

THE LIKENESS OF THE IMAGE:
ADAMIC MOTIFS AND אֱלֹהִים ANTHROPOLOGY IN
RABBINIC TRADITIONS ABOUT JACOB'S
IMAGE ENTHRONED IN HEAVEN

BY

SILVIU BUNTA

Marquette University, Milwaukee

Summary

The present article analyzes the various texts concerning Jacob's image engraved on the throne of glory. It compares the Jacob texts with previous traditions regarding Adam's special status as the image of God or the equivalent of a cultic representation of an ancient Near Eastern king or of a Roman emperor. The Jacob texts reveal a similar anthropology that emphasizes the dichotomy of humanity. On one hand the earthliness of the functionality of the human body is associated with angelic opposition, and, on the other, the body's divine likeness gives rise to angelic veneration. The investigation of the two traditions demonstrates a conspicuous dependence of the Jacob texts on the Adamic traditions.

The paucity and the succinctness of the midrashic and targumic texts concerning the image of Jacob on the throne of the divine כבוד do not permit an exhaustive ascertainment of their possible tradition sources. Contemporary scholarship does not furnish any attempts for such an analysis.¹

¹ Recent literature on these traditions includes Jarl Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God* (NTOA 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 135-151; J. Z. Smith, "The Prayer of Joseph," in Jacob Neusner, ed., *Religions in Antiquity. Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (Numen Suppl. 14; Leiden: Brill, 1968), 253-294; E. Wolfson, "The Image of Jacob Engraved upon the Throne of Glory: Further Speculation on the Esoteric Doctrine of the German Pietism," in M. Oron and A. Goldreich, eds., *Massu'ot Studies in Kabbalistic Literature and Jewish Philosophy in Memory of Prof. Ephraim Gottlieb* (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1994), 131-185 (in Hebrew); J. H. C. Neeb, "Jacob/Jesus Typology in John 1:51," *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* 12 (1992): 83-89; idem, "Origen's Interpretation of Genesis 28:12 and the Rabbis," in

This article analyzes the Jacob texts and contends that the tradition regarding Jacob's image is built on Adamic traditions. The texts employ terms and imageries used in Second Temple literature and early rabbinic literature to describe Adam's special status as the image of God. The Jacob texts further construct a dichotomic portrayal of Jacob; the patriarch's heavenly dimension (i.e., his image enthroned in heaven) is contrasted with his earthly dimension. The latter dimension encounters opposition and ridicule from angels, while Jacob's heavenly status receives angelic worship. The dichotomous portrayal of Jacob is reminiscent of the anthropology of Adamic traditions. In these traditions the protoplast's earthliness encounters opposition and ridicule from angels, in contrast to his status as the cultic statue of the godhead, for which he receives angelic reverence. For the purpose of illustrating the iconic function of Jacob, the Jacob texts employ a parable about the connection between a king and his cultic statues. This parable is developed within Adamic traditions for the exemplification of Adam's iconic value.

The Texts

The traditions regarding Jacob's image in heaven are documented in several exegetic endeavors of targumic and midrashic literatures. In these exegeses Jacob's dream of Gen 28:12 is the portal to a heavenly reality. Jacob sees in a dream that his image is engraved on a heavenly throne. The revelation provokes unrest among angels, a to and fro journey between the sleeping patriarch and his enthroned image.

Tg. Ps.-J. on Gen 28:12 states that the image of Jacob is "fixed on the throne of the Glory."² A ladder facilitates the ascent of the wit-

Origeniana Sexta (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1995), 71-80; J. M. Spiegelman, "Struggling with the Image of God," *Journal of Psychology and Judaism* 10 (1986): 100-111; W. Rordorf, "Gen 28,10ff und Joh 1,51 in der patristischen Exegese," in *Johannes-Studien* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1991), 39-46; Christopher Rowland, "John 1.51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition," *NTS* 30 (1984): 498-507; Peter Schäfer, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1975), 204-207; Shamma Friedman, "Graven Images," *Graven Images* 1 (1994): 233-238; A. Altmann, "The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends," *JQR* 35 (1944/1945): 371-391.

² "He had a dream, and behold, a ladder was fixed in the earth with its top reaching toward the heavens . . . and on that day they (i.e., angels) ascended to the heavens on high, and said, 'Come and see Jacob the pious, whose image is fixed on the Throne of Glory'" (*Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* [tr. M. Maher; ArBib 1b; Colledgeville: Liturgical Press, 1992], 99-100).

nessing angels to heaven to inform others that the image they contemplate on the heavenly throne has an earthly counterpart or prototype. Similarly, *Tg. Neof.* on Gen 28:12 describes the angelic ascent as the bearing of the good tidings that the prototype of the image “engraved on the throne of glory” is asleep on earth. The angels descend to look at the prototype of the heavenly image and again ascend to look at the image itself in heaven as in a desire to confirm the similarity.³ Jacob’s image engraved on the throne of God is also mentioned in *Gen. Rab.* 82:2,⁴ as well as in *Num. Rab.* 4:1⁵ and *Lam. Rab.* 2:1.⁶ A passage in *Hekhalot Rabbati*, a late mystical treatise,⁷

³ “And he dreamed, and behold, a ladder was fixed on the earth and its head reached to the height of the heavens; and behold, the angels that had accompanied him from the house of his father ascended to bear good tidings to the angels on high, saying, Come and see the pious man whose image is engraved in the throne of Glory, whom you desired to see. And behold, the angels from before the Lord ascended and descended and observed him” (*Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* [tr. M. McNamara; ArBib 1a; Colleveille: Liturgical Press, 1992], 140).

⁴ H. Freedman and N. Simon, eds., *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1961) [henceforth cited by writing], vol. *Genesis*, 752: “R. Isaac commenced: An altar of earth shalt thou make unto me . . . in every place where I cause My name to be mentioned I will come unto thee and bless thee (Exod 20:24). If I bless him who builds an altar in My name, how much the more should I appear to Jacob, whose features are engraved on My Throne, and bless him. Thus it says, And God appeared unto Jacob . . . and blessed him. R. Levi commenced: And an ox and a ram for peace offerings . . . for today the Lord appeareth unto you (Lev 9:4). If I appear to him who offered a ram in My name and bless him, how much the more should I appear to Jacob whose features are engraved on My throne, and bless him.”

⁵ Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. *Numbers*, 94: “The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Jacob: Thou art exceedingly precious in my sight, for I, as it were, set thine image on My throne, and by thy name the angels praise Me and say: Blessed be the Lord, God of Israel (Ps 41:14).”

⁶ Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. *Lamentations*, 151: “Similarly spake the Holy One, blessed be He, to Israel: Do you not provoke Me because you take advantage of the likeness of Jacob which is engraven upon My throne? Here, have it, it is thrown in your face! Hence, He hath cast down from heaven unto the earth the beauty of Israel (Lam 2:1).”

⁷ The *terminus ante quem* of *Hekhalot Rabbati* is generally estimated at c. 800 C.E. This *terminus* is established by a possible reference made by bishop Agobard of Lyons. Gershom Scholem first dated the text to the fifth or sixth century (*Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* [3rd ed.; New York: Schocken Books, 1954], 40-79). He subsequently argued for an earlier date and further contended that the main concepts have Tannaitic origins (*Origins of the Kabbalah* [3rd ed.; trans. Allan Arkush; Princeton University Press, 1990], 23; *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* [2nd ed.; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965], 6). David Halperin contends that *Hekhalot Rabbati* cannot be dated before the fourth century, although he concedes that certain materials have Tannaitic origins (*The Faces of the Chariot* [Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988], 360-363). Peter Schäfer, who notes the text’s lack of compositional and redactional homogeneity, emphasizes that *Hekhalot Rabbati* was “permanently in a state of

describes “the image of Jacob’s face” as “engraved on the throne of glory (כבוד).”⁸

The tradition of Jacob’s image undergoes significant developments in certain rabbinic circles and is a subject of disagreements. *Genesis Rabbah*, a classical Palestinian midrash dated to the beginning of the fifth century C.E.,⁹ records an exegetical dissent attributed to R. Hiyya the Elder and his disciple and colleague R. Jannai.¹⁰ R. Hiyya the Elder was a Palestinian Tanna of the early third century. R. Jannai was a first generation Palestinian Amora.

R. Hiyya the Elder and R. Jannai disagreed. One maintained: They were ascending and descending the ladder; while the other said: They were ascending and descending on Jacob. The statement that they were ascending and descending the ladder presents no difficulty. The statement that they were ascending and descending on Jacob we must take to mean that some were exalting him and others degrading him, dancing, leaping, and maligning him. Thus it says, Israel in whom I will be glorified (Isa 49:3); it is thou, whose features are engraved on high; they ascended on high and saw his features and they descended below and found him sleeping. It may be compared to a king who sat and judged in a [basilica];¹¹ people ascend to the basilica and find him [judging],¹² they go out to the chamber and find him [sleeping].¹³ (*Gen. Rab.* 68:12)¹⁴

R. Hiyya apparently interprets ב of Gen 28:12 as a reference to the ladder. In R. Jannai’s exegesis ב is associated with Jacob. It is difficult

flux” and early mentions or references cannot be regarded as testimonies for a final redaction of the writing as a whole (“Tradition and Redaction in Hekhalot Literature,” *JSJ* 14 [1983]: 172-181, here pp. 174-176).

⁸ Peter Schäfer et al., eds., *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981), #164.

⁹ *Genesis Rabbah* is critically edited by Julius Theodor and Chanock Albeck in *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah: Critical Edition with Notes and Commentary* (3 vols.; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1903-1928) [no volume numbers will henceforth be provided in reference to this publication, since the pages of the three volumes are numbered in sequence]. An English translation is available in Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*.

