

METAMORPHOSIS AND ROLE REVERSAL: ANTHROPOMORPHIC DEMONS AND ANGELOMORPHIC HUMANS IN THE LIFE OF ADAM AND EVE

SILVIU N. BUNTA, *University of Dayton, USA*

This paper is primarily a literary analysis of the Life of Adam and Eve corpus (henceforth LAE).¹ It offers a twofold argument. On the one hand, this paper argues that morphic concepts (image, form, likeness, transformation, etc.) constitute the linguistic and thematic hinge of the entire LAE corpus. The pseudepigraphic body of literature builds on this language both with its anthropology and demonology. Not only is the entire corpus particularly interested in the forms in which its *personae* appear, but this leitmotif sets the anthropologic-demonic tension of the entire narrative.

On the other hand, this paper will offer a close analysis of the story of the third temptation of Eve, which is extant only in a particularly short recension of LAE in Slavonic and Romanian manuscripts (henceforth SLAE and RLAE).² According to the Slavonic version, Satan tempts Eve a third time in the image of Adam. To this the Romanian version adds that Satan appears to Eve in the image of an angelomorphic, luminous Adam. The use of the concept of “image” suggests that the story fits neatly into the linguistic and thematic structure of the LAE corpus. Moreover, it is argued here that the story is a direct allusion to the concept that Adam is God’s image and echoes the story of the fall of Satan, although the latter is not extant in either the Romanian or Slavonic version. Furthermore, the reference to the angelomorphic, luminous Adam in the Romanian version is

¹ For succinct introductions to this corpus, see particularly M.E. Stone, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (SBL EJIL 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), and M. de Jonge – J. Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997). Throughout this article (unless noted otherwise) I have used the following editions of LAE: for the Greek texts, J.R. Levison, *Texts in Transition: The Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (SBL EJIL 16; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), and J. Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 2005); for the Latin, W. Meyer, “Vita Adae et Evae,” *Abhandlungen der königlichen Bayerischen Akademie des Wissenschaften, Philosoph.-philologische Klasse* 14 (1878), pp. 185-250; for Armenian, M.E. Stone, *The Penitence of Adam* (CSCO 429-30; Louvain: Peeters, 1981), and also Stone, *Texts and Concordances of the Armenian Adam Literature* (SBL EJIL 12; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), pp. 70-81; for Georgian, the French translation in J.P. Mahé, “Le Livre d’Adam géorgienne de la Vita Adae,” in *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions*, ed. R. van den Broek – M.J. Vermaseren (Leiden, Brill, 1981), pp. 227-260. I have also used, unless otherwise noted, the English translation of these sources in G.A. Anderson – M.E. Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* (2nd ed.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999).

² This particular dissimilarity between the shorter and longer recensions has already been noted by Émile Turdeanu in his *Apocryphes Slaves et Roumains de l’Ancien Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1981), p. 100.

best read within the context of the widespread ancient tradition about Adam's original angelomorphism. This evidence leads to the tentative conclusion that the third temptation of Eve seems to have been part of the larger narrative at early stages of the transmission of the text, when the story of the fall of Satan was still attached to it in one form or another.

Metamorphosis and Role Reversal

Through intricate imagery, parallels, and contrasts, the LAE corpus builds its complex narrative around morphic concepts (likeness, form, image, appearance, transformation, etc.). This leitmotif underlies the entire story of LAE, in all its versions, namely, Greek, Latin, Armenian, Georgian (henceforth GLAE, LLAE, ALAE, and, respectively, GeLAE), Slavonic, and Romanian.³ In this dominant language, characters are formed in certain images and metamorphose into other appearances, for better or worse. Not infrequently, characters change forms and even appropriate someone else's image. While inborn images represent status, often introduced from the perspective of larger structures (angelic world, human world, whole creation etc.), metamorphoses are primarily stories of collapse, restoration, or deceit.

At the center of this morphic leitmotif are Adam and Satan. The parallelism between the destinies of Satan and, respectively, Adam is evident. First, they both fall from their original status. LLAE, ALAE, and GeLAE 16:3 present the two falls as mirror events:

By a trick I cheated your wife and caused you to be expelled (*te expelli*) through her from the delights of your happiness, *just as* I had been expelled (*expulsus sum*) from my glory. (LLAE)
 I prepared a trap for you, so that I might alienate you from your happiness *just as* I, too, had been alienated *because of you*. (ALAE)
 I aimed at hunting you so that I might alienate you [or rather "I made you a stranger": յԵԵԼ] from the paradise of Delights, *just as* I had been alienated [or rather "I had become a stranger": յԵԵԼ] *because of you*. (GeLAE)

Second, the above passages from ALAE and GeLAE emphasize that Satan and Adam owe each other their falls.

Chronologically, the first fall is that of Satan, narrated at length only in LLAE, ALAE, and GeLAE 12-17.⁴ In all three versions the story follows

³ For example, the concepts *imago* and *video* appear no less than 9 and respectively 21 times in Meyer's edition of LLAE.

