

Margaret Barker

## Temple Imagery In Philo: An Indication Of The Origin Of The Logos?

Originally published in W. Horbury, ed, *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel* (JSOT Press: Sheffield, 1991), pp. 70-102.

Philo's Logos is a perennial problem. As we know, Philo was presenting his Judaism in Greek terms; much has been written on the Greek elements in his work and the philosophies to which he related his Judaism. But has that Judaism been correctly described? Where in it did Philo find any basis for his Logos? It is hard to accept Wolfson's view of the Logos:

It is a matter of indifference to us whether in Judaism before the time of Philo the personification of the term Logos meant that the Word of God was already considered as a real being created by God or whether its personification was merely a figure of speech.<sup>1</sup>

He clearly describes a separate heavenly being, and this sets a problem for orthodox monotheism. Thus A.F. Segal says of Philo's doctrine:

In doing this he has an entirely different emphasis than the rabbis. He is clearly *following* the Greek philosophers. Like them he is reluctant to conceive of a pure eternal God who participates directly in the affairs of the corruptible world. So he employs a system of mediation by which God is able to reach into the transient world, act in it, fill it as well as transcend material existence without implying a change in his essence.<sup>2</sup>

But was he following the philosophers? Was he not rather relating his own faith to their ideas and describing it in their

71

terms? Why, for example, if his Logos resembles Aristotle's *nous* is it not Aristotle's *nous*? Time and again there seem to be restraints on what he can say. What were they? Something must have defined and determined what he thought. Bousset recognized that he brought the Logos

---

<sup>1</sup> H. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (2 vols.; Cambridge, MA, 1948).

<sup>2</sup> A.F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven* (Leiden, 1978), p. 165 (my italics).

to the philosophies because it was 'through and through a mythological figure', but we have come some distance from his suggestion that the Logos derived from the Hermes-Thoth figure of the Hellenic-Egyptian mysteries.<sup>3</sup> The search is now conducted among the angel mediators who appear in the writings of the so-called intertestamental period.

The Logos was a 'second God'; Philo says so (*Quaest. in Gen.* 62) and elsewhere he is careful to define what he means (*Som.* 228). Our habit of reading back into first-century Judaism the orthodoxies of the later rabbis has led us to discount the possibility that a second God could have had a place within his Judaism. Philo was an acknowledged leader of the great Jewish community in Alexandria, and it is unlikely that he could have *invented* a second God and still retained any credibility, let alone led their embassy to the Emperor. I propose to bring to Philo neither the Greek philosophies to which he related his Judaism, nor a reconstruction of the first-century situation based on later ideas of orthodoxy (which went to great lengths to deny any notion of a second power in heaven),<sup>4</sup> but the hypothesis that it was the ideas of the apocalyptists, and the temple imagery from the royal cult surviving in their writings which *formed the basis of most of Philo's descriptions of the Logos.*

There is now a renewed interest in the angels of pre-Christian Judaism, especially in the Great Angel, the Son of Man figure.<sup>5</sup> There are various theories as to its origin and therefore its importance; the most significant, I believe, was Dix's when he saw in the Great Angel a later development of the

72

Angel of the Presence of Yahweh.<sup>6</sup> The compound nature of the Great Angel is one of the more puzzling features, but if all seven archangels (or all four, there are variant traditions) were aspects of the one Great Angel, just as we know the later angels had many names, then we should perhaps have the beginning of an understanding.<sup>7</sup> It is unsympathetic and unwise to read the angelophanies too critically; while it may be interesting for us to make minute comparisons and see which angels had glowing feet or wore turbans, the clear impression

---

<sup>3</sup> W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (ET; Abingdon, Nashville, 1970), pp. 399, 391 respectively.

<sup>4</sup> This is the theme of Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. C. Rowland, *The Open Heaven* (London, 1982); J.E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord* (WUNT 36; Tubingen, 1985); L.W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord* (London, 1988).

<sup>6</sup> G.H. Dix, 'The Seven Archangels and the Seven Spirits', *JTS* 28 (1927), pp. 233-50.