¹⁰ Several other disagreements between the two rabbis are recorded: *Gen. Rab.* 22:5; 34:9; 55:7; 69:3; *Lev. Rab.* 9:6; *Song Rab.* 4:12. It seems that the disagreements of the two marked later exegetical schools. A passage in the Babylonian Talmud makes an obvious effort to reconcile the two rabbis when it emphasizes that R. Jannai had the same opinions as his master: *b. Yebam.* 93a-b.

¹¹ My emendation. It should read בסילקי instead of פרוור. This and the subsequent emendations will be explained further in the argument of the article.

¹² Emended text. It should read דן instead of ישן.

¹³ Emended text. It should read ישן instead of דן.

¹⁴ Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. *Genesis*, 626; critical text at Theodor and Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah*, 787-788.

to ascertain whether the dissent between R. Hiyya and R. Jannai concerns solely the interpretation of the ambiguous biblical אֱלֹהִים or it also extends to the motif of angelic derisive attitude toward Jacob. Only the ensuing expansion of the two rabbinic interpretations introduces the motif of angelic derisive attitude toward Jacob. This commentary interprets the movement of the angels “to mean that some [angels] were exalting him (i.e., Jacob) and others degrading him, dancing, leaping, and maligning him.”¹⁵

Peter Schäfer notes that in rabbinic understanding sleep defines human *Sterblichkeit* and *Vergänglichkeit*.¹⁶ He further argues:

Die Engel entdecken, daß das Bild, das sie täglich im Himmel sehen und das von Gott so sehr geehrt wird, in Wirklichkeit das Abbild eines ganz gewöhnlichen und sterblichen Menschen ist. Ihre Reaktion ist der Spott: Sie verspotten den in ihren Augen erbärmlichen Menschen und sind sich ihrer Überlegenheit gewiß.¹⁷

The contradictory reaction of the angels reflects the complexity of their vision; they see both the image of Jacob enthroned in heaven and Jacob sleeping on earth. The contrast enthronement-sleep expresses a polarity between glorification and prostration, dominion and vulnerability. This polarity resides in the essence of Jacob and, may be argued, of the human condition. Jacob is both the enthroned image and the vulnerable human asleep. In this context the quotation of Isa 49:3 emphasizes that Jacob’s heavenly dimension is a representation of God and a symbol of divine presence. This ontological polarity of the human condition does not originate in Jacob traditions.

While the attribution of the midrash can be questioned, the tradition about Jacob’s image has known widespread circulation among early rabbinic circles. Additional evidence places the roots of the tradition before R. Hiyya’s time and further associates R. Hiyya’s circles with this tradition.

¹⁵ Based on the manuscript evidence it cannot be asserted with certainty if this addition is a unity or, as Friedman notes, if it exhibits two distinctive editorial processes, of which one, namely the mention of the angelic opposition to Jacob, involves “extraneous material from other *Genesis Rabbah* passages” (“Graven Images,” 234). Even if the passage is a secondary addition, its inclusion into the text occurred before the middle of the fifth century and is nevertheless a testimony to early developments of the tradition about Jacob’s image, as Friedman admits (“Graven Images,” 234).

¹⁶ *Rivalität*, 206. He makes reference to *Gen. Rab.* 8:10.

¹⁷ Schäfer, *Rivalität*, 206.

b. *Hul.* 91b records, as Schäfer notes, “eine verkürzte Fassung des Midraschs”:¹⁸

A Tanna taught: They ascended to look at the image (דיוקנא) above and descended to look at the image (דיוקנא) below. They wished to hurt him (בעו לסכונה), when Behold, the Lord stood beside him (Gen 28:13). R. Simeon b. Lakish said: Were it not expressly stated in the Scripture, we would not dare to say it. [God is made to appear] like a man who is fanning his son (כאדם שמניף על בנו). (*b. Hul.* 91b)¹⁹

The first half of the text is attributed to an unnamed Tanna. The attribution is a conventional talmudic method of introducing a view that is extensively accredited to Tannaitic circles.

The second half of the text is most probably juxtaposed to the view attributed to the Tannaim because of their common focus and similar interpretation of Gen 28:13. It further associates the tradition of the angelic opposition to Jacob with R. Hiyya’s circles. It is accredited to R. Simeon b. Lakish (or simply Resh Lakish), a mid third century Palestinian Amora, who was a colleague and brother-in-law of R. Johanan (b. Nappaha),²⁰ a disciple of R. Jannai.

Num. Rab. 4:1,²¹ which is part of the late (possibly medieval) section of *Numbers Rabbah*, attributes a similar interpretation of Gen 28:13 to the famous third century Caesarean Amora R. Hoshaya.²² R. Hoshaya

¹⁸ *Rivalität*, 205.

¹⁹ This and all subsequent texts from the Babylonian Talmud follow the translation in I. Epstein, ed., *The Babylonian Talmud* (35 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1935-1948).

²⁰ The two are often mentioned together: *Gen. Rab.* 3:6; 9:3; 9:5; 12:12; 13:11; 45:9; 60:3; 63:5; 63:6 etc. On the two rabbis see A. I. Baumgarten, “R. Yohanan and Resh Lakish on Anonymous Mishnayot,” in *Jewish Law Association Studies II* (Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1986), 75-88. On R. Johanan see S. K. Mirsky, “Mishnah as Viewed by the Amoraim,” in *Leo Jung Jubilee Volume; Essays in His Honor of the Occasion of His 70th Birthday* (New York: The Jewish Center, 1962), 155-173; R. Kimelman, “Rabbi Yohanan and Origen on the Song of Songs: A Third-century Jewish-Christian Disputation,” *HTR* 73 (1980): 567-595; G. J. Blidstein, “R. Yohanan, Idolatry, and Public Privilege,” *JJS* 5 (1974): 154-161.

²¹ “And Jacob went out . . . and he lighted upon the place . . . and he dreamed and behold a ladder . . . and behold, the Lord stood beside him, etc. (Gen 28:10-13). Happy the mortal, said R. Hoshaya, who beheld such a thing! The divine King and His attendants standing beside him and guarding (ומשמרים) him!” (Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. *Numbers*, 94).

²² On R. Hoshaya, see Dominique Barthélemy, “Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba qui censura le ‘Commentaire Allegorique’?,” in *Etudes d’Histoire du Texte de l’Ancien Testament* (Fribourg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, Ruprecht, 1978), 140-173; Halperin, *Faces*, 215-216, 325-326; Irving M. Levey, “Caesarea and the Jews,” in *Studies in the History of Caesarea Maritima* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975), 43-78.

was a pupil of R. Hiyya the Elder, whose discipleship he shared with R. Jannai. In collaboration with R. Jannai he also contributed to the education of R. Johanan, and together benefited of the erudition of R. Simeon b. Lakish. Given the possible medieval dating of the text, the attribution must be considered with caution. It is necessary to emphasize the similarity between this text and the traditions attributed to R. Hiyya, R. Jannai, and Resh Lakish. The text also provides additional support to the connection between R. Hiyya's circle and the Jacob traditions.

Modern scholarship has formulated several general conclusions concerning the Jacob texts. First, in all forms of the traditions Jacob is doubled by his image/likeness (דְּוִיִּקְנָא/אִיקוּוִּי). Second, the "throne of glory" or "of God," on which Jacob's image is engraved, is reminiscent of the throne of the כְּבוֹד of Ezek 1:26-28. Christopher Rowland has argued that this connection implies that Jacob is identified with the divine כְּבוֹד of Ezek 1:26-28.²³ The identification is further supported by *b. Hul.* 91b,²⁴ which preserves a supposed Tannaitic tradition according to which the angels ascending and descending on the ladder of Jacob are the four angels accompanying the throne of the כְּבוֹד in Ezekiel 1. David Halperin has noted that the identification is also proposed in a targumic Tosefta to Ezekiel in the medieval MS Montefiore, in which the כְּבוֹד is identified with the form (צוֹרֵת) of Jacob.²⁵ An identification of Jacob's image with the כְּבוֹד of Ezekiel 1 is also present in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*.²⁶

The association of Jacob with the כְּבוֹד of Ezekiel 1 introduces the possibility of a connection between the Jacob texts and traditions about Adam, who is a prominent identity of the כְּבוֹד in Second Temple literature.²⁷ This possibility has remained heretofore unexplored. Linguistic

²³ "John 1.51," 504. Rowland's argument is followed by Fossum, *Image*, 140.

²⁴ "A Tanna taught: What was the width of the ladder? Eight thousand parasangs. For it is written: And behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it. At least two were ascending and two descending, and when they met each other [on the ladder] there were four (cf. Ezek 1:10); and of an angel it is written: His body was like the Tarshish, and we have a tradition that the Tarshish is two thousand parasangs long."

²⁵ *Faces*, 121. See also Fossum, *Image*, 143-144.

²⁶ Fossum, *Image*, 143, n. 30. Fossum's suggestion is further supported by Andrei Orlov's arguments in "The Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*," in C. A. Evans, ed., *Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, forthcoming).

²⁷ One of the earliest testimonies regarding the identification of Adam with the כְּבוֹד occurs in Moses' throne-vision in Ezekiel the Tragedian's *Exagoge* (verses 68-89), which

and thematic analyses of the Jacob texts provide additional support for this connection.