⁴ On this story, see M.E. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penitence: Three Notes on *The Books of Adam and Eve*," in *Literature on Adam and Eve*, ed. G. Anderson, *et al.* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 43-56; G. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," in *Literature on Adam and Eve*, ed. Anderson *et al.*, pp. 83-110; Anderson, "Ezekiel

the protoplasts' second fall and explains Satan's relentless animosity toward Adam and Eve, which is attributed to the fact that the protoplasts caused Satan's own fall from his angelic status. When Adam was created, archangel Michael brought him before God's face and had him bow down before the divine presence. Michael then summoned all the angels to bow down to Adam, who was created as the "image" of God. All the angels venerated the theomorphic protoplast except Satan and his angels, who disobeyed Michael's command because the first human was "lower" (*deterior*) and "later" (*posterior*) than Satan. The Latin and Georgian versions add Satan's argument that Adam should have rather bowed down to him (*ille me debet adorare*).⁵ John Levison convincingly argues that in this context "the image consists of physical similarity to God."⁶ This physical resemblance enables Adam to function as a cultic statue of God.

The contrast between Satan and Adam in this scene is particularly evident in the Georgian version of the story: "The very day when you were created, on that day I fell from before the *face* (პირის) of God, because when God breathed a spirit onto your *face* (პირის), you had the image and likeness of divinity. And then Michael came; he presented you and made you bend down (თაყუანის) before God. And God told Michael, 'I have created Adam according to (my) image and my divinity.' Then Michael came; he summoned all the troops of angels and told them, 'Bow down (თაყუანის) before the likeness and the image of the divinity'" (GeLAE 13:2-14:1). There is a subtle parallelism in this text between God's face and Adam's. The words "face" (პირის) and "bow down" (თაყუანის) are both used first in relation to God and second in reference to Adam. Thus, as Satan falls from before God's face, God breaths a spirit onto Adam's face. Moreover, Adam "bows down" (თაყუანის) before God's face as all the angels "bow down" (თაყუანის) before Adam. There is also an evident contrast between Adam and Satan. First, Adam is brought before God just as

28, the Fall of Satan, and the Adam Books," in *Literature on Adam and Eve*, ed. Anderson, *et al.*, pp. 133-147; 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), pp. 294-300.

⁵ The opposition of the fallen angels to the worship of the iconic Adam is also recorded in several other Jewish-Christian and Christian sources, such as *Gospel of Bartholomew* 4:52-56 (E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 2 vols., ed. W. Schneemelcher, trans. R.M. Wilson [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963], vol. 1, p. 500), a Coptic text attributed to Peter of Alexandria (W.E. Crum, "Texts Attributed to Peter of Alexandria," *JTS* 4 [1903], pp. 387-97 [396-397]), a Coptic *Encomium on Michael* (in E.W. Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* [London: British Museum, 1915], pp. 904-905), a Coptic *Enthronement of Michael* (C.D.G. Müller, *Die Bucher der Einsetzung der Erzengel Michael und Gabriel* [CSCO 225/226; Louvain: Peeters, 1962], pp. 14-15), the Syriac *Cave of Treasures* (Su-Min Ri, *La Caverne de Trésors. Les deux recensions syriaques* [CSCO 486-487; Louvain: Peeters, 1987]), Origen's *De Principiis* I.V.4-5 (*ANF* 4: 258-260), and Tertullian's *On Patience* 5 (*ANF* 3:709-711).

⁶ J.R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), p. 178.

Satan loses his position before the divine face. Second, the text presents a subtle contrast of movement between the fall of Satan “from before” (-გაბ) the face of God and God’s breathing of the spirit “onto” Adam’s face.

After his fall, Satan becomes in the corpus the image-less transformer par excellence. He appears deceptively in other forms and not in his own. According to GLAE 17:1-2, ALAE and GeLAE 44.17:1-2a, he appears to Eve as an angel during the first temptation. Also all versions that contain the second temptation introduce Satan as appearing in an angelic form (GLAE II 29:12; LLAE, ALAE, and GeLAE 9:1). In the Romanian version of the shorter recension and in both Slavonic recensions he also appears as an angel to the serpent.

The same morphic vocabulary used in the story of the fall of Satan appears also in the scene of the fall of Adam and Eve. In tempting Eve, Satan tells her that the consumption of the forbidden fruit would result in their transformation into godlike or divine beings (ALAE and GeLAE 44.19:1c). Moreover, this opportunity is contrasted with the possibility that, while Eve will attain divine status, Adam will “become like an animal” if she does not share her transformation with him (ALAE and GeLAE 44.19:1c). In the terms of ALAE 44.21:5, in tempting Adam Eve “makes him like her.” GeLAE 44.21:5 records similarly that by falling Adam “becomes like Eve.” In a sense, in his fall Adam is recreated from the image of God into the image of the fallen Eve. The parallelism in vocabulary and focus between the stories of the fall of Satan and of the fall of Adam and Eve may reflect an intension to emphasize the absurdity of Adam’s behavior: The protoplast expects to become what he already is. In sharp contrast to their expectation, in their transformation Adam and Eve become exactly what they wanted to avoid, that is, being like animals.

