebrew).

___. "Myth vs. Symbol in the Zohar and in Lurianic Kabbalah." In *Essential Papers on Kabbalah*. Essential Papers on Jewish Studies, edited by Fine Lawrence, 212-42. New York: New York University Press, 1995.

___. "The Work of the Chariot and the Work of Creation as Esoterical Teachings in Philo of Alexandria." In *Scriptural Exegesis: The Shapes of Culture and the Religious Imagination; Essays in Honour of Michael Fishbane*, edited by Deborah A. Green and Laura Suzanne Lieber, 105-120. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

___. *Ars Poetica in Sefer Yetsira*. Tel Aviv: Schocken, 2000.

___. *Studies in the Zohar*. Translated by Arnold Schwartz, Stephanie Nakache, Penina Peli. SUNY Series in Judaica. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1993.

Lincoln, Andrew T. *The Gospel According to Saint John*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005.

Lindars, Barnabas. "Torah in Deuteronomy." In *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas*, edited by P. R. Ackroyd, 117-136. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Liver, Jacob. "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth." *HTR* 52, no. 3 (1959): 149-85.

Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996.

Maasen, Sabine, and Peter Weingart. *Metaphors and the Dynamics of Knowledge*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Mack, Burton L. "Wisdom Makes a Difference: Alternatives to 'Messianic' Configurations." In *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, edited by Ernest S. Frerichs, William S. Green, and Jacob Neusner, 15-48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

___. *Logos und Sophia: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie im Hellenistischen Judentum*. SUNT 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.

___. "The Christ and Jewish Wisdom." In *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, *Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, et. al., 192-221. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Mantel, Hugo. *Studies in the history of the Sanhedrin*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1961.

Marcus, Ivan G. *Piety and Society: The Jewish Pietists of Medieval Germany*. Leiden: Brill, 1981.

Margolin, Ron. "Moshe Idel's Phenomenology and its Sources." *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* 6 (18) (2007): 41-2.

McArthur, Harvey K., and Robert M. Johnston. *They also Taught in Parables: Rabbinic Parables from the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2014.

McGrath, James F. *John's Apologetic Christology: Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

McHugh, John F. *John 1-4 (ICC): A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. London; New York: T&T Clark, 2009.

McNamara, Martin J. "Logos of the Fourth Gospel and Memra of the Palestinian Targum (Ex 12^{42})." *The Expository Times* 79, no. 4 (1968): 115-7.

___. *Targum and Testament.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.

___. *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis*. Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press, 1992.

___. *Targum Neofiti 1: Deuteronomy*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997.

Mendelson, Alan. *Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria.* Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1982.

Meroz, Ronit. "The Weaving of a Myth: An Analysis of Two Stories in the Zohar." In *Study and Knowledge in Jewish Thought*. Vol. 2, edited by Howard Kreisel, 168-205. Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2006.

___. *Headwaters of the Zohar: Analysis and Annotated Critical Edition of Parashat Exodus of the Zohar*. (Hebrew) Tel Aviv: The Haim Rubin Tel Aviv University Press, 2019.

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*. Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series 8. Lund: Gleerup, 1976.

Middleton, R. D. "Logos and Shekinah in the Fourth Gospel." *JQR* 29, no. 2 (1938): 101-3.

Miller, Michael T. *The Metaphysical Meaning of the Name of God in Jewish Thought: A Philosophical Analysis of Historical Traditions from Late Antiquity into the Middle Ages.* PhD Diss. UK: University of Nottingham, 2014.

Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John: Text and Context.* Boston: Brill, 2005.

Moore, George F. "Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: Memra, Shekinah, Metatron." *HTR* 15, no. 1 (1922): 54.

Morlok, Elke. *Rabbi Joseph Gikatilla's Hermeneutics*. Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism 25. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Morton, Smith. "What Is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures." *JBL* 78 (1959): 66-72.

Moses ben Maimon (Maimonides), and Shlomo Pines. *The Guide of the Perplexed*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, c2005.