Linguistic Considerations

All the targumic Jacob texts and, with the notable exception of *b. Hul.* 91b, all the rabbinic texts designate the image of Jacob with אִיְקוֹנִין , a Palestinian Aramaic transliteration of εἰκών/εἰκόνιον.²⁸ A second century C.E. (circa 140) papyrus (BGU #423) contains a phonetic link between the Greek terms and the Aramaic transliteration, namely εἰκόνιν.²⁹ This form could either be an accusative singular form of εἰκών³⁰ or a nominative-accusative-vocative form of εἰκόνιον.³¹ According

is generally dated to the second century B.C.E. Critical texts of the passage can be found in M. Denis, *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 210; B. Snell, *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta I* (Göttingen, 1971), 288-301; C. R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. Volume II: Poets* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 362-366. In this vision Moses sees an anonymous humanlike figure on a heavenly throne, whom he designates as φῶς. The throne is reminiscent of the throne of the כבוד in Ezek 1:26-28; the use of the term φῶς for the enthroned humanlike being is an allusion to Adam, defined by the wordplay φῶς-φῶς in Hellenistic Jewish circles (cf. the testimony of Zosimus of Panopolis in *On the Letter Omega* 10-15; text in Howard M. Jackson, ed. and trans., *Zosimus of Panopolis, On the Letter Omega* [Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978], 28-37). A second early testimony comes from the second century B.C.E. fragments of 4Q504 8 (Puech col. I), 1-7. For the relevance of this testimony see M. Baillet, *DJD VII* (1982), 137-168; Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam. Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 92-93. A portrayal of Adam as the כבוד is preserved in *T. Ab.* 11. The identification of Adam with the כבוד is facilitated by Priestly Source's and Ezekiel's correlative use of דמות. As Mark S. Smith notes, "whereas Ez 1,26 conveys the prophet's vision of God in the likeness of the human person, the Priestly Source's vision of the human person is in the likeness of God" (Mark S. Smith, "Divine Form and Size in Ugaritic and Pre-exilic Israelite Religion," *JAW* 100 (1988): 424-427, here p. 427). See also John F. Kutsko, *Between Heaven and Earth: Divine Presence and Absence in Ezekiel* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 65-70; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962-1965), 1:146; idem, *Genesis. A Commentary* (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972), 59; J. M. Miller, "In the 'Image' and 'Likeness' of God," *JBL* 91 (1972): 289-304, here pp. 302-303.

²⁸ Thus Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: The Judaica Press, 1996), 60.

²⁹ Arthur S. Hunt and C. C. Edgar, eds., *Select Papyri* (CL 266, 282; 2 vols.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1932-1934), 1:304 (#112). In the text a soldier announces his father that he has sent him a portrait (ἔπεμψά σοι εἰκόνιν μου).

³⁰ Papyri from late imperial period attest to the widespread formation with -ιν of the accusative singular in third declension nouns with consonant ending stems. E.g., χάρτιν (BGU #48). See J. H. Moulton, "Grammatical Notes from the Papyri," *Classical Review* 15 (1901): 31-38, 434-442; 18 (1902): 106-112, 151-155, here p. 35; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (New York: Hodden & Stoughton, 1923), 265.

³¹ The nominative-accusative-vocative form of second declension neutral nouns in

to Jastrow the Aramaic term, which has two other variants, אִיקוֹן (an exact transliteration of εἰκών) and אִיקוֹנָא, means ‘picture,’ ‘image,’ or ‘features.’³² אִיקוֹנֵי is also commonly used in the classical Palestinian midrashim to denote royal statues.

b. Hul. 91b uses a late Jewish literary Aramaic cognate of אִיקוֹנֵי, namely דִּיקוֹנָא (with the variant דִּיקוֹן). Levy translates it as ‘image.’³³ Jastrow notes that the word is “a reverential transformation of אִיקוֹן” and translates it with ‘image’ and ‘likeness.’³⁴ דִּיקוֹנָא occurs in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*³⁵ and scarcely in the Babylonian Talmud.³⁶

Fossum has recently noted that the use in the Jacob texts of the words אִיקוֹנֵי and דִּיקוֹנָא bears witness to connections with early traditions about Adam, who is defined as the image of God in the same terms. Fossum has further noted that in *Tg. Ps.-J.* דְמוּת of Gen 1:26 and 5:1 and צִלְמֵ of Gen 1:27 and 9:6 are rendered with דִּיקוֹנָא; צִלְמֵ of Gen 5:3 is rendered with אִיקוֹנֵיהּ.³⁷ Moreover, in *b. B. Bat.* 58a דִּיקוֹנָא defines Adam’s status as the image of God.

Angelic Veneration and Opposition

In the Priestly Source and the book of Ezekiel Adam’s special relationship with the deity is defined by means of צִלְמֵ and דְמוּת³⁸ (Gen 1:26). The two terms belong to the vocabulary regarding the cultic statues of gods.³⁹ Recent scholarship has further contended that the use of the two terms in the definition of Adam’s special relationship to the deity implies that the protoplast was regarded as the equivalent of a

-iov often loses o, generating a form in -iv. E.g., κλειδίον for κλειδίον, in BGU #775. For this phenomenon, see Robertson, *A Grammar*, 260-261; Moulton, “Grammatical Notes,” 34.

³² *Dictionary*, 60. In the family of the word, אִיקוֹנָא (E.g., *Deut. Rab.* 4:4) designates a “procession in which portable images are carried” (ibidem, 60).

³³ *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Baumgärtner, 1867), 1:170.

³⁴ *Dictionary*, 297.

³⁵ On Gen 1:26-27; 4:26; 5:1-2; 9:6-7; Lev 26:1; Deut 21:23.

³⁶ *Yoma* 69a, *Sotah* 36b, *Sanh.* 96b, 104b, *Hul.* 91b, *Mo’ed Qat.* 15b, *B. Bat.* 58a, *Shabb.* 149b, *B. Qam.* 104b, *B. Met.* 115a, *Bek.* 7b.

³⁷ Fossum, *Image*, 140, n. 23.

³⁸ Mark S. Smith notes that in several ancient Near Eastern texts דְמוּת refers to the resemblance between a statue and its prototype, while צִלְמֵ refers to the statue itself, or “to the material medium in which the *d’mût* is made” (“Divine Form,” 426, n. 13).

³⁹ Num 33:52; 1 Sam 6:5; 2 Kgs 11:18; Ezek 7:20; 16:17; 23:24; Amos 5:26. In Mesopotamia *šalmu* designates a divine cultic statue.

pagan cult statue or idol as early as the exilic period.⁴⁰ For the Priestly Source and the author of Ezekiel Adam functions as God's representation. This expands considerably the problem of aniconism versus iconism in Second Temple Judaism. Shamma Friedman locates precisely the new issue:

Of course, the ban on icons is in force . . . But how about in the other direction? "I am my Beloved's and my Beloved is mine" (Song 6:4). If I manufacture an icon picturing my Beloved and worship it, I deserve the death penalty. Would my Beloved equally refrain from the graven image?⁴¹

For the Priestly Source and Ezekiel, as well as for subsequent Adam traditions, the godhead creates its sole self-portrait in Adam.

Crispin Fletcher-Louis has subsequently extended the implications of the early Second Temple conception and has proposed a connection to the tradition about the worship of Adam.⁴² He has remarked that, in light of the cultic setting of Genesis 1,⁴³ "to speak of an 'image' in this context is to allude to a cult object."⁴⁴ It could be further added that, as in the ancient Near East the statues of the gods mediate the presence of the gods to humanity in a cultic setting and for a cultic purpose,⁴⁵ in early Second Temple Judaism the iconic Adam is also

⁴⁰ E. Zenger, *Gottes Bogen in den Wolken* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983), 84-96; A. Angerstorfer, "Hebräisch *dmwt* und aramäisch *dmw(t)*," *BN* 24 (1984): 30-43; Smith, "Divine Form," 426-427; C. Patton, "Adam as the Image of God: An Exploration of the Fall of Satan in the *Life of Adam and Eve*," *SBLSP* 130 (1994): 294-300; Th. Podella, *Das Lichtkleid JHWHs* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1996), 252-259; H. Niehr, "In Search of YHWH's Cult Statue in the First Temple," in K. van der Toorn, ed., *The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Leuven: Peters, 1997), 73-96, here pp. 93-94; Kutsko, *Between Heaven and Earth*, 65-76.

⁴¹ "Graven Images," 233.

⁴² "The Worship of Divine Humanity as God's Image and the Worship of Jesus," in C. Newman et al., eds., *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism. Papers from the St Andrew's Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (SJSJ 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 112-128, here pp. 125-128; and idem, *All the Glory of Adam*, 101-102.

⁴³ See also P. J. Kerney, "Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Exodus 25-40," *ZAW* 89 (1977): 375-387; M. Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord, The Problem of the *Sitz-im-Leben* of Gen 1:1-2:3," in A. Caquot, M. Delcor, eds., *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles* (AOAT 212; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), 501-511; J. D. Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence of Evil* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988).

⁴⁴ "The Worship of Divine Humanity," 123.

⁴⁵ Thus Niehr, "Search," 77; A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 183-198; Angelika Berlejung, *Die Theologie der Bilder: Herstellung und Einweihung von Kultbildern in Mesopotamien und die alttestamentliche Bilderpolemik* (Göttingen;

perceived as YHWH's צַלֵּם for cultic purposes. Therefore, Fletcher-Louis remarks, "the *theology* of the worship of Adam story must now be rooted firmly in the beginnings of the Second Temple period."⁴⁶

Sources from later Second Temple period build on this theology a tradition according to which at Adam's creation the angels worship the protoplast as the image of God.⁴⁷ An early expression of this tradition is 4Q381 1,10-11, which is paleographically dated to the first half of the first century B.C.E.⁴⁸ The text is most probably a copy of an original from the Persian or early Hellenistic periods:⁴⁹ "All His hosts and [His] ange[ls . . .] to serve man (or Adam: וְלַעֲבֹד לְאָדָם) and to minister to him (וְלִשְׁרָתוֹ). . . ."⁵⁰ Although the connection with the theology of the worship of Adam has not been noted in the first editions of the text,⁵¹ subsequent studies have ascertained that the text reflects this theology.⁵²

The belief that Adam was worshiped at his creation is also documented in the Latin, Georgian and Armenian versions⁵³ of *Life of Adam and Eve*. The *terminus ante quem* of the Jewish writing is the beginning of the fourth century C.E. It is, however, generally dated to the first century C.E.⁵⁴ Based on conspicuous literary and conceptual affinities between *L. A. E.* 12-14 and Daniel 3, Fletcher-Louis contends that the

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998); idem, "Geheimnis und Ereignis: zur Funktion und Aufgabe der Kultbilder in Mesopotamien," *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 13 (1998): 109-143.