<sup>7</sup> Segal (*Two Powers in Heaven*, p. 131) mentions a rabbinic debate on Gen. 19.24, the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah. The name Yahweh appears twice; R. Judah said one of the occurrences referred to Gabriel. 'NNT hile Gabriel was not considered a separate independent power by the rabbis, the tradition attests, to the existence of exegeses which allowed the tetragrammaton to signify a being other than Israel's one God.'

given is that the same angel is intended in each case. Points of similarity in the descriptions are not due to slavish copying of an earlier account. Those who had or described the experience of the Angel are unlikely to have checked carefully all previous references. Such descriptions were traditional and traditional forms would naturally have been used. To read the accounts sympathetically we must read them as we might, say, the accounts of visions of Mary. Those who have had such experiences almost certainly have been influenced in their descriptions by earlier accounts of such visions. All the descriptions are broadly similar and recognizable even though details differ. No one would suggest that they were visions of different Marys.

I suspect that the Great Angel texts all refer to one heavenly being, and this was Yahweh, who had been known as the Holy One of Israel in the ancient cult. In this paper I shall work out the implications of this for our reading of Philo. His Logos was this Great Angel; he allegorized (or perhaps we should say 'demythologized') for his Hellenized contemporaries the ancient beliefs about Yahweh and Elyon in the same way as he did the Pentateuch.

73

Israel's earliest religion was not monotheistic.<sup>8</sup> There was an elaborate cult of heavenly beings, though only fragments of that cult now survive. It was not until the exile, under the influence of the Second Isaiah and the Deuteronomists that the great diversity of older traditions came to be combined, or rather fused.<sup>9</sup> The result of this was that Yahweh took over the roles which had formerly been those of both Yahweh and El Elyon, and a massive re-interpretation of the older traditions was begun. Not everyone accepted the new monotheism; those who transmitted the traditions now found in the Apocalypses retained many older beliefs, the most significant of which, for our purposes, was the belief that Yahweh was not the High God but one of the sons of God. He was a Holy One, the Holy One of Israel (Isa. 4.1 *et passim*). He was Israel's patron angel.

The Qumran text of Deut. 32.8 differs significantly from the MT, but not from the LXX.<sup>10</sup> The MT now says that the nations were allocated according to the number of the sons of Israel; the Qumran reading is 'the sons of El'. Since the LXX has the very similar 'angels of God', it appears that the MT has lost the idea of the sons of God, and with it, the idea that Yahweh was one of them. The implication of this older reading was known to the writer of the *Clementine Recognitions*:

---

<sup>8</sup> This was the theme of my *The Older Testament* (London, 1987).

<sup>9</sup> Segal (*Two Powers in Heaven*, p. 148) shows that the earliest arguments against the 'Two powers' heresy were based on Exod. 20.2, Deut. 32.9, and 'Isa. 44-47 generally as well as other II Isaiah passages'.

<sup>10</sup> P.W. Skehan, 'A Fragment of the Song of Moses (Deut. 32) from Qumran', *BASOR* 136 (1954), pp. 12-15.

For every nation has an angel, to whom God has committed the government of that nation; and when one of these appears, although he be thought and called God by those over whom he presides, yet, being asked, he does not give such testimony to himself. For the Most High God, who alone holds the power of all things, has divided all the nations of the earth into seventytwo parts, and over these he hath appointed angels as princes. But to the one among the archangels who is greatest, was committed the government of those who, before all others, received the worship and knowledge of the Most High God (*Rec. 2.42*).<sup>11</sup>

74

Here we have clear evidence from a time later than Philo of the survival of a belief that the 'God' of Israel was in fact an archangel, the chief of the sons of El. Note that God is named Most High, the ancient El Elyon. It appears that those who accepted the fusions of the Second Isaiah and the Deuteronomists regarded Yahweh and El Elyon as one and the same, although the actual name Yahweh soon fell into disuse among them, and was replaced either by circumlocution or by Elyon. Those who fused the deities then named the great angel of the older tradition Michael. This is the way in which we usually read the Old Testament and envisage first-century Judaism; we read Elyon as a synonym for Yahweh, thus distorting many texts. There were, however, others who had not been directly influenced by the innovations of the exilic period, and they kept Elyon and Yahweh as distinct figures, Yahweh remaining the Angel of Israel. When the two streams were confused, there resulted two Yahwehs; the High God and his emissary were both called by the same name, as we shall see.