Murphy, Ronald E. "The Personification of Wisdom." In *Wisdom in Ancient Israel: Essays in Honour of J. A. Emerton*. Edited by John Day, et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

___. Proverbs: *Word Biblical Commentary* 22. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1998.

Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.

___. "Torah and Tradition." In *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, 1316-7. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; 2010.

Neher, Andre. *The Prophetic Existence*. Translated by William Wolf. New York: AS Barnes, 1969.

Neusner, Jacob, and Alan J. Avery-Peck. *Encyclopedia of Midrash: Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism.* Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2005.

___. *Judaism and Scripture: The Evidence of Leviticus Rabbah, Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

___. *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by William S. Green and Ernest S. Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

___. *The Reader's Guide to the Talmud.* Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Neumark, David. *Geschichte Der Jüdischen Philosophie Des Mittelalters*. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1907.

Niehoff, Maren R. "What Is a Name? Philo's Mystical Philosophy of Language." *JSQ* 2 (1995): 232-33.

___. "*Creatio ex Nihilo* Theology in Genesis Rabbah in light of Christian Exegesis." *HTR* (2006): 38-39.

Nuriel, Abraham. “Providence and Governance in Moreh ha- Nevukhim.” *Tarbiz* 49 (1980): 348-53 (Hebrew).

Odeberg, Hugo. *3 Enoch: Or, The Hebrew Book of Enoch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928.

Orlov, Andrei A. *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

___. “Metatron.” In *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism,* 942-43. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; 2010.

Pachter, Mordechai. “The Concept of Devekut in the Homiletical Ethical Writings of 16th Century Safed.” In *Studies in Medieval Jewish History and Literature* 2, edited by Isadore Twersky, 171-230. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Parry, Donald W., and Emanuel Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.

Pedaya, Haviva. “The Provencal Stratum in the Redaction of Sefer ha-Bahir.” *Shlomo Pines Jubilee Volume* (= *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought*). Vol. 9. Edited by Zev W. Harvey. Jerusalem: Hamakor Press 2, 1990.

___. “The Sixth Millennium: Millenarism and Messianism in the Zohar.” *Da‘at: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy & Kabbalah* 72 (2012): 51-98 (Hebrew).

___. “Possessed by Speech: Towards an Understanding of the Prophetic-Ecstatic Pattern among Early Kabbalists,” *Tarbiz* 65, no. 4 (1996): 565-636.

___. *Name and Sanctuary in the Teaching of R. Isaac the Blind: A Comparative Study in the Writings of Earliest Kabbalist*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2001.

Perkins, Pheme. *Jesus as Teacher*. New York; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Pessin, Sarah. “Jewish Neoplatonism: Being Above Being and Divine Emanation in Solomon Ibn Gabirol and Isaac Israeli.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Jewish Philosophy,* edited by Daniel H. Frank and Oliver Leaman, 91-110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Pfann, Stephen, and Philip S. Alexander, eds. *Qumran Cave 4: Volume XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1: Miscellaneous Texts from Qumran*. Vol. 36. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Pines, Shlomo. “God, the Divine Glory and the Angels according to a 2nd Century Theology.” In *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 6 (3-4), edited by Joseph Dan. (Hebrew) Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1987.

___. “Points of Similarity between the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Sefirot in the Sefer Yezira and a Text of the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies: The Implications of This Resemblance.” *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 7, no. 3 (1989): 66-74.

___. "The Limitations of Human Knowledge According to Al-Farabi, Ibn Bajja, and Maimonides." In *Studies in Medieval Jewish History and Literature* 1, edited by Isadore Twersky, 82-109. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.

___. *Scholasticism after Thomas Aquinas and the Teachings of Hasdai Crescas and his Predecessors.* (Hebrew) Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1967.

Plett, Heinrich F. *Intertextuality*. Research in Text Theory 15, edited by Janos S. Petofi and Hans P. Mai. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991.

Pohlenz, Max. *Die Stoa: Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung.* 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Pritchard, James B. ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. NJ: Princeton University Press, 1950.

Ravitzky, Aviezer. "The Secrets of the Guide to the Perplexed: between the Thirteenth and Twentieth centuries." In *Studies in Maimonides,* edited by Isador Twersky, 165-67. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press: 1990.