⁴⁶ *All the Glory of Adam*, 102.

⁴⁷ On this tradition, see G. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," in G. Anderson et al., eds., *Literature on Adam and Eve* (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2000), 83-110; Schäfer, *Rivalität*; J. P. Schultz, "Angelic Opposition to the Ascension of Moses and the Revelation of the Law," *JQR* 61 (1970/1971): 282-307; A. Marmorstein, "Controversies Between the Angels and the Creator," *Melilah* 3-4 (1950): 93-102 (in Hebrew); Altmann, "The Gnostic Background."

⁴⁸ Schuller, *DJD XI* (1998): 88.

⁴⁹ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 21-52.

⁵⁰ The Hebrew is from F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1997-1998), 2:754-755. The translation is E. M. Schuller's in *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (HSS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 76; the translation is reprinted in "4QNon-Canonical Psalms," in *DJD XI* (1997), 75-172.

⁵¹ Schuller, *DJD XI* (1998): 96; idem, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 84.

⁵² Cf. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 98-100. Fletcher-Louis notes that "both the verbs and which are used in 4Q381 have a strongly cultic orientation for the community that used the text" (ibidem, 99-100).

⁵³ Michael Stone argues that, even if the Greek version lacks the passages, it implicitly assumes the tradition in the development of its story ("The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on *The Books of Adam and Eve*," *JTS* 44 [1993]: 153-156).

⁵⁴ Michael Stone, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (SBL EJL 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 53-58.

pseudepigraphic text “owes its genius to the early Hellenistic period when Daniel 3 was written.”⁵⁵ The Georgian version of *L.A.E.* 13:1-16:1 reads:

¹³Le diable lui (i.e., to Adam) répondit et lui dit: “[Tu ne m’as (rien) fait,]⁵⁶ mais c’est à cause de toi que je suis tombé sur la terre. Le jour même où tu fus créé, ce jour là, je tombai de la face de Dieu parce que, comme Dieu t’avait soufflé l’Esprit sur ton visage, tu avais l’image et la ressemblance de la divinité. Puis Michel arriva; [il te présenta et te fait prosterner devant Dieu].⁵⁷ Et Dieu dit à Michel: ‘J’ai créé Adam selon (mon) image et ma divinité.’ ¹⁴Alors Michel vint; il convoqua toutes les troupes des anges et il leur dit: ‘Prosternez vous devant le semblable et l’image de la divinité.’ Or, quand Michel les convoqua et que tous se prosternèrent devant toi, il me convoqua moi aussi et je lui dis: ‘Éloigne toi de moi, car je ne saurais me prosterner devant celui qui est plus jeune que moi; en effet, avant celui-ci, je suis seigneur, et c’est à lui qu’il convient de se prosterner devant moi.’ ¹⁵Cela, d’autres anges des six classes l’entendirent et ma parole leur plut et ils ne se prosternèrent pas devant toi. ¹⁶Alors Dieu s’irrita contre nous et il nous ordonna, à eux et à moi, de descendre de nos demeures vers la terre.” (*L.A.E.* 13:1-16:1)⁵⁸

The opposition of the fallen angels to the worship of the iconic Adam is also recorded in several Jewish-Christian and Christian sources, such as *Gospel of Bartholomew* 4:52-56,⁵⁹ a Coptic text attributed to Peter of Alexandria,⁶⁰ a Coptic *Encomium on Michael*,⁶¹ a Coptic *Enthronement of Michael*,⁶² the Syriac *Cave of Treasures*,⁶³ Origen’s *De Principiis*

⁵⁵ *All the Glory of Adam*, 103.

⁵⁶ I provided between brackets the correction that J.-P. Mahé subsequently made to his original translation (G. Anderson and M. Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* [EJIL 5; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994], vii).

⁵⁷ The words between brackets contain the correction that Mahé subsequently made to his original translation “il (ordonna) qu’on se prosternât devant toi en présence de Dieu” (Anderson and Stone, *Synopsis*, viii [wrong order], 11 [correct replacement]).

⁵⁸ Translation from Mahé, “Le Livre d’Adam géorgienne de la *Vita Adae*,” in R. van den Broek and M. J. Vermaseren, eds., *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions* (Leiden, Brill, 1981), 227-260, here pp. 234-235. The tradition is also preserved in *Apoc. Sedr.* 5:1-2.

⁵⁹ Edgar Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha* (2 vols.; ed. W. Schneemelcher; trans. R. M. Wilson; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), 1:500.

⁶⁰ W. E. Crum, “Texts Attributed to Peter of Alexandria,” *JTS* 4 (1903): 387-97, here pp. 396-397.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, 396-397, n. 3. Also found in E. W. Budge, *Miscellaneous Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (London, 1915), 904-905.

⁶² C. D. G. Müller, *Die Bucher der Einsetzung der Erzengel Michael und Gabriel* (CSCO 225/226; Louvain: Peeters, 1962), 14-15.

⁶³ *Cave of Treasures*, from Brit. Mus. MS. Add. 25875, fol. 5b, cols. 1-2. The text can

I.V.4-5,⁶⁴ and Tertullian's *On Patience* 5.⁶⁵ The extensive presence of the tradition in third century Christian sources indicates that it had a widespread circulation in second century Jewish circles.⁶⁶

The tradition associates the angelic worship of Adam with the proplast's identity as the image of God. As John R. Levison emphasizes, "the image consists of physical similarity to God."⁶⁷ This physical resemblance enables Adam to function as a cultic statue of God. The connection between Adam's physical resemblance to God and the angelic worship of Adam is evident in Michael's command to Satan: *adorate imaginem domini dei* in Latin, and "prosternez vous devant le semblable et l'image de la divinité" in Georgian. *Astowac*,⁶⁸ which the Armenian version uses for Adam's iconic function,⁶⁹ means both 'god' and 'idol.'⁷⁰ Given the latter connotation, the Armenian version better reflects the early Second Temple conception of Adam as the equivalent of a pagan cult statue or idol.⁷¹

be found in Su-Min Ri, *La Caverne de Trésors. Les deux recensions syriaques* (CSCO 486-487; Louvain: Peeters, 1987).

⁶⁴ ANF 4:258-260.

⁶⁵ ANF 3:709-711.

⁶⁶ For Origen's contact with Judaism, see C. Kannengiesser and W. L. Petersen, eds., *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988); N. R. M. de Lange, *Origen and the Jews* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976); idem, "Jewish Influence on Origen," in *Origeniana* (Bari: Istituto di Letteratura Cristiana Antica, 1975), 225-242; Barthélemy, "Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba"; Kimelman, "Rabbi Yohanan and Origen". Tertullian's indebtedness to Judaism is masked by his negative attitude toward Judaism: A. G. Stroumsa, "Tertullian on Idolatry and the Limits of Tolerance," in *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 173-184; W. Horbury, "Tertullian on the Jews in the Light of De Spectaculis XXX. 5-6," *JTS* ns (1972): 455-459; W. H. C. Frend, "A Note on Tertullian and the Jews," in *Studia Patristica, vol 10* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1970), 291-296.

⁶⁷ *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism* (JSPSS1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 178.

⁶⁸ I follow here the transliteration of classical Armenian proposed by Robert W. Thompson, *An Introduction to Classical Armenian* (2nd ed.; Delmar, NY: Caravan Books, 1989), 11-12.

⁶⁹ "Bow down to god (*Astowac*) whom I have made" (Anderson and Stone, *Synopsis*, 11; the translation is from Michael Stone, *The Penitence of Adam* [2 vols.; CSCO 429-430, *Scriptores Armeniaci* 13-14; Leuven: Peeters, 1981]). The Armenian text is reprinted in Michael Stone, *Texts and Concordances of the Armenian Adam Literature. Vol. I.* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 70-81. Prof. Stone notes that manuscript no. 3461 from Erevan, Matenadaran, replaces *astowac* with Adam (*The Penitence of Adam*, 2:4, n. 1 on ch. 14).

⁷⁰ B. A. Olsen, *The Noun in Biblical Armenian* (Berlin, New York: M. de Gruyter, 1999), 545-546. *Astowac* translates the Hebrew Bible use of 'ēlōhîm for idols: Exod 20:23; 34:15-17; Num 25:2; Deut 4:28; Josh 24:14.

⁷¹ Adam's resemblance to God is offered as justification for worship in *Gospel of*

Adam possesses the image of God through the insufflation of divine breath.⁷² The imagery is the result of a juxtaposition of Gen 1:26 with Gen 2:7. This combination is most probably rooted in the Adamic traditions of the early Second Temple period. H. Niehr remarks that, given the conception of Adam as the equivalent of a pagan cult statue or idol, the inspiring of Adam with divine breath in Gen 2:7 was in all probability associated with the ancient Near Eastern ritual of vivification of the cultic statues of gods.⁷³

The angelic opposition to Adam, which in rabbinic literature exceeds the category of fallen angels,⁷⁴ stands in contrast with the angelic veneration of the protoplast. The contrast emphasizes the twofold nature of the protoplast. Adam is both the living cultic statue of God and, as Satan stresses derisively, a “youth.”⁷⁵ This dichotomy is situated entirely within Adam’s body. His body is a mixture of divine likeness and clay.⁷⁶ The

Bartholomew and Encomium on Michael. The reading of the latter is worth mentioning: “The angels beheld the likeness and image of God in Adam and they fell down and worshipped him and gave him glory as the likeness of God [my emphasis]” (Crum, “Texts Attributed,” 396-397, n. 3).

⁷² The Armenian version reads: “when God breathed his spirit into you, you received the likeness of his image” (Anderson and Stone, *Synopsis*, 11). The Latin records: *quando insufflavit deus spiritum vitae in te et factus est vultus et similitudo tua ad imaginem dei.*

⁷³ “Search,” 93. For this ritual see A. Berlejung, “Washing the Mouth: The Consecration of Divine Images in Mesopotamia,” in van der Toorn, *The Image and the Book*, 45-72; Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 183-198; T. Jacobsen, “The Graven Image,” in P. D. Miller et al., eds., *Ancient Israelite Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 23-28; M. B. Dick and C. B. Walker, “The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia,” in M. B. Dick, ed., *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth: The Creation of the Cult Images* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 55-121.