There is considerable evidence from a variety of sources and periods to suggest that this belief in Yahweh as the angel of Israel, the 'second God', was not confined to a small or eccentric group. First, there are the two figures in Daniel 7. Emerton has shown that the imagery of the vision resembled that of the two Ugaritic gods El and Baal. Ugaritic gods, however, had no place in a tract written for people whose ancient religion was threatened with extinction at the hands of pagans. This imagery must have come from the heart of Israel's own religious heritage, and the two figures must have been Israel's equivalents of El and Baal. They were El Elyon and Yahweh as they had been remembered in the apocalyptic traditions, even though it is usually assumed that the Ancient of Days must, in Maccabaeian times, have been understood to be Yahweh.<sup>12</sup> But not everyone understood it that way. In the tradition which underlies this vision, it was Yahweh who was perceived in human form 'like a son of man'. Such anthropomorphism was deeply rooted in Israel's tradition, and is the key to under

---

<sup>11</sup> Text in GCS [*Griechische christliche Schriftsteller*] 51, pp. 76-77; translation in *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. 3 (Edinburgh, 1867), p. 220.

<sup>12</sup> J.A. Emerton, '*The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery*', *JTS* ns 9 (1958), pp. 225-42.

standing much, both in Philo, in the Rabbis and elsewhere. The human figure was the link between the two worlds.

Second, there persisted a controversy over the two powers in heaven. One example will suffice. In *b. Sanh.* 38b there is a passage attributed to R. Nahman (dated late third or early fourth century) who told of R. Idi in dispute with a heretic over Exod. 24.1, 'And he said to Moses, "Come up to the LORD"'. The heretic said that the verse implied two deities, since the text would otherwise have said 'Come up to me'. R. Idi had said that the LORD meant Metatron, the angel mentioned in Exod. 23.21, of whom it was said 'My name is in him'. Segal comments:

We learn from this defence that the heretics, in rabbinic eyes, were seen to confuse an angel with God.<sup>13</sup>

*We also learn that the angel, the second deity, was called Yahweh.*

Third, there was a widespread belief in two Yahwehs; where the two traditions had mingled, both the High God and the Angel were called Yahweh. Thus Metatron has some very interesting names in *3 Enoch*; he is called Yahoel and the Lesser Yahweh. It is assumed that the Metatron figure was 'compounded of diverse elements', but there is another possibility: that the diverse elements were all part of an older figure, the second deity of the older cult. The two Yahwehs appear elsewhere in various forms. As P.S. Alexander says:

Other texts mention both the Greater Yahweh and the Lesser Yahweh. The titles... functioned *independently of the Metatron traditions*. Thus we encounter the Great Jao and the Little Jao in the third-century Christian Gnostic work *Pistis Sophia*, and in the Gnostic *Book of Jeu*. In the Syriac *Gannat Bussame (Garden of Delights)* we find listed among deities worshipped by unbelievers Adonai Katon, the general of Adonai Gadol, who are revered by the Israelites.<sup>14</sup>

The first-century *Ascension of Isaiah* also knows of two Yahwehs. Knibb translates thus:

And I saw how my LORD and the angel of the Holy Spirit worshipped and both together praised the LORD (*Asc. Isa.* 9.40).

This implies that both the Father and the Son were known as Yahweh, since *Asc. Isa.* 10.7 reads:

---

<sup>13</sup> Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, p. 65.

<sup>14</sup> P.S. Alexander, 'The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch', *JJS* 28 (1977), pp. 156-80.

And I heard the voice of the Most High, the father of my LORD as he said to my LORD Christ who will be called Jesus, 'Go out and descend through all the heavens...'<sup>15</sup>

Yahweh was invariably linked to the human form.

Fourth, in al-Qirqisani's account of Jewish sects he mentions the Magharians, a pre-Christian group, who understood the anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew Bible to refer not to God himself, but to the great angel who had created the world. This angel not only created; he also gave the Law, inspired the prophets and ruled as God's agent.<sup>16</sup>

Thus far, in texts from many traditions ranging over some seven centuries from the second BC to the fifth AD, we have discovered a second divine figure named Yahweh or the Lesser Yahweh who assumed human form and was believed to have been the human figure in the Hebrew Bible. He was the creator, the lawgiver, the one who went between earth and heaven and the general of the host. The later rabbis were opposed to this belief and argued against it; and the MT suggests that a sensitive text has been altered.