___. "To the Utmost of Human Capacity: Maimonides on the Days of the Messiah." In *Perspectives on Maimonides: Philosophical and Historical Studies,* edited by Joel L. Kraemer and Lawrence V. Berman, 221-256. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Reif, Stefan C. *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Reiterer, Friedrich V. "The Interpretation of the Wisdom Tradition of the Torah within Ben Sira." In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology.* 209-232. Edited by Angelo Passaro and Giuseppe Bellia. *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature* 1. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

Remes, Pauliina. "Neoplatonism." *Ancient Philosophies* 4. 48-52. Stocksfield, England: Acumen, 2008.

Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.

Riesner, Rainer. *Jesus Als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung Zum Ursprung Der Evangelien-Überlieferung*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981.

Ringgren, Helmer. *Word and Wisdom Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East*. Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Boktrycker, 1947.

Robert, Cook W. "Eschatology in John's Gospel." *Criswell Theological Review* 3 (1988): 99.

Roberts, R. L. "The Rendering 'Only Begotten' in John 3:16." *Restoration Quarterly* 16 (1973): 2-22.

Robinson, James A. T. "The Relationship of the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John." *NTS* 9 (1962): 128.

Robinson, James M. “Jesus as Sophos and Sophia: Wisdom Tradition and the Gospels.” In *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*, edited by Robert L. Wilken, 1-16. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975.

Robinson, John A. T. *The Priority of John*. Edited by Jennifer F. Coakley. London: SCM Press, 1985.

Ronning, John L. *The Jewish Targums and John's Logos Theology*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.

Rogers III, Cleon L. “The Meaning and Significance of the Hebrew Word אמון in Proverbs 8, 30.” *ZAW* 109 (1997): 208-21.

Rubenstein, Jeffrey L. “Social and Institutional Settings of Rabbinic Literature,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Rabbinic Literature*, edited by Charlotte Fonrobert and Martin Jaffee, 58-74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

___. *The Culture of the Babylonian Talmud*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. 2003.

Runia, David T. *Philo and the Church Fathers: A Collection of Papers*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

___. *Philo of Alexandria, On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

___. *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*. Vol. 44. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1986.

Ruzer, Serge. “From Man as Locus of God’s Indwelling to Death as Temple’s Destruction: Notes on the History of a Motif.” *Revue Biblique* 119, no. 3 (2012): 383-402.

Rynhold, Daniel. *An Introduction to Medieval Jewish Philosophy*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2009.

___. “Good and Evil, Truth and Falsity: Maimonides and Moral Cognitivism.” *Trumah* 12 (2002): 163-182.

Saadia Gaon, *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*. Translated by Samuel Rosenblatt. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.

Saint Justin Martyr, and Michael Slusser, *Dialogue with Trypho*. Selections From the Fathers of the Church. Vol. 3. Washington, District of Columbia: Catholic University of America Press, 2003.

Saldarini, Anthony J. “Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Literature.” *CBQ* (1975): 348-58.

Sanders, Jack T. *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background*. Vol. 162. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Saperstein, Marc. *Decoding the Rabbis: A Thirteenth-century Commentary on the Aggadah.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Sassure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Translated by Roy Harris. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1983.

Savingnac, Julien de. “Le Messianisme de Philon d’Alexandrie.” *NT* 4 (1959): 319-24.

Schäfer, Peter, et. al., *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (סינופסיס לספרות ההיכלות). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981.

___. *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

___. *The Jewish Jesus: How Judaism and Christianity Shaped Each Other*. NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. “Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls.” In *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, edited by. J. Charlesworth et. al, 116-129. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

___. “The Concept of the Messiah in Second Temple and Rabbinic Literature.” *Review and Expositor* (1984): 235-46.

___. *From Text to Tradition: A History of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism*. Hoboken NJ: Ktav Pub. House, 1991.

Schniedewind, William M. “King and Priest in the Book of Chronicles and the Duality of Qumran Messianism.” *JJS* 45, no. 1 (1994): 71-78.