There is a third fall that, particularly in the Armenian and Georgian versions (ALAE and GeLAE 44.15:1-44.16:4), stands in parallelism with the fall of Satan, namely, the deceit of the serpent. ALAE and GeLAE 44.16:2, in which the animals have to bow down (same verb *თაყუანის* in Georgian) to Adam, recall the angelic veneration of Adam described in the story of Satan’s fall. Moreover, Satan tempts the serpent with the same thoughts that he himself articulated in front of Adam: the serpent is greater than all other animals and he came into being before Adam, therefore he cannot worship one that is lower and later than he. The parallelism between the fall of the serpent and the fall of Satan is also explicitly stated in GLAE 16:3: “Rise up and we [that is, Satan and the serpent] will cause him to be cast out of the Garden, even as we were cast out through him.” Although the fall of Satan is not extant in the Greek manuscripts, Michael Stone argues convincingly that this passage in GLAE makes a clear reference to it.⁷

⁷ Stone, “The Fall of Satan and Adam’s Penitence,” 52-56.

Based on the two mirror falls, that is, the fall of Satan and the fall of the protoplasts, LAE constructs an elaborate reversal of roles and statuses between Adam and Satan. The argument that Satan makes in the Latin and Georgian versions that Adam should have rather bowed down to him and the intricate consonances of GeLAE 13:2-14:1 suggest such a role-reversal. Moreover, in the end Adam is to receive the glory that Satan lost (LLAE 17:1). He “will sit on the throne of him who supplanted him” (*sedebit in throno eius qui eum supplantavit*: LLAE 47:3; also GLAE 39:2-3, ALAE 47:2-3, and GeLAE 47:2-3).

At least two traditions mentioned so far, namely, the role-reversal between Adam and Satan and the veneration of Adam by angels and animals, suggest that in LAE one’s innate form represents status or position, often within larger hierarchies that structure the creation. That the proper order of the world is one of the major foci of LAE becomes particularly clear in GLAE 37:5. In this passage God commands Michael to take Adam into the third heaven to rest until “that great day of the *oikonomia* that I will establish in the world” (τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης τῆς μεγάλης τῆς οἰκονομίας ἣς ποιήσω εἰς τὸν κόσμον). Most Latin manuscripts of this passage suggest that the proper order mentioned here is the exaltation of Adam to the place that Satan lost: “He [that is, Adam] will sit on the throne of him who supplanted him.”⁸ It is significant that *supplanto* does not simply convey treachery, but it also implies a disturbance in the right functioning of things, an uprooting of the proper order.⁹ There is an obvious moral or ethical aspect to the complex morphic vocabulary of LAE. The transformations of the characters are blatant violations of the stability and boundaries that God set in the world.

Several scenes in the LAE corpus serve more or less subtly as illustrations of this proper order of the world and/or its post-lapsarian disarray. The story of the encounter with the beast is an evident example. It is extant in all text-forms. That the story is primarily about the godlike or iconic status of humanity is established in its first lines. In all versions Eve expresses her indignation at the beast’s desire to devour Seth and refers to humanity’s status as the image of God:

You wicked beast, do you not fear to fight with the image (εἰκὼν) of God? (GLAE 10:3)

O cursed beast, why are you not afraid to cast yourself at the image (*imago*) of God, but dare to fight against it? (LLAE 37:3)

O wild beast, how do you not fear the image (უჟაჟიერ) of God, that you dared to fight with the image of God? (ALAE 37.10:3)

⁸ The Latin section has parallels in GLAE 39:2-3, ALAE 47.39:2-3, and GeLAE 47.39:2-3.

⁹ A recently published manuscript contains a text closer to the Greek: *Pone eum in paradiso in tertio caelo usque in diem dispensationis qui dicitur economia quando faciam omnibus misericordiam per dilectissimum filium meum* (J. Pettorelli, “Vie latine d’Adam et d’Ève. La recension de Paris, BNF, lat. 3832,” *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 57 [1999], pp. 5-52).

O evil beast, have you no fear? Did you dare to fight the image (ԵՅԵՅ) of God? (GeLAE 37.10:3)
 O beast, aren't you afraid before the image (ՕԵՐԱՅԱ) of the divine countenance? (SLAE 14)

The Greek, Armenian, and Georgian text-forms associate the concept of image specifically with the issue of proper hierarchy and subjection:

How did you not call to mind *your subjection*? For long ago you were made *subject to the image of God*. (GLAE 10:3)
 Or how have you not recalled *the first order of God* and have opened your mouth *against the image (ԵՅԵՅ) of God*? (GeLAE 37.10:3)
 How did you not remember *the obedience which you formerly displayed*, that your mouth was opened *against the image (ԱՂԱՍԻԿԷՐ) of God*? (ALAE 37.10:3).

In the Greek version in particular the answer to Eve's question lies in the post-lapsarian dislocation of the world order. Specifically, Eve subjected herself to beasts in accepting the guidance of the serpent: "Then the beast cried out and said: It is not our concern, Eve, your greed and your wailing, but your own; for (it is) from you that the rule of the beasts has arisen. How was your mouth opened to eat of the tree concerning which God commanded you not to eat of it? On this account, *our nature (φύσις) also has been transformed*" (GLAE 11:1-2). The vulnerability of humanity in front of animals seems to be a consequence of the fall. Another passage in the Greek text records the tradition succinctly: "The beasts, over whom you [Adam] ruled, shall rise up in rebellion against you, for you have not kept my commandment" (GLAE 24:4). This new situation contrasts sharply with the fact that in the beginning all animals obeyed Adam and Eve, tradition that the corpus introduces repeatedly (see particularly SLAE 1:1).