⁷⁴ E.g., *Ab. R. Nath. A.*: “When the Holy One, blessed be He, created Adam, He formed him (with two faces), front and back, as it is said, “Thou hast fashioned me back and in front, and laid Thy hand upon me” (Ps 139:5). Then the ministering angels came down to destroy him, but the Holy One, blessed be He, took him up and put him under his wings, as it is said, ‘And Thou hast laid Thy hand upon me.’” (Judah Goldin, trans., *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* [2nd ed.; New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1983], 15). For the motif of angelic opposition against Adam see also *Gen. Rab.* 8:4-6, *b. Sanh.* 38b, 3 *Enoch* 4:6.

⁷⁵ Steenburg notes the presence of a similar duality in *Sib. Or.* 8:442-445: “The concessive force of πέρ (“although”) in the participial phrase, ᾧ θνητῷ περ ἕόντι, assumes a tension between Adam being mortal and being ‘served’ by all things” (“The Worship of Adam,” 97). Without discerning a connection with the motif of the angelic opposition to Adam, Steenburg continues: “Why this tension would exist is not clear” (*ibidem*, 97).

⁷⁶ This bodily dichotomy escapes the attentive analysis of Stefan Schreiber, “Der Mensch im Tod nach der *Apokalypse des Mose*: eine frühjüdische Anthropologie in der Zeit des Paulus,” *JSJ* 35 (2004): 49-69. His conclusion, however, that *L.A.E.* departs from the dichotomic anthropology of σῶμα versus ψυχή, converges with my proposal that *L.A.E.* focuses on the dichotomy between heavenly likeness and distinctiveness.

dichotomy reflects the ontology of a cultic statue of a deity, which is a mixture of earthly material and divine likeness.

The ancient concept that Adam was created as a cultic statue of the godhead is also reflected in rabbinic sources. The editorial variants of *Gen. Rab.* 8:8, which expands on the significant rabbinic argument that God did not take *equal* council with angels in the creation of Adam,⁷⁷ do not furnish a consensus concerning the source of the following parable:

R. ליה/Laya⁷⁸ said: There is no taking counsel here, but it may be compared to a king who was strolling at the door of his palace when he saw a clod (בולדין)⁷⁹ lying about. Said he, What shall we do with it? Some answered: [Use it in building] public baths; others answered: private baths. I will make a statue (אדרנינטיס) of it, declared the king. Who then can hinder him? (*Gen. Rab.* 8:8)⁸⁰

אדרנינטיס is a corrupt form of אנדריאנטוס/אנדרשט.⁸¹ The word is an appropriation of ἀνδριάς, which denotes a statue of a human. In rabbinic literature the Aramaic transliterations generally indicate royal statues.⁸²

It is significant that this rabbinic tradition opts for a parable about the building of an imperial statue for the illustration of the creation of Adam without angelic consent. God is compared with a king that wishes to make a statue of himself. Adam is associated to the resulting statue, which is created out of clod without the concurrence of the royal counselors. The parable shows evidence of the same juxtaposition of Gen 1:26 and 2:7 as *L.A.E.* 13:1-16:1. In the biblical story Adam is created out of earth and the material of the royal statue is clod. In both stories the clod is formed into a statue.

⁷⁷ In regard to the rabbinic disputes concerning the partners of God in creation, see Alan Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), esp. 121-134; J. Fossum, "Gen 1,26 and 2,7 in Judaism, Samaritanism, and Gnosticism," *JTS* 16 (1985): 202-239.

⁷⁸ Theodor proposes that ליה/Laya stands for Hila (Theodor and Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah*, 62). He also records the variant Levi (Theodor and Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah*, 62). Levi seems to be a secondary *lectio facilior*.

⁷⁹ בולדין is most probably a corrupted derivation from βολάριον, clod. See also Clemens Thoma and Simon Lauer, *Die Gleichnisse der Rabbinen: Einleitung, Übersetzung, Parallelen, Kommentar, Texte* (2 vols.; Judaica et Christiana 10, 13; Bern, New York: P. Lang, 1986, 1991), 2:109-110.

⁸⁰ Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. *Genesis*, 59; critical text at Theodor and Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah*, 62.

⁸¹ Thus Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 18; Theodor and Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah*, 62.

⁸² See Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 81-82.

The source of the parable is uncertain. It must be noted that one (probably secondary) variant associates the parable with R. Levi. R. Levi was a late third century Palestinian Amora, a disciple of R. Johanan. He is repeatedly portrayed as a quite accurate source for the teachings of his master.⁸³

The tradition of the angelic veneration of Adam receives another rabbinic formulation in *Gen. Rab.* 8:10, with the theological parameters that the tradition entails:

R. Hoshaya said: When the Holy One, blessed be He, created Adam, the ministering angels mistook him [for a divine being] and wished to exclaim 'Holy' before him. What does this resemble? A king and a governor who sat in a chariot, and his subjects wished to say to the king, 'Domine! (Sovereign)!' but they did not know which it was. What did the king do? He pushed the governor out of the chariot, and so they knew who was the king. Similarly, when the Lord created Adam, the angels mistook him [for a divine being]. What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do? He caused sleep to fall upon him, and so all knew that he was [but mortal] man (אדם); thus it is written, Cease ye from man, in whose nostrils is a breath, for how little is he to be accounted (Isa 2:22)! (*Gen. Rab.* 8:10)⁸⁴

The parable is attributed without editorial variations to the famous third century Caesarean Amora R. Hoshaya, to whom *Num. Rab.* 4:1 ascribes the teaching concerning the angelic opposition to Jacob.

The tradition interprets the concept of image of God as physical resemblance to God,⁸⁵ as do *L.A.E.* 13:1-16:1 and *Gen. Rab.* 8:8. The

⁸³ *Gen. Rab.* 91:8; 98:11 (dissent); *Num. Rab.* 2:12; *Esther Rab.* 3:10; 5:3; 6:3; *Song Rab.* 1:11; *Lam. Rab.* 3:22; *Eccl. Rab.* 1:7. Dissent is also often attributed to the two: e.g., *Gen. Rab.* 98:11.

⁸⁴ Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. *Genesis*, 60; Theodor and Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah*, 63-64. The tradition reappears without attribution in *Eccl. Rab.* 6:9. A different version of the confusion is also recorded in *Pirke R. El.* 11: "Adam stood and began to gaze upwards and downwards. . . . He stood on his feet and was adorned with the Divine Image. His height was from east to west, as it is said, Thou hast beset me behind and before (Ps 139:5). Behind refers to the west, and before refers to the east. All the creatures saw him and became afraid of him, thinking that he was their creator, and they came to prostrate themselves before him" (G. Friedlander, ed., *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* [New York: Hermon Press, 1965], 79).

⁸⁵ This, A. G. Gottstein contends, is in rabbinic Judaism the main connotation of the concept of image of God ("The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HTR* 87 [1994]: 171-195, esp. pp. 173-176). See also Morton Smith, "The Image of God: Notes on the Hellenization of Judaism with Special Reference to Goodenough's Work on Jewish Symbols," *BJRL* 40 (1958): 473-512; idem, "On the Shape of God and the Humanity of the Gentiles," in Jacob Neusner, ed., *Religions in Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill,

resemblance between Adam and God confounds the angels. Unable to differentiate between the image and the prototype, the angels unwittingly direct their worship to Adam. The angelic mistake, however, entails no binitarian intent.

It has been argued that the parable expresses a rabbinic polemic against the tradition of the worship of Adam, consequently viewed as a threat to monotheism.⁸⁶ The argument exceeds the intent of the parable. The parable solely opposes the worship of Adam *as God*. The entitlement of Adam to worship or reverence, as the representation of God, is not negated. The worship of Adam *per se* is not the intended subject of the text. The majestic procession of Adam in the divine chariot alludes to the common Roman practice of the festive ride of a victorious commander of the army (commonly the emperor) for public veneration.⁸⁷ In the rabbinic parable the angels fulfill the function of the revering spectators. Adam's ride in the divine chariot, alongside God, entails the entitlement of the former to angelic veneration.

The text also does not imply that the angelic adoration of Adam *as God* resides in the recital of the 'Domine' (i.e., Isa 6:3) in front of the protoplast. The recital of 'Domine' for humans is regarded as a legitimate practice in some rabbinic circles, including apparently the one of R. Johanan, R. Hoshaya's disciple (cf. *b. B. Bat.* 75b). The emphasis of the parable is that the angels direct the 'Domine' to Adam *as God*.

The text thus emphasizes both the resemblance and the distinction between the image of God and God. They have the same form, yet they do not share the same nature. A. G. Gottstein has emphasized that the message of the text is that "Adam is distinguished from God not by form, but by the different quality of life attached to the same form; in other words, God and Adam are distinguished not by body, but by bodily function."⁸⁸ The confusion of the angels is the consequence

1970), 315-326. For a critique of Gottstein's literal understanding of rabbinic references to Adam's body of light, see David H. Aaron, "Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam," *HTR* 90 (1997): 299-314.

⁸⁶ Steenburg, "The Worship of Adam," 98. See also C. R. A. Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition," *JJS* 43 (1992): 1-31, here p. 17.

⁸⁷ The punishment of Adam also recalls imperial methods of preventing or rectifying the overreaction of the audience toward a rewarded victor: Altmann, "The Gnostic Background," 380-381.

⁸⁸ "The Body," 182.

of their inability to perceive Adam's distinctive nature and "bodily function" in his divine appearance and form.