Scholem, Gershom G. *Origins of the Kabbalah*, edited by Raphael J. Zwi Werblowsky, and translated by Allan Arkush. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1987.

___. “Abulafia's Secrets of the Guide: A Linguistic Turn.” *Revue De Métaphysique Et De Morale* 4 (1998): 495-529.

___. “Devekut or Communion with God.” In *The Messianic Idea in Judaism: And Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*, 203-227. New York: Schocken, 1971.

___. “Eine unbekannte mystische Schrift des Mose de Leon.” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*. H. 3/4 (1927): 109-123.

___. “Mysticism and Society.” *Diogenes* 58 (1967): 1-24.

___. and Simon Pleasance. “The Name of God and the Linguistic Theory of the Kabbalah.” *Diogenes* 20, no. 79 (1972): 59-80.

___. “The Neutralization of the Messianic Element in Early Hasidism.” In *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*, 176-202. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.

___. “Traces of Gabirol in the Kabbalah.” In *Studies in Kabbalah* I, edited by J. Ben-Shlomo and Moshe Idel, 39-66. (Hebrew) Tel Aviv: *‘Am ‘Oved*, 1998.

___. *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition*. 2nd ed. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965.

___. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 3rd rev. ed. New York: Schocken Books, 1941.

___. *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism*. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.

___. *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah*. Translated by Joachim Nuegroschel and edited by Jonathan Chipman. New York: Schocken Books, 1991.

___. *Sabbatai Ṣevi: The Mystical Messiah, 1626–1676*. Vol. 208. NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016.

___. *Studies and Texts Concerning the History of Sabbetianism and Its Metamorphoses*. (Hebrew) Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1974.

___. *Zur Kabbala Und Ihrer Symbolik.* Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1960.

Schwartz, Dov. "The Neutralization of the Messianic Idea in Medieval Jewish Rationalism." *HUCA* 64 (1993): 57-58.

___. *Messianism in Medieval Jewish Thought*. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2017.

Scott, Bernard B. "Jesus as Sage: An Innovating Voice in Common Wisdom." *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, edited by John G. Gammie, and Leo G. Perdue, 399-415. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Scott, Steven R. "The Binitarian Nature of the Book of Similitudes." *JSP* 18/1 (2008): 55-78

Scott, J. M. Clark, and Martin Scott. *Sophia and the Johannine Jesus.* Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

Scott, Robert B. Y. "Wisdom in Creation: The ʿĀmôn of Proverbs VIII 30." *VT* 10, no. 2 (April 1960): 213-223.

Seeligmann, Isaac L. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems*. Leiden: Brill, 1948.

Schipper, Bernd U. "When Wisdom Is Not Enough! The Discourse on Wisdom and Torah and the Composition of the Booke of Proverbs." In *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*, edited by Bernd U. Schipper and David A. Teeter, 55-79. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Segal, Alan F. *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 25. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Sendor, Mark B. *The Emergence of Provençal Kabbalah: Rabbi Isaac the Blind's Commentary on Sefer Yeẓirah* (Volumes I and II). PhD Diss. Ann Arbor, MI: U.M.I: 1995.

Septimus, Bernard. "Maimonides on Language." In *The Culture of Spanish Jewry: Proceedings of the First International Congress*, edited by Aviva Doron, 35-54. Israel: Levinsky College of Education Publishing House, 1994.

Simon, Maurice, and Harry Freedman, trans. *Midrash Rabbah: Genesis*. Vol. 1. London; New York: Soncino Press, 1983.

Sinnott, Alice M. *The Personification of Wisdom.* England: Ashgate Pub., 2005.

Skehan, Patrick W. “Structures in Poems on Wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24.” *CBQ* 41, no. 3 (1979): 374.

Smith, Dwight M. *The Theology of the Gospel of John.* New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Sperber, Daniel. *Essays on Greek and Latin in the Mishna, Talmud and Midrashic Literature*. Jerusalem: Makor Pub, 1982.

Sperber, Alexander. *Targum Onkelos to Numbers: An English Translation of the Text with Analysis and Commentary*. Edited by Abraham Berliner and Israel Drazin. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Pub., 1998.