The Georgian version of the encounter with the beast expresses the post-lapsarian disarray of the world in morphic language: "Then the beast replied to her and told Eve, 'It is not from our greed(iness) that your discontent and your weeping come, but your discontent and your weeping come from your own greed(iness), for at the beginning of creation, it was you who hearkened to the beast, the serpent. How did you dare to open your mouth and eat of the tree of which God had commanded you not to eat? (It is) you, (because of) whom *the aspect [სახე] of everything has changed*'" (GeLAE 38.11:1-2). სახე means not only "aspect," but it can also be translated as "face" and "image." In the immediately preceding paragraph (GeLAE 37.10:3) humanity is defined as the "image of God." The implication seems to be that the deformation of Adam's divine "image" results in the deformation of the "image" of the entire creation. The fall of Adam and Eve amounts to a violation of the pre-established boundaries of the world with cosmic repercussions.

A much more subtle illustration of the violation of the cosmic order lies in the protoplasts' search for food. Stone has previously observed that food plays a major role in the LAE corpus.¹⁰ Food is one of the foremost problems that beset Adam and Eve on their expulsion from paradise. In the legend of the cheirograph Satan intervenes in the protoplasts' attempts to solve this problem.¹¹ The protoplasts' post-lapsarian search for food (e.g., LLAE 3:1-4:3) contrasts with the abundance of food before the fall.

The Third Temptation of Eve

The story of the third temptation of Eve is extant only in a particularly short recension of LAE in Slavonic and Romanian manuscripts. There is still no critical edition of the shorter recension of SLAE.¹² The only manuscripts published to date are those belonging to the Russian and Ukrainian groups.¹³ Even the published manuscripts have received little to no interest from current scholarship.¹⁴ The prevailing disinterest in the shorter recension is probably due to the fact that Vatroslav Jagić, the first editor of the longer recension, dismissed the shorter version as a mere abbreviation of the longer text.¹⁵

¹⁰ Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penitence," p. 55; Stone, *The Penitence of Adam*, pp. 430.xiii-xiv.

¹¹ M.E. Stone, "The Legend of the Cheirograph of Adam," in *Literature on Adam and Eve*, ed. Anderson, et al., pp. 149-166 (150, n. 4). On this legend see particularly M.E. Stone, *Adam's Contract with Satan: The Legend of the Cheirograph of Adam* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002).

¹² The longer recension is known to date in eight manuscripts. For a list of all known manuscripts, see Turdeanu, *Apocryphes*, pp. 82-85. Only two of these manuscripts (C¹ and AS) are still unpublished. The others appeared in: N.S. Tihonravov, Памятники отреченной русской литературы (2 vols.; Санкт-Петербург, Москва, 1863), vol. 1, pp. 6-15 (manuscript *t*); V. Jagić, "Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apocryphen, I: Die altkirchenslavischen Texte des Adambuches," *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philos.-hist. Klasse* 42 (1893), pp. 1-104 (*m, belg, n*, and, only in a compiled list of variations, *P*); I. Ivanov, *Bogomilski knigi i legendi* (Sofia, 1925) (*P* in its entirety and the variants of *S*). I consulted the latter work in its French translation, J. Ivanov, *Livres et légendes bogomiles: Aux sources du catharisme* (trans. M. Ribeyrol; Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 1976).

¹³ The Russian manuscripts *pp* and *tr* are published in Tihonravov, Памятники отреченной русской литературы, vol. 1, pp. 298-304, and respectively vol. 1, pp. 1-6. Manuscript *pp*¹ is published in A. N. Рурин, Памятники старинной русской литературы (3 vols.; Санкт-Петербург, 1860-1862), vol. 3, pp. 4-7. For a complete list of the manuscripts and their publications see Turdeanu, *Apocryphes*, pp. 95-96, and Stone, *Adam's Contract with Satan*, pp. 117-119.

¹⁴ For a recent list of the few studies on SLAE, see A.A. Orlov, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 8-9.

¹⁵ Jagić, "Slavische Beiträge," p. 17.

The only eight known manuscripts of RLAE preserve solely the shorter recension.¹⁶ The oldest is ms 469, which dates from the first quarter of the seventeenth century.¹⁷ However, Nicolae Cartoian notes that most probably the text is not an autograph, but only a copy of a translation from Slavonic made in the sixteenth century, if not earlier.¹⁸ Manuscript 469 is also the only one to have been published, but only partially. In 1883 Moses Gaster published the final seven folios (400r-407r) of the text in its original Cyrillic characters.¹⁹

Both the Slavonic and Romanian shorter recensions differ from all other versions of LAE in containing a third temptation story. The longer Slavonic recension only contains the story of a second temptation of Eve:

³⁵ But I, my children, said to your father [Eve said to Adam], “Arise, my husband, pray to God, that he deliver us from the devil, for you suffer so on my account.” But Adam said to me, “Eve, now you feel such remorse over your error, that you will listen to my heart, for God created you from my rib. We will fast for forty days, perhaps the Lord will pity us and leave for us understanding and a portion of life.” I said, “My husband, you fast forty days, and I will fast forty-four days.” ³⁶ And Adam said to me, “Come to the river called Tigris, take a stone and place it under your feet, stand up in the water and cover yourself with water, as with a coat up to the neck, and pray to God in your heart, but no word should come out across your lips.” And I said, “My husband, I will call out to God with my whole heart.” (And Adam said to me, “Guard yourself carefully; *if you don’t see me and all my features* (АЩЕ НЕ ВЪДЪИШИ МЕНЕ И ВСЕ ВЪЛЪГЫ МОЕ), don’t climb up out of the water, give

¹⁶ Turdeanu knew of only five manuscripts, namely BAR 469 (384r-407r), 1255 (18r-18v), 2158 (9r-12r), 3813 (91r-101v), and 5299 (1r-6r) (*Apocryphes*, 104-110). Now I can add to Turdeanu’s list three other manuscripts, all in BAR, namely, 3275 (1r-5v), 5022 (208r-212v), and respectively 5916 (14v-23v).

¹⁷ Turdeanu, *Apocryphes*, p. 106; M. Gaster, *Chrestomathie roumaine* (2 vols.; Leipzig-Bucarest: Brockhaus-Socecu, 1891), vol. 1, p. 63; Gaster, “Texte române inedite din sec. XVII,” *Revista pentru istorie, arheologie și filologie* 1 (1883), pp. 70-80 (74); N. Cartoian, *Cărțile populare în literatura românească* (2 vols.; București: Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1929, 1938), vol. 1, pp. 49, 57.

¹⁸ Cartoian, *Cărțile populare*, vol. 1, p. 57. The fact that I found the text to have been produced by two different hands supports Cartoian’s suggestion. One hand copied folios 384r to 393r. The handwriting is askew and untidy. Another copyist produced the second half of the text, in a neat penmanship. It is highly unlikely that this variation would occur in an original translation. In the following analysis of RLAE I will rely primarily on this manuscript.

¹⁹ M. Gaster, “Texte române inedite din sec. XVII,” *Revista pentru istorie, arheologie și filologie* 1 (1883), pp. 78-80. He reprinted the same fragment of the text in his *Chrestomathie roumaine* (2 vols.; Leipzig-Bucarest: Brockhaus-Socecu, 1891), vol. 1, pp. 63-65. Gaster also introduced the text in *Literatura populară română* (București: Ig. Haimann, 1883), pp. 271-274.

no credence to words, so that you won't get into any more trouble.”)²⁰ And Adam went to the Jordan and stood up in the water and immersed himself in water and also dampened the hair on his head.³⁷ While he prayed to God and his prayers went up, the angels assembled themselves and every flying creature, the wild and the domestic and every winged bird, and they stood as a wall around Adam, while they entreated God for him.³⁸ The devil came to Eve *in the form [and radiance] of an angel (АГГЕЛКИМЪ ОБРАЗЪМ И СВѢТЛОСТІЮ)*, there where I stood in the water,²¹ letting passionate tears fall to the ground, he said to me [to Eve], “Come forth, Eve, out of the water, God has heard your prayer and also we angels, we who prayed for you, and the Lord has sent me to you, that your should emerge from this water.”³⁹ And I [Eve] discerned that he was the devil, and answered him nothing at all. But when after forty days, Adam emerged from the Jordan, he noticed the footprints of the devil and was very afraid lest the devil had duped me [Eve]. But when he saw me [Eve] standing in the water, he was very happy. And he took me [Eve] and led me [Eve] out of the water (SLAE 35-39).²²

The same general storyline exists, with some variations, in the other versions of the longer recension, namely, GLAE, LLAE, ALAE, and, respectively, GeLAE.²³

The shorter Slavonic version contains a story that is in major points close to the one in the longer recension.²⁴ However, the narrative in the

²⁰ The whole phrase (“And Adam said to me, ‘Guard yourself carefully; *if you don't see me and all my features*, don't climb up out of the water, give no credence to words, so that you won't get into any more trouble.”) follows *belg*. It is lacking in manuscript *m*.

²¹ The phrase “and radiance” (И СВѢТЛОСТІЮ) is replaced in *belg* and *n* by “where I stood in the water” (ИДЕЖЕ СТОЯХЪ ВЪ ВОДѢ).

²² The translation is the one published in Anderson – Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 7E-13E. Between brackets are the different readings of manuscript *m*. For these differences I consulted the critical text of Jagić, “Slavische Beiträge,” pp. 94-95.