In several of the non-canonical texts Yahweh appears as the Great Angel. Sometimes he is named, sometimes not. Where he is unnamed, it is usually *assumed* that he is Michael, on the grounds that that angel elsewhere is named Michael.<sup>17</sup> The angel in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is named; he is Yahoel (*Apoc. Ab.* 10.3), sent by the Eternal One to be the guide and the protector of Abraham and to have charge of his descendants

77

(*Apoc. Ab.* 10.16). Being sent implies subordination. He is identified with the angel of *Exod.* 23.21 (*Apoc. Ab.* 10.9), and *distinguished* from Michael (*Apoc. Ab.* 10.17). He resembles the man figure of Ezekiel's visions (who, as we shall see, *was* Yahweh), wears the turban headdress of the High Priest and carries a golden rod or sceptre. In the elaborate hymn of praise to God in *Apoc. Ab.* 17, one of the names of God is Yahoel, the same as that of the angel. A similar double naming occurs in the Slavonic *Life of Adam and Eve* and the related *Apocalypse of Moses*. The angel Joel is distinguished from Michael (*Life* 31) but identified as an

---

<sup>15</sup> M.A. Knibb (trans.), 'The Ascension of Isaiah', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1 (New York, 1983), hereafter *OTP*.

<sup>16</sup> L. Nemoy, 'Al-Qirqisani's Account of the Jewish Sects', *HUCA* 7 (1930); H.A. Wolfson, 'The Pre-existent Angel of the Magharians and Al-Nahawandi', *JQR* 51 (1960-61), pp. 89-106, who rejects any link between the angel of the Magharians and Philo.

<sup>17</sup> R.H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, II (Oxford, 1913), e.g. pp. 335, 421.

archangel (*Apoc. Mos.* 43.5). Jael is also a name for God (*Apoc. Mos.* 29.4). Unnamed, the angel appears in the *Assumption of Moses* 10.1-3:<sup>18</sup>

Then the hands of the angel shall be filled  
Who has been appointed chief,  
And he shall henceforth avenge them of their enemies.  
For the Heavenly One will arise from his royal throne  
And he will go forth from his holy habitation  
With indignation and wrath on account of his sons.

Here we have the chief angel as a warrior ('avenge them of their enemies') and a Priest ('his hands shall be filled'), characteristics we have already encountered in other angel texts; but he is also a king. He has a throne. Comparable texts in the Old Testament (e.g. *Isa.* 26.21; *Mic.* 1.3) show that the one who came from his holy place was Yahweh. Furthermore, the *Assumption of Moses* deals with the same events as Deuteronomy 32-33. If we compare *Ass. Mos.* 10.1-3 with the text of *Deut.* 32.43, we find that the angel of the *Assumption of Moses* bears a strong resemblance to the Yahweh of the Song of Moses. The LXX and 4QDeut show that this text too differs in the MT.<sup>19</sup> 4QDeut describes Yahweh avenging the blood of his sons (cf. MT 'servants' but *Ass. Mos.* 'sons'), and making expiation for the blood of his people. The Yahweh of 4QDeut was a warrior priest who received the homage of the elohim

78

(4QDeut 32.43b). This priestly role for the angel appears also in *T. Levi* 5.1, 6, where an unnamed interceding angel grants Levi his vision of the heavenly throne; *T. Dan.* 6.1 has an angel who is both mediator and warrior, described later in *T. Dan.* 6.5 as the Angel of Peace; *T. Ash.* 6.6 and *T. Ben.* 6.1 mention the angel of peace who guides the soul to eternal life. In the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* the great angel of fire and bronze appears (6.15). Zephaniah thought he had seen the Lord Almighty, but the angel said his name was Eremiel (*Apoc. Zeph.* 6.15). In *Joseph and Aseneth* Aseneth is visited by a man from heaven who is 'commander of the whole host of the Most High' (*Jos. As.* 14.7) and 'chief of the house of the Most High' (*Jos. As.* 15.12). Note that God is named the Most High. Although this figure resembled Joseph, he was also the angel of fire and (this time) molten iron. He had a crown and a sceptre. He had written Aseneth's name in the Book of Life (*Jos. As.* 15.4) but his name was not to be spoken or known (*Jos. As.* 15.12).

---

<sup>18</sup> G.W.E. Nickelsburg (*Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* [Cambridge, MA, 1972]) concluded from this text and others that a lost tradition of the great judgment lay behind all of them which included, among other things, this great angel.

<sup>19</sup> Skehan, 'A Fragment of the Song of Moses'.

In this group of texts the angel is a human figure, a high priest, king and warrior. He is chief of the Host of the Most High, the heavenly scribe, and the guiding angel of the faithful.