The complex relationship of Adam to God, relationship entailing both resemblance and distinctiveness, parallels the rapport between a statue of a Roman emperor and the emperor himself. The latter relation is analyzed in *Exod. Rab.* 15:17 in terms reminiscent of *Gen. Rab.*

It is as if a beautiful tree was erected in the bath-house, and when the chief of the army with his suite came to bathe, they trampled upon the tree, and all the villagers and everyone else were eager to tread upon it. Some time later, the king sent his bust to that province that they should put up a statue (תבנית) of him, but they could find no wood except that from the tree in that bath-house. The artisans said to the ruler: If you wish to set up the statue (תבנית), you must bring the tree which is in the bath-house, for that is the best there is. They brought it and prepared it thoroughly, and placed it in the hands of a carver, who fashioned the bust on it and placed it within the palace. Then came the ruler and bowed before it; and the general, the prefect, the imperial officers, the legionaries, the people and everybody else did likewise. Then did the artisans say unto them: Yesterday, you were trampling on this tree in the bath-house, and now you are bowing to it. They replied: It is not to the tree that we are bowing, but to the bust of the king engraved thereon. (*Exod. Rab.* 15:17)⁸⁹

The worship of the imperial statue is not directed to its substance, but to its likeness, which is ultimately the emperor's. The relationship of Adam to God, which is also an image-prototype connection, entails that the worship of Adam as God's statue is intrinsically a worship of God. The worship of the image is a veneration of the prototype in its likeness.⁹⁰ This is no more binitarianism than the worship of an ancient Near Eastern god in his statue.⁹¹

⁸⁹ Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. *Exodus*, 181.

⁹⁰ For the ancient Near Eastern roots of this important concept see Niehr, "Search," 77; Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 183-184; E. M. Curtis, "Images in Mesopotamia and the Bible: A Comparative Study," in W. W. Hallo et al., eds., *Scripture in Context III: The Bible in the Light of Cuneiform Literature* (ANETS 8; Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1990), 31-56, here pp. 39-42; W. W. Hallo, "Cult Statue and Divine Image: A Preliminary Study," in W. W. Hallo et al., eds., *Scripture in Context II: More Essays on the Comparative Method* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 11-14. In the ancient Near East the presence of the god in the statue is an indwelling. Niehr notes that a damage to the divine likeness of the statue obstructs the relationship between the statue and its deity and renders the statue uninhabitable for the latter ("Search," 78).

⁹¹ This coincides with Fletcher-Louis's remark that "the worship of a human being

The image is distinct from its prototype in its substance. The worship of the image as entirely equal to the prototype, likeness *and substance*, as the angels venerate Adam in *Gen. Rab.* 8:10 and as the artisans view the cult of the imperial statue, is unwarranted iconologically (in the case of the imperial statue) and theologically (in the case of Adam).

Gottstein has briefly remarked that *Gen. Rab.* 8:10 parallels the Jacob tradition in *Gen. Rab.* 68:12 (one may add *b. Hul.* 91b). He has emphasized that in both texts sleep symbolizes the distinctiveness of humanity from the divine.⁹² It could be added that both texts construct an anthropology centered in the concept of צַלֵּם. In *Gen. Rab.* 8:10 Adam is distinguishable from God not in body or form, but in bodily function. In *Gen. Rab.* 68:12 Jacob's image is identified with the divine כְּבוֹד, while the sleeping patriarch embodies the human *Sterblichkeit* and *Vergänglichkeit*.

The parallelism between the Adamic traditions and the Jacob texts also extends to the motifs of angelic veneration and opposition. In Adamic traditions Adam is venerated as a cultic statue of God. This status is contrasted with the nature of his body, which attracts angelic opposition and ridicule. In Jacob traditions the image of Jacob, which functions as the divine כְּבוֹד, receives the reverence of angels, while the sleeping patriarch is attacked with mockery.⁹³

The association of both Adam and Jacob traditions with R. Hiyya the Elder's school provides a possible traditional bridge between the Adamic and Jacob traditions. R. Hiyya had R. Hoshaya and R. Jannai as pupils. *Gen. Rab.* 68:12 ascribes the controversy concerning the ladder of Jacob (כַּד of Gen 28:12) to R. Hiyya and R. Jannai. In *Gen. Rab.* 8:10 and *Num. Rab.* 4:1 a formulation of the motif of the angelic veneration of Adam and a speculation concerning angelic opposition to Jacob are attributed to the same R. Hoshaya. *b. Hul.* 91b ascribes

as *God's image* need in no way threaten Jewish monotheism" ("The Worship of Divine Humanity," 125).

⁹² "Body," 182, n. 35.

⁹³ The parallelism with Adamic traditions is also evident in a Jacob tradition preserved by Origen (*Commentary on John* II.31; *GCS* 10: 88,23-89,2). The fragment is generally regarded today as part of *The Prayer of Joseph*. In it Uriel reveals to Jacob the latter's heavenly identity: Jacob is the "firstborn (πρωτόγονος) of every living thing" and "the archangel of the power of the Lord and the chief captain among the sons of God (ἀρχαγγελος δυνάμεως κυρίου και ἀρχιχιλίαρχός εἰμι ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ)." Even though he is an angel, Jacob still faces the fierce opposition of Uriel. Uriel's claims for primordality and superiority are reminiscent of the arguments of Satan in his refusal to worship Adam in *L.A.E.* 13-16.

the source of another testimony about the angelic opposition toward Jacob to R. Simeon b. Lakish, the colleague and brother-in-law of R. Johanan (b. Nappaha), the disciple of R. Jannai and R. Hoshaya.

The Adamic/Iconic Value of Jacob and Humanity

A theological bridge between Adamic and Jacob traditions is provided in the Adamic speculation concerning the transmission of the likeness to God from Adam to other humans or the whole humanity. According to this speculation the likeness has not been retained undiminished. One of the consequences of the fall of Adam was the diminishment of the protoplast's original enormous stature and bodily luminosity (cf. *Gen. Rab.* 12:6; *b. Sanh.* 38b etc.). Humanity still retains, although partially, the likeness of the deity. *b. B. Bat.* 58a reads:

R. Bana'ah used to mark out caves. When he came to the cave of Abraham, he found Eliezer the servant of Abraham standing at the entrance. He said to him: What is Abraham doing? He replied: He is sleeping in the arms of Sarah, and she is looking fondly at his head. He said: Go and tell him that Bana'ah is standing at the entrance. Said Abraham to him: Let him enter; it is well known that there is no passion in this world. So he went in, surveyed the cave, and came out again. When he came to the cave of Adam, a voice came forth from heaven saying, Thou hast beholden the likeness of my likeness, my likeness itself thou mayest not behold. . . . R. Bana'ah said: I discerned his [Adam's] two heels, and they were like two orbs of the sun.⁹⁴ Compared with Sarah, all other people are like a monkey to a human being, and compared with Eve Sarah was like a monkey to a human being,⁹⁵ and compared with Adam Eve was like a monkey to a human being, and compared with the Shechinah Adam was like a monkey to a human being. The beauty of R. Kahana was a reflection of [the beauty of Rab; the beauty of Rab

⁹⁴ The passage has a parallel in *Lev. Rab.* 20:2. An English translation that follows the standard Vilna edition is available in Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*. It attributes the saying to Resh Lakish in the name of Simon b. Mennaseyah. A critical edition appeared in Mordecai Marguliot, ed., *Midrash Wayyikra Rabbah* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books, 1972). Marguliot's text ascribes the saying to R. Levi in the name of Simon b. Mennaseyah. The passage also appears in *Eccl. Rab.* 8:2, where it is attributed to R. Levi. For interpretations of the tradition see Aaron, "Shedding Light," 303-314, which is a response to Gottstein, "The Body," 179-181.

⁹⁵ In *Gen. Rab.* 40:5 Sarah has the image (סני"ס) and the beauty of Eve. The tradition, either polemically, against the view attributed to R. Bana'ah, or incidentally, reads in the chain of beauty an undiminished resemblance.

was a reflection of] ⁹⁶ the beauty of R. Abbahu; the beauty of R. Abbahu was a reflection of the beauty of our father Jacob, and the beauty of Jacob was a reflection of the beauty of Adam. (*b. B. Bat.* 58a)

Friedman notes that the Hamburg Codex completes the chain of beauty with: “The beauty of Adam the first was like the beauty of the Divine Presence.”⁹⁷ So do MS Munich 95 and MS Escorial G-I-3, both here and in the parallel *b. B. Met.* 84a. The addition is a logical conclusion to the previous comparison of Adam with the Shekinah. The beauty of Adam, who is created in the image of God, is itself a reflection of the beauty of God.

The last phrase concerning the transmission of beauty from Adam to R. Kahana reflects a complicated editorial process. The phrase appears in a different context in *b. B. Met.* 84a, which omits Rab from the chain of beauty. It is improbable that the tradition has Tannaitic origins in its present form, as it is suggested in the attribution to R. Bana’ah, a Tanna from the early third century. R. Kahana was a late third century Palestinian Amora, disciple of Rab. Rab was a Palestinian Amora from the middle of the third century. R. Abbahu could only be the Caesarean Amora from the late third century. These rabbis flourished after R. Bana’ah. It is, however, highly probable, as Friedman notes,⁹⁸ that the text combines two traditions, an early tradition that only mentioned the Shekinah, Adam, and Jacob, and a later development that added the rabbinic names with the evident intent to extend the transmission of divine resemblance from biblical to rabbinic figures. The present form of the text dates before the sixth century, when the redaction of the Babylonian Talmud was completed. The primary form of the tradition, which mentioned only Adam and Jacob, predates the addition of rabbinic names, which occurred after the activity of R. Abbahu in the late third century.

In the first part of the text, itself of uncertain origin, humans do not retain Adam’s likeness to God in its entirety. The likeness is transmitted partially through history. Abraham, while he is not the perfect icon (דְּיוּקָנָא) of God, still possesses the likeness of the icon (דְּמוּת דְּיוּקָנִי). It is unclear whether the end of the text, concerning the transmission

⁹⁶ The mention of Rab in MS Vat. 115 disrupts the evident intent of the addition to establish a descending line of transmission of beauty from rabbinic authorities to Adam and the Shekinah.