²³ In contrast to the Slavonic recension, the Latin, Georgian, and Armenian versions begin the story with a dialogue between Adam and Eve. In this passage Adam asks Eve about the manner in which and for how long she would like to repent (ALAE and GeLAE only) and Eve tells Adam to determine himself the number of days and the severity of their penitence (in all three versions). Also in contrast to the Slavonic text, in the Greek, Georgian, and Armenian sources the penitence of the protoplasts is 40 and, respectively, 34 days long. The Latin text has 37 days instead of 34. Moreover, no other version of the story mentions Adam's request that Eve should only come out of the water if she sees him. However, similarly to the Slavonic, all other texts mention the standing of Eve on a stone and the fact that her prayer is to be soundless. Also, all other texts mention the protective wall of angels and animals around Adam, although in these versions they do so at the bequest of Adam. In further agreement with the Slavonic text, the other versions also mention the appearance of Satan/Devil in the form of an angel. However, only in the Latin, Armenian, and Georgian texts the devil promises Eve the nourishment on account of which Eve repents. In these sources and in the Greek text, in sharp contrast to the Slavonic version, Satan is successful and deceives Eve a second time.

²⁴ I follow here the texts of manuscripts *pp* (Тихонравов, Памятники, p. 301), *tr* (Тихонравов, Памятники, pp. 4-5), and *pp'* (Рурин, Памятники, vol. 3, pp. 5-6).

shorter recension departs from the longer recension in several aspects.²⁵ More significantly, there is no specific mention of the devil being in the “form” or “image” of an angel, as in the longer recension, although this seems to be implied; the devil approaches Eve “luminous like an angel” (*АКЫ АНГЛЪ СВѢТЛЪ*).²⁶ However, the most significant difference between the longer and the shorter recension lies in the fact that the latter contains a third temptation of Eve. Manuscript *pp* reads as follows: “And again he came on the third day and made himself into the image of Adam (*СЪТВОРИСЯ АДАМОВЫМЪ ОБРАЗОМЪ*). And much he beguiled me. I did not get out until I saw the sign (*ЗНАМА*) that Adam told me.”²⁷ Eve does not believe that Adam is her husband until he shows her the sign (*ЗНАМА*) that he made for her. The sign that Adam makes for Eve is never identified. The passage seems to imply at first that the sign is the appearance of Adam himself. However, in his third temptation the devil still cannot beguile Eve even though he comes to her in the shape of Adam. Therefore, one is left to assume that the sign could be a distinguishing mark of Adam that even the devil’s deception could not replicate.

The oldest manuscript of the Romanian version, ms 469, contains the same stories of the second and third temptations, but with some variations:

And I said to Adam: “My lord, let us repent so that maybe God will deliver us from this devil.” Adam said that we fast 40 days. I said to him: “Lord, you fast 40 days, and I will fast 44.” And he told me: “Enter into the water of the Tigris and hold a stone on your head and another under your feet and enter into the water up to the neck. And do not listen to anyone so that no one will trick you again.” “Make me a hidden sign.” And he told me: “Do not come out of the water until I will come to you.” And he stood up and went to the Jordan to make penitence. There gathered all the animals and the birds and multitudes of angels to cry for Adam. Adam immersed himself completely in the water of the Jordan and there he spent 40 days. And the devil came to me, luminous like an angel, and was shedding tears all the way to the ground. And he told me: “O, Eve! God heard your prayer and he heeded us, his angels, praying for you and, lo, God sent me now to you so that you may come out of the water.” And I did not believe him. And he came back on the

²⁵ The shorter recension does not make the distinction between the fast of Adam and that of Eve. It simply records that Adam proposes a fast of 40 days, a proposal that both follow. Eve is to hold a stone on her head (*ПОЛОЖИ КАМЕНЬ НА ГЛАВѢ СВОЕЙ*), while placing another under her feet. There is no mention of Eve praying in her heart, without words. Adam makes a hidden sign (*И СОТВОРИ МИ ЗНАМА/ЗНАМЕНИЕ СОКРОВЕНО*) by which Eve could know when she is to come out of the water: “Do not come out (of the water) until I will come” (*НЕ ИЗИДИ ДОНДЕЖЕ АЗЪ НЕ ПРИИДУ*).

²⁶ Thus *pp* (in Tihonravov, Памятники, p. 301); no substantial variations in *tr* (Tihonravov, Памятники, p. 4).

²⁷ I followed here the text of *pp* (in Tihonravov, Памятники, p. 301). Manuscript *tr* presents no substantial variations (Tihonravov, Памятники, p. 5).

third day, as luminous as before. And he made himself into Adam's image. And he tried so much to trick me, but I did not come out of the water until I saw the sign that Adam made for me. If Adam spent the 40 days, he emerged from the Jordan and, on his way to me, met the devil heading my way and he was very afraid, thinking that the devil had duped me. But seeing me in the water he was very glad. When he came, I did not believe he was my lord until he showed me the sign that he made for me. Then I emerged from the water and believed that he was my lord. And then God saved us from that devil.²⁸

This text coincides with the shorter Slavonic recension in several elements.²⁹ More importantly, as in the shorter Slavonic recension, there is no specific mention of the devil being in the "image" of an angel. Furthermore, in agreement with the shorter Slavonic recension and in contrast to the longer version, the Romanian text contains a third temptation of Eve.

However, several differences from the shorter Slavonic recension are also evident.³⁰ More importantly, in the account of the third temptation, the devil does not simply appear "in the image of Adam," as in the Slavonic version (АДАМОВЫМ ОБРАЗОМ), but in the image of a luminous or angelomorphic Adam; he appears "in the image of Adam" (*în chipul lui Adam*), but he is also "luminous as before" (*luminat ca și înainte*), that is, as he emerged in the second temptation, when he took the luminous appearance of an angel.