Daniel lies between the Old Testament and these noncanonical texts, forming a bridge between the angels of the apocalyptists and whatever came before them. Daniel shows the chief angel in many aspects. First, he is the Prince of the Host who is attacked by the little horn (Dan. 8.11). He loses the continual burnt offering, and the place of his sanctuary is overthrown. Since this text refers to the Jerusalem temple, the Prince of the Host must have been worshipped there. Second, he is called the Prince of Princes (Dan. 9.25); since the Princes were the angels of the nations (e.g. Dan. 10.13), this Great Angel, the angel of Israel, was their chief. Third, Daniel saw him as the angel of fire and bronze, a heavenly being in human form sent to him to reveal the future (Dan. 10.1-14). Ezekiel had seen a similar figure who was Yahweh. Daniel saw this angel clothed in linen, perhaps because he was identified with the scribe of Ezek. 9.3, or perhaps it was the garb of a High Priest in the sanctuary. The High Priest wore linen when he went into the sanctuary on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16.4) because he was entering the presence of God, and therefore

79

dressed as one of the angels, whom the apocalyptists describe as 'men in white garments' (e.g. *1 Enoch* 87.2; 90.22; and then, by implication, the transformations described in *2 Enoch* 22.810; *Asc. Isa.* 8.14; 9 *passim*). Fourth, the unnamed angel was helped in his struggles by Michael (Dan. 10.13), so he was not Michael. Finally, Daniel saw the man-like figure going up to this throne to be given dominion, glory and kingdom (Dan. 7.14). (It is important to remember that the so-called 'son of man' figure is not described in Daniel, or indeed anywhere else. Only the human form is noted, until the description in Rev. 1.13ff., where the figure is described as the angel of fire and bronze. There is, then, no reason why the figure of Daniel 7 should not have been the same as the unnamed angel.) Daniel, then, could be saying that the chief of the archangels was worshipped in Jerusalem; he was a warrior, a revealer sent down to the seer who could also go up to heaven and take his place as the agent of God's rule ('to him was *given* dominion...'). He resembled Ezekiel's Yahweh, and could have been dressed as a High Priest. All this is tentative; but the evidence of other texts adds weight to the possibility that this was Yahweh, present in a second-century apocalypse.

We must now go behind Daniel to find the Yahweh Angel in the Old Testament itself. First, there is the evidence of the UDL The Angel of the Presence in MT Isa. 63.9 becomes Yahweh himself in the LXX. Similarly the angel in the Hebrew of Eccl. 5.6 becomes God himself in the Greek. These examples suggest that the Greek translators and the originators of the MT had *different ideas* as to how a particular heavenly being was to be described: as an angel or as Yahweh? Similarly, there are later texts in which it is emphasized that Yahweh himself acted in



Israel's history, for example, at the Exodus.<sup>20</sup> The mighty deeds had not been done by an angel or an emissary, even though there are places, for example Judg. 2.2, where it says that the Angel of Yahweh brought Israel from Egypt. Could this emphasis in later interpretation be another indication that the Angel *had come to mean* a being other than Yahweh, while the interpreters wished to keep what they knew to have been

80

the original meaning of the text, namely that this Angel was Yahweh himself?

The Angel of Yahweh appears often in the Old Testament, and there are undoubtedly some places in which a being separate from Yahweh has to be understood. The Angel of Yahweh speaks to Yahweh in Zech. 1.12, for example. In other places, such as Ps. 35.5-6 and 2 Kgs 1.3,15, the Angel appears in isolation, and had we been told that the Angel and Yahweh were synonymous, as Elohim and Yahweh are believed to be, the text would still make good sense. A third type of text has Yahweh and the Angel as interchangeable terms, as though they were synonymous. It is not easy to distinguish the Angel from Yahweh in Zechariah 3. The three who visited Abraham (Gen. 18) present a similar problem. In the Gideon stories the two are interchangeable (cf. e.g. Judg. 6.11ff.), as they are in the story of Samson's parents (Judg. 13). This third type forms the bulk of the evidence for the Angel of Yahweh and raises the important question: Was the Angel synonymous with Yahweh, perhaps one way of expressing a manifestation of Yahweh in human form? The Angel is always a man figure, often a warrior. This emphasis on anthropomorphism is not stating the obvious; many of the heavenly beings were not in human form, for example, the living creatures of Ezekiel's vision, or the snake-like angels of 4Q Amram and the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*.