⁹⁷ Friedman, “Graven Images,” 237-238.

⁹⁸ Friedman, “Graven Images,” 236.

of beauty from Adam to Jacob, implies an undiminished resemblance between humanity and God, contrary to the previous imagery about the monkey-to-human transmission of the likeness. The language (cf. 'reflecting' מַעֲיֵן) is ambiguous; it does not attribute any degree to the resemblance. However, Jacob possesses the reflection, complete or partial, of the beauty of Adam.

The reflection of God in the human beauty, likeness, or form, confers the whole humanity the value of representation of the deity. This seems to be a development of the early Second Temple conception of Adam as the equivalent of a pagan cult statue or idol. This development of Adamic traditions is subjected in rabbinic speculations to the ban on icons. *b. Abod. Zar.* 42b-43b attests to a tradition among the last generations of Babylonian Amoraim according to which the making of a portrait of a human is prohibited, since it would be equivalent to making an image of the deity.⁹⁹ The prohibition is supported with an interpretation of מִנִּי of מִנִּי in Exod 20:23 as *nota objecti* ("me") instead of preposition ("with me"). This leads to the reading "You shall not make idols of me." Exod 20:23 is therefore read in conjunction with Gen 1:26. To follow Friedman's thought, while the deity is free to make icons of itself, humanity is still bound not to follow.

The Roman Emperor and His Statues

The speculation that extends Adam's iconic value to humanity is often illustrated with parables about the Roman emperor and his cultic statues. *Lev. Rab.* 34:3 attributes such a parable to Hillel:

Another explanation of the text: If thy brother be waxen poor (Lev 25:25). It bears on what is written in Scripture: The merciful man doeth good to his own soul (Prov 11:17). Hillel the Elder once, when he concluded his studies with his disciples, walked along with them. His disciples asked him: Master, whither are you bound? He answered them: To perform a religious duty. What, they asked, is this religious duty? He said to them: To wash in the bath-house. Said they: Is this a religious duty? Yes, he replied; if the statues (מִנִּי) of kings, which are erected in theatres and circuses, are scoured and washed by the man who is appointed to look after them, and who thereby obtains his maintenance through them—may more, he is exalted in the company of the great of the kingdom—

⁹⁹ The story reappears in *b. Rosh. Hash.* 24b.

how much more I, who have been created in the image and likeness; as it is written, For in the image of God made He man (Gen 9:6). (*Lev. Rab.* 34:3)¹⁰⁰

Hillel lived at the turn of the two eras.¹⁰¹ If the attribution of the teaching to Hillel might be questioned, the antiquity of the theology of bloodshed as an offense against the godhead in its image reaches back to Gen 9:6, which Hillel quotes.¹⁰² John F. Kutsko remarks that Ezekiel's connection between the shedding of human blood and God's withdrawal from the Temple could have the same rationale as Gen 9:6.¹⁰³

Additional sources furnish evidence for the circulation of the tradition regarding the iconic value of humanity and for its association with imperial images in Tannaitic times. In *Mek. R. Ish. (Ba-Hodesh 8)*, a collection of Tannaitic midrashim most probably compiled in the third century,¹⁰⁴ murderers are viewed as guilty of diminishing the image of God and are compared to those who destroy cultic images of kings:

How were the ten Commandments arranged? Five on the one tablet and five on the other. On the one tablet was written: I am the Lord thy God. On opposite it on the other tablet was written: Thou shalt not murder. This tells that if one sheds blood it is accounted to him as though he diminished the divine (likeness)¹⁰⁵ (דְמוּת). To give a parable: A king of flesh and blood entered a province and the people set up portraits (אִיקוֹנוֹת) of him, made images (צִלְמִים) of him, and struck coins in his honor. Later on they upset his portraits (אִיקוֹנוֹתָיו), broke his images (צִלְמוֹ), and defaced his coins, thus diminishing the likeness (בְדִמְיוֹתוֹ) of the king. So also if one sheds blood it is accounted to him as though he had diminished the divine (likeness)¹⁰⁶ (בְדִמְיוֹת). For it is written: Whoso sheddeth

¹⁰⁰ Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. *Leviticus*, 428. The story is retold slightly different in *ʿAbot R. Nat.* B 30.

¹⁰¹ The secondary literature on Hillel is large. One of the newest major additions to it is J. H. Charlesworth and L. L. Johns, eds., *Hillel and Jesus: Comparative Studies of Two Major Religious Leaders* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997).

¹⁰² J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 705; Kutsko, *Between Heaven and Earth*, 72.

¹⁰³ *Between Heaven and Earth*, 70-74.

¹⁰⁴ *Mekhilla de-Rabbi Ishmael* has two critical editions: Jacob Z. Lauterbach, ed. and trans., *Mekhilla de-Rabbi Ishmael* (3 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933), and H. S. Horovitz and I. A. Rabin, eds., *Mekhilla d'Rabbi Ismael* (Jerusalem: Wahrman Books, 1970). The former has an English translation on facing pages.

¹⁰⁵ My correction.

¹⁰⁶ My correction.

man's blood . . . for in the image of God made He man (Gen 9:6). (*Mek. R. Ish. Ba-Hodesh* 8)¹⁰⁷

The parable is also attested in the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*,¹⁰⁸ a Jewish-Christian writing from the beginning of the third century C.E.¹⁰⁹ The theology of the parable is also evident in a paragraph preserved in both recensions of 2 *Enoch* with insignificant manuscript variations. The homogeneity of the manuscripts attests to the presence of the paragraph in the earliest form of the pseudepigraphon, form tentatively dated to the first century C.E.¹¹⁰

The LORD with his own two hands created mankind; and in a facsimile of his own face. Small and great the LORD created. Whoever insults a person's face insults the face of the LORD; whoever treats a person's face with repugnance treats the face of the LORD with repugnance. Whoever treats with contempt the face of any person treats the face of the LORD with contempt. (2 *En.* 44:1-2 shorter recension)¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷ The translation is from Lauterbach, *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*, 2:262. *Exod. Rab.* 30:16 contains a different form of the tradition. The source of the heavenly likeness of humanity is not God, but the angels, and the likeness is limited to Israel. Similarly, *Exod. Rab.* 60:5 attributes to R. Hiyya a saying according to which the whole Israel is the icon of God.

¹⁰⁸ "He who insults the image and the things belonging to the eternal King has the sin reckoned as committed against him in whose likeness the image was made" (3.17.2). The translation is from *ANF* 8:241.

¹⁰⁹ Thus J. Quasten, *Patrology* (3 vols.; Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1990), 1:62.

¹¹⁰ On the date and historical-theological setting of 2 *Enoch* see R. H. Charles and W. R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896); R. H. Charles, "The Date and Place of Writing of the *Slavonic Enoch*," *JTS* 22 (1921): 161-163; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves, 1952); A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," *JJS* 15 (1962): 1-21; S. Pines, "Enoch, Slavonic Book of," *EJ* 6:797-99; M. Scopello, "The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi VIII.1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *VC* 34 (1980): 367-385; A. De Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," in A. Diez Macho, ed., *Apócrifos del AT IV* (Madrid, 1984), 147-202; F. I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP* 1:91-221; idem, "The Second Book of Enoch," *ABD* 516-22; C. Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995); J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1995); P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (JSPSS, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996). Andrei Orlov has kindly sent me a copy of his article "Noah's Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," forthcoming in *Henoch* 26 (2004), in which he argues for a pre-70 C.E. date of the pseudepigraphon.

¹¹¹ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 171.

The text does not exhibit any cognizance of the concept of partial transmission of divine resemblance from Adam to the rest of humankind. The creation of Adam “in the facsimile of God’s own face” has direct and undifferentiated relevance for the treatment of every human face. Humanity retains the likeness of God fully. Any insult addressed to the human face is relationally transmitted to the divine face.

The close connection between Adam and humankind is also attested in the beginning of Sirach 17. The creation of Adam is the creation of the human, ἄνθρωπος.¹¹² The noun is generic. Subsequent references to humanity are plural: αὐτοί. Verse 3 stands to attention: κατ’ εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς. Adam’s divine likeness is reflected upon all humanity.

Mark 12:16-17 (and parallels: Matt 22:20-21, Luke 20:24-25) constitutes a further evidence that the association between the connection of humanity with the deity and the relation of the imperial images (εἰκόν) with the emperor circulates in the first half of the first century C.E.

Gen. Rab. 68:12 uses a similar parable about the Roman emperor to illustrate Jacob’s iconic value. As seen above, *b. B. Bat.* 58a establishes a direct connection of divine resemblance between Jacob and Adam. Jacob has the privileged position of heir of Adam’s divine likeness. The use in the Jacob tradition (*Gen. Rab.* 68:12) of the parable about the Roman emperor, parable previously employed in Adamic traditions, further attests to the connection between the two traditions. An analysis of *Gen. Rab.* 68:12 evinces further connections with Adamic traditions.

It is thou [Jacob], whose features are engraved on high. They [i.e., the angels] ascended on high¹¹³ and saw his features and they descended below and found¹¹⁴ him sleeping. It may be compared¹¹⁵ to a king who sat and judged in a [basilica] (emended text: should read בְּסִילְקִי instead of פְּרֻוֹר); people ascend to the basilica and find him [judging] (emended

¹¹² For the Greek text I have consulted A. Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935).

¹¹³ Although eleven manuscripts contain “on high,” i.e., לְמַעְלָה or a variant, Albeck chooses not to include it in his text (Theodor and Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah*, 788).

¹¹⁴ Several manuscripts have וְיִמְצְאוּ אֶת אֲדָמָהּ or וְיִמְצְאוּ אֶת אֲדָמָהּ instead of וְיִמְצְאוּ אֶת אֲדָמָהּ, which seems to be the original reading. The preference for וְיִמְצְאוּ אֶת אֲדָמָהּ is an obvious attempt to strengthen the parallelism between Jacob and the king, since וְיִמְצְאוּ אֶת אֲדָמָהּ is used for the king.