A linguistic note is necessary.³¹ *Luminat*, which I translated here as "luminous," is morphologically a perfect participle (from the Latin *luminatus*), and in a literal translation it should be rendered with the passive "illuminated." However, the Romanian perfect participle inherits the complexity of the Latin verbal adjective in *-to-*.³² The Latin adjective in *-to-* is incorporated into the verbal system as a participle form. This Latin

²⁸ This is my own translation of manuscript 469 f. 395v-399r. This passage is not part of Gaster's edition ("Texte române inedite din sec. XVII," pp. 78-80; Gaster, *Chrestomathie roumaine*, vol. 1, pp. 63-65).

²⁹ To add here only a few, Eve is to hold a stone on her head, while placing another under her feet (*tine o piatră în capul tău iară alta supt picioarele tale*). There is no mention of Eve praying in her heart, without words. Adam makes a hidden sign (*sămn ascuns*) by which Eve could know when she is to come out of the water: "Do not come out (of the water) until I will come" (*nu eși până nu oi veni eu la tine*). The devil first comes to Eve "luminous like an angel" (*luminos ca un înger*).

³⁰ Just like the longer Slavonic recension and unlike the shorter recension, the Romanian version has Eve's fast as 44 days long. Also, Adam actually meets the devil on his way toward Eve and does not only see his footprints, as in the Slavonic text.

³¹ I have made this point previously, in the author's "One Man (φως) in Heaven: Adam-Moses Polemics in the Romanian Versions of the *Testament of Abraham* and Ezekiel the Tragedian's *Exagoge*," *JSP* 16 (2007), pp. 139-165 (143-144).

³² The Latin adjective in *-to-* most probably originates in Indo-European non-verbal formations that acted completely independent from the verbal system and did not support the verbal morphosyntactic variations.

participle in *-to-* expresses states defined by actions or achieved through actions, denoting “non seulement l’état acquis..., mais encore l’action passé.”³³ The participle is therefore part of the *perfectum* aspect and may be both passive (*porta clausa*, “door that has been closed”) or active (*adultus*, “that has matured” or *qui adoleuit*), even agentive (*haec adeptus, morem secutus*).³⁴ Virtually all Romance languages have inherited the active aspect of the Latin perfect participle. Contemporary Romanian contains the following expressions: *om citit* (“one that has read extensively”), *om învățat* (“one that has studied”).³⁵ English supports similar expressions, such as “learned person” (“one that has learnt or studied”), although these have become increasingly obsolete. Therefore, given the context of the apparition of Satan as *luminat* and the active use of the “passive” participle in Romanian, it is most probable that the text intends to describe Satan as luminous rather than illumined.

To go back to the story itself, based on its plot the third temptation of Eve falls neatly into the whole narrative of LAE constructed on morphic concepts. Here, like in most of his appearances throughout the LAE corpus, Satan does not appear in his own form, but in somebody else’s. As noted above, in all versions of LAE Satan appears as an angel during the first and second temptations of Eve (GLAE 17:1-2; 29:12; ALAE and GeLAE 44.17:1-2a; LLAE, ALAE, and GeLAE 9:1). In the Romanian version and in both Slavonic recensions he also appears angelic when he approaches the serpent.³⁶

However, with rare exceptions, in these stories Satan’s newly acquired appearance is not described by means of εἰκών, *imago*, պատկեր, or бѣсѣ. These terms rather seem to be reserved for Adam’s innate form, his paradisiacal identity. For Satan’s metamorphoses GLAE 17:1-2 and 29:12a use εἶδος and σχῆμα. ALAE 44.17:1-2a and 9:1 use “form” (կերպ) and “likeness.” GeLAE 44.17:2a uses “likeness” (մեծցեսեց).³⁷ In contrast to these other texts, which commonly avoid the use of “image” in reference to Satan’s transformations, both the Romanian and Slavonic shorter recensions describe Satan during the third temptation of Eve as being “in

³³ A. Ernout – F. Thomas, *Syntaxe Latine* (2nd ed.; Paris: Klincksieck, 1953), p. 276.

³⁴ Ernout – Thomas, *Syntaxe Latine*, pp. 276-277. Given this active-passive flexibility, forms such as *potus* accommodate more than one possible interpretation; it could mean “one that has drunk” or “one that has been drunk.”

³⁵ *Gramatica limbii române* (2nd ed., 2 vols.; București: Editura Academiei, 1963), vol. 1, p. 230.

³⁶ SLAE 9 (Jagić, “Slavische Beiträge,” p. 86); for the shorter recension, see *pp* (in Tihonravov, Памятники, p. 298) and *tr* (Tihonravov, Памятники, p. 2: АКО АНГЕЛЪ ЕСТЬ). The Romanian manuscript 469 has “Șarpele deaca văzu pre diavol îi păru și lui că iaste înger” (f. 387r). The other versions do not record the angelic apparition of Satan to the serpent.