Yahweh was a warrior;<sup>21</sup> he appears frequently in the Old Testament either as the angel with a sword, or simply as the one who wields the sword of judgment and vengeance. Thus in Num. 22.23, Josh. 5.13-15, 1 Chron. 21.16, the man figure or the angel of Yahweh holds a drawn sword. In Deut. 32.41-42 and Isa. 34.5, 6 the sword of Yahweh is the instrument of destruction; cf. Isa. 66.16; Jer. 12.12; 47.6; Ezek. 21.3-5; 32.10. Much later there is the account in 2 Macc. 3.24ff. of the vision of a warrior with weapons of gold coming to the defence of Jerusalem; cf. Isa. 37.36, where the angel of Yahweh slaughtered the Assyrians before Jerusalem.

81

There are also more elaborate manifestations of Yahweh, visions of the king on his throne, for example Exod. 24.10, 1 Kgs 22.19-23 and Isaiah 6, which are also the setting for Deut. 33.5 and many of the Psalms. The most detailed throne vision in the Old Testament is that of

---

<sup>20</sup> J. Goldin, 'Not by Means of an Angel and not by Means of a Messenger', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Religions in Antiquity* (Leiden, 1970).

<sup>21</sup> P.D. Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel* (Harvard Semitic Monographs, 3; Cambridge, MA, 1973).

Ezekiel. He saw the chariot throne (Ezek. 1), which was represented in the temple by the chariot throne of the cherubim (1 Chron. 28.18), and on the throne he saw a human form, the angel of fire and bronze. In the later vision (Ezek. 8) the prophet saw the same figure of fire and bronze, but without the throne.<sup>22</sup> In Ezek. 9.4 the figure is *named as Yahweh*, the one who had come to summon the judgment upon Jerusalem. Yahweh was the bringer of judgment; the day of Yahweh was the constant theme of the prophets. The judgment was set in the heavenly temple and doubtless enacted in temple ritual (e.g. Ps. 73.17). In later texts, such as the *Similitudes of Enoch*, the Judge becomes the Son of Man, while Mt. 25.31ff. sees the Son of Man, the King and Judge, as acting for his Father. The Son of Man was the agent of a High God just as Yahweh had been. Yahweh was also the scribe: Ps. 87.6 depicts Yahweh recording the people, and Isa. 34.16 mentions the Book of Yahweh as the Book of Judgment.

The heavenly king was represented on earth by the Davidic king. We shall never fully understand what lies beneath some of the more obscure statements about the ancient kings, but we can at least look at what is there. The king *sat on the throne of Yahweh and was worshipped with him* (1 Chron. 29.20, 23; cf Pss. 11.4; 45.7; Mic. 2.13, and the close links thought to exist between Ps. 2 and Dan. 7).<sup>23</sup> The king was the son of Yahweh; this is how the manifestation was described. How this sonship was achieved or symbolized we do not know. No supernatural birth was envisaged (1 Chron. 28.6), but the variant readings of Isa. 9.6 suggest angelic status. The four royal titles of the MT are replaced in one of the many Greek versions by 'The Angel of Great Counsel'. Ps. 89.19 implies that there was some sort of mystical ascent experience involved in the kingmaking, as the result of which the king was set on the holy hill (Ps. 2). A comparison with Ezekiel 28 suggests that the Davidic king joined

82

the princes of the other nations in the garden of God; cf. Daniel 7 where the ascent to heaven precedes the enthronement.<sup>24</sup> The earliest known account of such an ascent experience is in 1 *Enoch* 14, and the setting for the ascent is clearly the heavenly temple, of which the temple in Jerusalem was the earthly counterpart. Enoch was commissioned to take a message of judgment. We know from 4QShirShabb<sup>25</sup> that the temple functionaries had heavenly counterparts; in the days of the monarchy the king had also had the two roles; he had been the man-like representation of Yahweh the Angel, the King of Israel. It was this ancient manifestation in the king which was remembered in all the later descriptions of the crowned and sceptred angel. Later tradition gave this role to Moses. In his drama *Exodus*, the tragedian

---

<sup>22</sup> Rowland (*The Open Heaven*) emphasizes this (pp. 96-97).

<sup>23</sup> A. Bentzen, *King and Messiah* (ET; London, 1955).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *The Older Testament*, pp. 115-21.

<sup>25</sup> C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (Harvard Semitic Studies, 27; Atlanta, 1985).