¹¹⁵ Four manuscripts contain מִשָּׁל, while the others simply introduce the comparison with the preposition לְ.

text: should read דן instead of ישן), they go out to the chamber and find him [sleeping] (emended text: should read ישן instead of דן). (*Gen. Rab.* 68:12)¹¹⁶

There are no major editorial variants of the text, which implies minimal redaction. All the manuscripts read: “It may be compared to a king who sat and judged in a פרוור; people ascend to the בסילקי and find him *sleeping*, they go out to the פרוור and find him *judging*.” Following a remark of Albeck,¹¹⁷ Schäfer notes that, in order to preserve the intended parallelism between Jacob and the emperor, the text must be emended.¹¹⁸ First, the descent should reveal in both cases a sleeping individual. Second, for historical accuracy, בסילקי should be the judgment place.¹¹⁹ The above translation incorporates the necessary emendations.

פרוור¹²⁰ probably has a Persian origin, evident in the biblical form פרבר.¹²¹ Jastrow translates it as “open place, court.”¹²² In the Roman period the term was associated with the Greek πρόθυρον (“vestibule”), association evident in the variant פרוודור. The association added to the original meaning of the term (i.e., “court”) the connotation of outdoor colonnade or portico.¹²³ Porticos were common features of Roman imperial *villae*, large properties or estates in the country (cf. ויוצאין), with houses and subsidiary buildings. The large porticos of the sumptuous *villae* were the preferred places for relaxation.

The story of the emperor serves only as a parable (cf. משל or ל) or an illustration of the duplication of Jacob with his image. The parallelism between Jacob and the emperor is implicit. The journey of the angels between Jacob’s image and Jacob is compared with the journey of the people between the judging emperor and the sleeping emperor.

¹¹⁶ Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. *Genesis*, 626; Theodor and Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah*, 787-788.

¹¹⁷ Theodor and Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah*, 788.

¹¹⁸ Schäfer, *Rivalität*, 205-206.

¹¹⁹ For the judicial function of *basilica*, beside its most popular and less solemn commercial function, see J. B. Ward-Perkins, *Studies in Roman and Early Christian Architecture* (London: Pindar Press, 1994), 448-449. Vitruvius provides an early testimony about the two functions of *basilica*: *De Architectura*, v.1.8 (*qui apud magistratus starent negotiantes in basilica ne impediunt*).

¹²⁰ The manuscripts attest to the following variants: פרוור, פרוור, פרוור, פרוור, פרוודור, פרוודור: Theodor and Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah*, 788.

¹²¹ L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958), 776.

¹²² *Dictionary*, 1218. Levy translates it as *Vorstadt, Vorwerk, or Vorhof* (*Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim* [Berlin, Vienna: B. Harz, 1924]).

¹²³ Thus Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1218; Friedman, “Graven Images,” 235.

The angels ascend (עולים) to Jacob's features, the people ascend (עולים) to the judging emperor. The angels descend and find Jacob sleeping (ומוצאים אותו ישן), the people go out and find the emperor asleep (ומוצאים אותו ישן). As Jacob sleeps down on earth and his image is on high, the emperor sleeps down in his פרווד, while the judgment takes place in a higher location (cf. עולים) in the basilica. The journey of the people between the basilica and the colonnade is fictitious, realistically impossible. The imperial villa was certainly not open to the public. The imagery is most probably the appropriation of a common literary motif of imperial subjects desiring to see the emperor in his entire imperial magnificence. As in the case of Jacob, the sleep of the emperor is a dramatic contrast to his glorious enthronement and the expectations of the people.

The parallelism between Jacob and the emperor entails further connections. The parable does not explicitly mention a portrait or a statue of the emperor. Friedman contends that the imagery refers to "two beings who looked alike, and not one person and his picture," and that it incorporates an apparently familiar motif of "a double vision of the king."¹²⁴ However, the only example that he offers for this motif is from the Hebrew Bible and not from the Roman world.

The parallelism of the parable with the story of Jacob and the fact that the concept of the emperor's presence in his images (based on the common likeness) is widely attested in rabbinic thought, as evinced above, presence that allows for the naming of imperial images as the emperors themselves,¹²⁵ support the possibility that the sleeping emperor is doubled by an imperial image, as Jacob is doubled by his image. A closer analysis of the parable evinces further support for this possibility. The emperor's double in the *basilica* is both judging and sitting (cf. "sat and judged" וישב ודן), which implies enthronement. With the increasing role of *basilicae* in the imperial cult,¹²⁶ role also attested in the Eastern provinces of the empire, statues of the emperors were

¹²⁴ "Graven Images," 235.

¹²⁵ The practice is common in the ancient Near East and ancient Israel (cf. the unqualified use of אלהים for both gods and their statues). It is also common practice in the Roman empire to refer to the worship of an emperor's statue as worship of the emperor. The awareness among rabbis of such a practice in regard to Roman imperial statues is attested in *Lev. Rab.* 34:3. The proximity of a custodian of royal statues to these cult objects ensures for him the company of "the great of the kingdom," i.e., of the emperors.

¹²⁶ E.g., the testimony of Vitruvius (*De Architectura*, v.1.7), which attributes such a role to the basilica he has just built (shortly after 27 B.C.E.).

placed in main apses of *basilicae*. These imperial statues mainly served as objects of the cult of the emperor and constant reminders of the extension of the emperor's absolute judicial powers within the whole Roman territory.¹²⁷ An example is the famous statue of Constantine, which is unfortunately preserved only partially. The statue was built between 315 and 330 C.E. and placed in the basilica of Maxentius (henceforth of Constantine), after Constantine defeated him at the battle of Milvian bridge. The statue was thirty-feet-tall and portrayed Constantine on his curile throne, as an absolute leader and judge.¹²⁸ Most probably Constantine's statue replaced a similar statue of Maxentius, according to the ancient Roman tradition of replacing an opponent's monuments with the victor's.¹²⁹

The parallelism of the image of Jacob with the enthroned king also entails that the former is enthroned. Immediately previous to the parable the text mentions Jacob's "features/image engraved on high" (שאיִקוּנוֹן) (הקוֹקֵה לַמַּעֲלָה).¹³⁰ Two manuscripts¹³¹ do not contain the phrase "on high." One manuscript version adds (to לַמַּעֲלָה) הַכְּבוֹד.¹³² The enthronement of the image of Jacob is consistent with the other texts of the Jacob tradition.

The story of the patriarch sleeping on earth while his image is enthroned in heaven is therefore illustrated with the parable of a Roman emperor. While the emperor sleeps in the sumptuous portico of his *villa*, his enthroned statue sits in the apse of his *basilica*. Jacob's image corresponds to an imperial statue, similarly to Adam's iconic value.

Conclusions

The succinctness of the texts about Jacob's image in heaven does not permit an exhaustive consideration of their sources. However, several

¹²⁷ *Song Rab.* 8:13 contains a Jewish testimony to this function of the royal statues.

¹²⁸ For the statue see J. Elsner, *Imperial Rome and the Christian Triumph: The Art of the Roman Empire AD 100-450* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 61; D. E. E. Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1992), 438-441; S. B. Platner, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), 76-78.

¹²⁹ Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture*, 438.

¹³⁰ Friedman argues that "on high" (לַמַּעֲלָה or לַמַּעֲלָה) is an "epithet for God Himself" ("Graven Images," 235).

¹³¹ Theodor and Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah*, 788.

¹³² *Ibidem*, 788.

conclusions concerning the parallelism of these texts with Adamic traditions can be formulated at the current stage of the research.

First, both traditions demonstrate a similar anthropology and emphasis on humanity as both earthly, dimension identified in both traditions within the functionality of the human body, and heavenly, dimension associated in both traditions with the divine likeness of humanity.

Second, both traditions symbolize the earthly dimension of humanity with sleep.

Third, both traditions express the heavenly dimension of humanity in statuary concepts, through the concept of צֶלֶם in the case of Adam and by means of the equivalent Aramaic terms אִיקוֹנִין and דִּיִּקוֹנָא in the case of Jacob.

Fourth, in both traditions the dichotomy likeness-sleep is associated with the motifs of angelic veneration and opposition. In Adamic traditions Adam is venerated as a cultic statue of God, while his mortality or vulnerability encounters angelic opposition and ridicule. In Jacob traditions the image of Jacob enthroned in heaven receives the reverential admiration of angels, while angels also ridicule and even attack the patriarch asleep on earth.

Fifth, both traditions employ parables about royal images to illustrate the divine iconicity inherent in Adam and Jacob.

Sixth, it can be safely concluded, based on the previous observations, that in Jacob traditions the image of the patriarch functions as a representation of the godhead, as does Adam in Adamic traditions. Jacob's image is defined in terms used in Second Temple literature and early rabbinic literature in regard to Adam's special status as the image of God. Moreover, certain rabbinic traditions regarded Adam's divine resemblance as transmitted to the rest of humanity in a chain of likeness. In this transmission of likeness Jacob has the special status of direct reflection of the beauty of Adam.

A final observation is due. It has been proposed that the Jacob tradition functions as an anti-anthropomorphic method of safeguarding God's transcendence.¹³³ It must be noted that the identification of the כְּבוֹד with a human is previously claimed for Adam in Adamic traditions. The identification is the consequence of a *rapprochement* between Ezek 1:26-28 and Gen 1:26, *rapprochement* facilitated by the conception

¹³³ Halperin, *Faces*, 121, 407.

of the protoplast as the equivalent of an idol. Similarly to Adam, Jacob functions in his identity as the **כבוד** as the equivalent of a pagan cult statue, or, in the terms of *Gen. Rab.* 68:12, of the statues of the Roman emperors. The Jacob tradition therefore bears the anthropomorphic connotations of the concept of **צלם אלהים**.