³⁷ The only exceptions are GeLAE 9:1 and 44.17:1, noted above, and some recensions of SLAE 19 and 38. It is possible that the use of “image” in the Slavonic second temptation is due to the mergence of this story with the third temptation. Moreover, one should also keep in mind that the Slavonic term may be used quite loosely.

the image of Adam” (АДАМОВЫМ ОБРАЗОМ, *în chipul lui Adam*). In an ironical twist of characters Satan takes on the “image” of Adam. The use of “image” here does not seem accidental. This point is further supported by the fact noted above, that, unlike the longer Slavonic recension, which has Satan in the “image” of an angel during the first and second temptations (АГГЕЛКИМЪ ОБРАЗОМ), both the shorter Slavonic recension and the Romanian version avoid the use of “image” in relation to Satan’s angelic appearances. In both recensions Satan only takes on the “image” when he appropriates the form of Adam. This use of “image” in the third temptation narrative is, I would suggest, a direct allusion to the concept that Adam is God’s image. Furthermore, it seems to echo the story of the fall of Satan. Although the fall of Satan is not related in either of the two shorter recensions, their attribution of the “image” of Adam to Satan is an ironical allusion to Satan’s claim in this story to be superior to the protoplast, the “image” of God. Now Satan takes on the form that he refused to worship in the first place. To add to this parallelism, the Latin and Georgian versions of the fall of Satan mention Satan’s argument that Adam should have rather bowed down to him (*ille me debet adorare*). It seems reasonable to assume that the third temptation narrative was built on a certain knowledge or awareness of the story of the fall of Satan.

Furthermore, in the Romanian version Satan is also “luminous” or angelomorphic “as before” (*luminat ca și mainte*). In this version the status of the two competing *personae* is fully reversed: Satan, a fallen angel, appropriates the form of an angelic human, Adam, his archenemy. Moreover, the Romanian version also echoes the ancient tradition about Adam’s original angelomorphism, which has been amply documented in previous scholarship.³⁸ Scholars have also previously noted that the original angelomorphism of the protoplast is implied in the LAE corpus at least in two instances. Thus, LLAE 4:2, ALAE 4:2, and GeLAE 4:2 mention that

³⁸ To cite only a few studies: C. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 153-155; C. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), pp. 140-145; Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 88-135; J. Fossum, “The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis,” in *Geschichte, Tradition, Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), vol. 1, pp. 529-539; S. Niditch, “The Cosmic Adam: Man as Mediator in Rabbinic Literature,” *JJS* 34 (1983), pp. 137-146; A. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), pp. 108-115; P. Schäfer, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975); B. Barc, “La taille cosmique d’Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois premiers siècles après J.-C.,” *RSR* 49 (1975), pp. 173-185; J. Jervell, *Imago Dei: Gen 1:26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulischen Briefen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), pp. 99-100, 105-107; W.D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (London: SPCK, 1948), pp. 45-46; A. Altmann, “The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends,” *JQR* 35 (1945), pp. 371-391.

Adam and Eve ate angelic food in paradise.³⁹ Moreover, according to ALAE 44.21:2 Adam was adorned with great glory before his fall.

Conclusions

The cumulative evidence presented in this study leads to two tentative conclusions. First and more generally, the entire LAE corpus seems to build its complex narrative around morphic concepts (image, form, likeness, transformation, etc.), which act as the linguistic and thematic hinge of the story. Particularly, the pseudepigraphic body of literature builds on this language its anthropology and demonology. The human and angelic *personae* of the story are formed in certain images and metamorphose into other appearances, for better or worse. Moreover, the morphic language sets the anthropologic-demonic tension of the entire narrative. Satan falls because of Adam's "image" status, and, in turn, he is particularly known to appropriate someone else's image, including Adam's, in order to beguile the first humans.

Second, the tradition recorded in the shorter Slavonic and Romanian recensions of LAE, according to which Satan tempts Eve a third time "in the image of Adam" (in the Slavonic text) or in the "image" of an angelomorphic Adam (in the Romanian text), seems connected to the thematic hinge of the entire LAE corpus. Moreover, the use of "image" here seems intentional and appears to allude to the concept that Adam is God's image and to echo, in an ironical twist, the story of the fall of Satan, although the latter is no longer extant in the Slavonic and Romanian manuscripts. It seems reasonable to assume that the third temptation story was built at an early stage of the transmission of the text, when the story of the fall of Satan was still part of the larger narrative. This tentative conclusion is further supported by the reference to an angelomorphic Adam in the Romanian version. This echoes the ancient tradition about Adam's original angelomorphism and corresponds to allusions to the protoplast's angelic nature in other versions of LAE. The thesis advanced here supports the antiquity of the third temptation story in line with the insightful remark of Marinus de Jonge and Johannes Tromp about the recent scholarship on LAE: "It has rightly become less natural to assume that an old, more primitive stage in a writing's development is intrinsically more important than later stages, especially if one acknowledges (as the present authors do) that later stages of the writing may contain traditions that are older than the earlier stages of the writing which do not contain those traditions."⁴⁰

³⁹ E.g., Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism*, p. 19; Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, pp. 141-142.

⁴⁰ De Jonge – Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve*, p. 65.