Staerk,Willy. *Soter: die biblische Erlösererwartung als religionsgeschichtliches Problem; eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung I, Teil: Der biblische Christus* (B.F.Ch.Th. II, 31). North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany: Gütersloh Bertelsmann, 1933.

Stallman, Robert C. *Divine Hospitality in the Pentateuch: A Metaphorical Perspective on God as Host.* PhD Diss. PA: Westminster Theological Seminary, 1999.

___. “Divinity Hospitality and Wisdom's Banquet in Proverbs 9:1-6.” In *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke*, edited by Bruce K. Waltke, 120-121. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000.

Staub, Jacob. trans., *The Creation of the World According to Gersonides*. Brown Judaic Studies 24. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982.

Sterling, Gregory E. “Different Traditions or Emphases? The Image of God in Philo’s *De Opficio Mundi*.” In *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated literature,* edited by Gary A. Anderson, et. al, 41-56. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013.

___. “When the Beginning Is the End: The Place of Genesis in the Commentaries of Philo.” In *The Book of Genesis. Composition, Reception and Interpretation,* edited by C. Evans, J. Lohr and D.L. Petersen, 428-38. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Stern, Joseph. “Maimonides’ Epistemology.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Maimonides,* edited by Kenneth Seeskin, 105-133. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Stevenson, Angus, and Christine A. Lindberg, eds. *New Oxford American Dictionary*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Stone, Michael E. *Scriptures, Sects, and Visions, A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Strack, Hermann L. and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* Munchen: C. H. Beck, 1922-1928.

Strauss, Leo. “The Law of Reason in The Kuzari.” In *Persecution and the Art of Writing,* 98-112. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1952.

Stroumsa, Gedaliahu G. “Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ.” *HTR* 76, no. 3 (1983): 269-288.

Stroumsa, Sarah. “Saadya and Jewish Kalam.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Jewish Philosophy,* edited by Daniel H. Frank and Oliver Leaman, 71-90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Suggs, Marion J. *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew’s Gospel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Swartz, Michael D. “Ancient Jewish Mysticism.” In *Jewish Mysticism and Kabbalah: New Insights and Scholarship, Jewish Studies in the 21st Century,* edited by Frederick E. Greenspahn, 33-48. New York: NYU Press, 2011.

Swartz, Yossef. “Magic, Philosophy and Kabbalah: The Mystical and Magical Interpretation of Maimonides in the Later Middle Ages.” *Da‘at: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy and Kabbalah* 64/66 (2009): 99-132 (Hebrew).

Talmage, Frank E. “Apples of Gold: The Inner Meaning of Sacred Texts in Medieval Judaism.” *Jewish Spirituality* 1 (1986): 313-56.

___. *David Kimhi: The Man and the Commentaries*. Edited by Harvard Judaic Monographs 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. “The Concepts of Messiah and Messianism in Early Judaism.” In *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity,* edited by James H. Charlesworth et. al., 79-115. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

___. “Waiting for the Messiah: The Spiritual Universe of the Qumran Covenanteers.” In *Judaisms and Their Messiahs,* edited by Jacob Neusner, et al., 123-31. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Taylor, Richard C. “The Agent Intellect as ‘form for us’ and Averroes’s Critique of Al-Farabi.” *Tópicos* (*México*) 29, no.1 (2005): 29-51.

Teeter, David A. “Torah, Wisdom, and the Composition of Rewritten Scripture: Jubilees and 11QPsa in Comparative Perspective.” In W*isdom and Torah: The Reception of ‘Torah’ in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period,* edited by Bernd U. Schipper and David A. Teeter, 233-272. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Tobin, Thomas H. “Logos.” *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* 4 (1992): 352-3.

___. “The Prologue of John and Hellenistic Jewish Speculation.” *CBQ* 52, no. 2 (1990):252-269.

___. *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983.

Tishby, Isaiah. “Fear, Love, and Devekut in the Teaching of the Zohar.” *Molad* 19, no. 151-152. Tel-Aviv: *Mifleget Po‘ale Eretz-Yi'sra’el*, 1961 (Hebrew).

___. *Mishnat Ha-Zohar*. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1971.

___, and Yeruḥam F. Lachower, and David Goldstein. *The Wisdom of the Zohar: An Anthology of Texts.* Littman Library of Jewish Civilization (Series). Oxford and New York: Published for the Littman Library by Oxford University Press, 1989.

Turner, Nigel, and James H. Moulton. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.

Twersky, Isadore. *Law and Philosophy: Perspectives on Maimonides' Teaching*, vol. 2. Ramat-Aviv: The Open University of Israel, 1992.

Urbach, Efraim E. *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.

___. "The Traditions about Merkabah Mysticism in the Tannaitic Period." In *Studies in Mysticism and Religion : Presented to Gershom G. Scholem on His Seventieth Birthday by Pupils Colleagues and Friends*, edited by R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, and Chaim Wirszubski, 1-28. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1967.

Vermès, Géza. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. 2nd rev. ed. Studia Post-Biblica; 4. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Washington, Harold C. "The Strange Woman (נכריהה /זרה אשה) of Proverbs 1-9 and Post-Exilic Judean Society." In *Second Temple Studies Vol. 2: Temple Community in the Persian Period*, edited by T. C. Eskenazi and Kent H. Richards, 217-242. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.

Wasserstrom, Steven. "Sefer Yesira and Early Islam: A Reappraisal." *The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 3, no. 1 (1994): 1-30.

Weeks, Stuart. *Instruction and Imagery in Proverbs 1-9*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Weiss, Tzahi. *Sefer Yesirah and Its Contexts: Other Jewish Voices*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018.

Westermann, Claus. *The Parables of Jesus in the Light of the Old Testament.* Translated and edited by W. Golka and Alastair H.B. Logan. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990.

White L. Michael. *Scripting Jesus: The Gospels in Rewrite*. 1st ed. New York: HarperOne, 2010.

Wilder, Amos N. "The Rhetoric of Ancient and Modern Apocalyptic." *Interpretation* 25 (1971): 436-53.

Wilkinson, Richard. *The Complete Gods and Goddesses of Ancient Egypt*. New York: Thames, 2003.

Winston, David. "Was Philo a Mystic?" In *The Ancestral Philosophy: Hellenistic Philosophy in Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Gregory E. Sterling, 151-70. Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2001.

___. *Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1985.

___. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979.

___. "The Sage as Mystic in the Wisdom of Solomon," In *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, edited by John Glenn Gammie, and Leo G. Perdue, 387-397. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Wise, Michael O. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. Chicago, IL: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990.

___. *The Dead Sea Scrolls-Revised Edition: A New Translation.* Edited by Martin G. Abegg, and Edward M. Cook. New York: Harper Collins, 2005.

Witherington, Ben. *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

Wolfson, Elliot R. "The Hermeneutics of Visionary Experience: Revelation and Interpretation in the Zohar." *Religion* 18 (1988): 311-45.

___. "Asceticism and Eroticism in Medieval Jewish Philosophical and Mystical Exegesis of the Song of Songs." In *With Reverence for the Word: Medieval Scriptural Exegesis in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, edited by Jane Dammen McAuliffe, Barry D. Walfish, and Joseph W. Goering, 292-308. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

___. "Eunuchs Who Keep the Sabbath: Becoming Male and the Ascetic Ideal in Thirteenth- Century Jewish Mysticism." In *Becoming Male in the Middle Ages*, edited by, J. J. Cohen and B. Wheeler, 151-185. New York: Garland, 1997.

___. "Forms of Visionary Ascent as Ecstatic Experience." In *Gershom Scholem's Major trends in Jewish mysticism 50 years after: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on the History of Jewish Mysticism*, edited by Peter Schäfer and Joseph Dan, 209-235. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.

___. "God, the Demiurge and the Intellect: On the Usage of the Word Kol in Abraham ibn Ezra." *Revue des études juives* 149, no. 1-2 (1990): 77-111.

___. "Hebraic and Hellenic Conceptions of Wisdom in Sefer ha-Bahir." *Poetics Today* (1998): 147-71.

___. "Judaism and Incarnation: The Imaginal Body of God." In *Christianity in Jewish Terms*, edited by Tikva Simone Frymer-Kensky, 239-254. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2000.

___. "Letter Symbolism and Merkavah Imagery in the Zohar." In *Studies in the Literature of Jewish Thought Presented to Rabbi Dr. Alexander Safran*, edited by M. Hallamish and Alei Shefer, 195-236. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan, 1990.

___. "Metatron and Shi'ur Qomah in the Writings of Haside Ashkenaz." In *Mysticism, Magic and Kabbalah in Ashkenazi Judaism*,. edited by Karl E. Grözinger, and Joseph Dan, 60-92. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2012.

___. "Mirror of Nature Reflected in the Symbolism of Medieval Kabbalah." In *Judaism and Ecology: Created World and Revealed Word,* edited by Hava Tirosh-Samuelson, 305-331. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

___. "Mystical Rationalization of the Commandments in *Sefer Ha-Rimmon*." *HUCA* 59 (1988): 217-51.

___. "Poetic Thinking" in *Library of Contemporary Jewish Philosophers*. Vol. 11. Edited by Hava Tirosh-Samuelson and Aaron W. Hughes. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

___. "Negative Theology and Positive Assertion in the Early Kabbalah." *Da'at: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy and Kabbalah* 32/33 (1994): v-xxii.

___. "The Secret of the Garment in Nahmanides." *Da'at: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy and Kabbalah* 24 (1990): xxv-xlix.

___. "Traces of Philonic Doctrine in Medieval Jewish Mysticism: A Preliminary Note." *Studia Philonica* 8 (1996): 99-106.

___. "Via Negativa in Maimonides and Its Impact on Thirteenth-Century Kabbalah." In *Maimonidean Studies* 5, edited by Arthur Hyman, Alfred L. Ivry, James Diamond, and Maimonides, 393-442. New York: The Michael Scharf Publication Trust of Yeshiva University Press, 2008.

___. *Abraham Abulafia–Kabbalist and Prophet: Hermeneutics, Theosophy, and Theurgy*. Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2000.

___. *Along the Path: Studies in Kabbalistic Myth, Symbolism, and Hermeneutics*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2012.

___. *Circle in the Square: Studies in the Use of Gender in Kabbalistic Symbolism*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1995.

___. *Language, Eros, Being: Kabbalistic Hermeneutics and Poetic Imagination*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2009.

___. *Luminal Darkness: Imaginal Gleanings from Zoharic Literature*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2007.

___. *Through a Speculum That Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism.* NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020.

___. *Venturing Beyond-Law and Morality in Kabbalistic Mysticism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Wolfson, Harry A. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.* Vols. 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.

___. *Studies in the History of Philosophy and Religion*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Wolters, Al. "Ṣôpiyyâ (Prov 31:27) as Hymnic Participle and Play on Sophia," *JBL* 104, no.4 (1985): 577-87.

Wright III, Benjamin G. "Ben Sia, Book of." In *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism,* 437. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; 2010.

Whybray, Roger. N. *Wisdom in Proverbs: The Concept of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9*. Studies in Biblical Theology 45. London: SCM Press, 1965.

Yadin, Azzan. "Shenei Ketuvim and Rabbinic Interpretation." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 33, no. 4 (2002): 386-410.

___. "Theosophy and Kabbalistic Writing: Between Sha'arei Orah and Sha'arei Ẓedek." *Pe'amim: Studies in Oriental Jewry*, no. 104 (2005): 41-42.

___. "קול as Hypostasis in the Hebrew Bible." *JBL* (2003): 616.

Yoder, Christine D. *Wisdom as a Woman of Substance: A Socioeconomic Reading of Proverbs 1-9 and 31:10-31.* Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2014.

Yonge, Charles D. *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

Yudelowitz, Mordechai. *Yeshivat Pumbedita bi-Yemei ha-Amoraim*. (Hebrew) Tel Aviv: Israel Art Print, 1935.