Ezekiel described how Moses ascended to the presence of God and was there made God and King; he reigned as God's agent. Cf. Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 1.155-58.

If the king represented Yahweh, we may find in the king's roles some of those of Yahweh. The Davidic king, for example, was a priest. Whatever Ps. 110 means, it does show that the royal house was associated with the Melchizedek figure, and 11QMelch implies that this same Melchizedek was believed to function as Yahweh on the Day of Judgment, for texts which in the Old Testament refer to Yahweh, in 11QMelch refer to Melchizedek. This could have been an innovation; or it could have been a traditional understanding of those passages. Either way, the royal priesthood is associated with Yahweh.

The Davidic king was 'the firstborn, the highest of the kings of the earth (Ps. 89.37). Yahweh (Gen. 49.24; Isa. 40.11; Jer. 31.10; Pss. 23.1; 80.1) and the Davidic king (Ezek. 37.24) were described as shepherds of the people, a pastoral image which was also used of angels. Enoch described the seventy angels and their punishment. Even two or three centuries later, Hermias mentions several shepherd angels (*Vis.* 5. 1; *Sim.* 6.1). Other temple imagery also involved the dual role of the king: the menorah, for example, represented both the presence of

83

Yahweh with his people, and the stability of the Davidic house.<sup>26</sup>

The ancient Yahweh was also manifested as the Name, by which was meant something very different from what we mean by a name, although exactly what this was is not easy to define. It is one of the most mysterious of the titles, and for that reason probably one of the most important. The Name was synonymous with, Yahweh in some cases; in others the word itself seems to have had special powers.

The greatest exponents of Name theology were the Deuteronomists and their heirs; when they reformed and reformulated the theology of the ancient cult, they moved away from anthropomorphism and redefined what was meant by the Name. This association is very important. Mettinger's study concluded:

The concept of God advocated by the Deuteronomistic theology is strikingly abstract. The throne concept has vanished and the anthropomorphic characteristics of God are on the way to oblivion. Thus the form of God plays no part in the D work of the Sinai theophany (Deut. 4.12).<sup>27</sup>

Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple is the clearest expression of the new theology, and shows the older beliefs being rejected.

---

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *The Older Testament*, ch. 9.

<sup>27</sup> T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth* (Lund, 1982), p. 124.

But will God indeed dwell on earth? Behold heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain thee; how much less this house which I have built (1 Kgs 8.27).

Any idea of the visible presence of God was abandoned and the Older anthropomorphism was replaced by abstract ideas: 'You saw no form; there was only a voice' (Deut. 4.12). There were two reasons for this: the Deuteronomists were closely associated with the monotheism of the Second Isaiah who had identified Yahweh with Elyon and therefore 'relocated' Yahweh only in heaven rather than in the temple on Zion; and they were constructing from the ruins of the monarchy a faith to survive though it could no longer have the visible king at its

84

centre. The old concept of the human form in the temple was no longer tenable.

In the Name theology not only the Sabaoth designation but also the cherubim throne have disappeared; God himself is no longer present in the Temple but only in heaven. However, he is represented in the temple by his Name.<sup>28</sup>

This is in clear contrast to earlier use of the Name, even by the Deuteronomists. It had previously been synonymous with the presence of Yahweh, not a substitute for it. In Deuteronomy 12 it is said that the cult actions take place before Yahweh (vv. 7, 12, 13); in the place Yahweh chooses (vv. 14, 18, 26); and in the place where he causes his Name to dwell (vv. 5, 11, 21). Either the text is riddled with contradictions, or there was a time when these three expressions were synonymous. The presence of Yahweh was the presence of the Name. Other texts afford corroboration: Yahweh dwelt in the temple (e.g. Ps. 11.4; Jer. 8.19); the Name dwelt in the temple (Ps. 74.7). The Name of the Lord could come in judgment (Isa. 30.27). The Name seems to be a person also in Ps. 20.1-2 and in the Hebrew of Ps. 75.5. In Ps. 118.10-13 Yahweh and the Name are synonymous. The Name could be 'in' an angel (Exod. 23.20-21). The Name as a designation for Yahweh did not cease with the reforms of the Deuteronomists. Many later examples can best be explained as a survival of the older practice. The *Gospel of Truth* 38, for example, contains the statement 'Now the Name of the Father is the Son' and goes on to show that the Name in its visible aspect is the Son. The whole picture is complicated by later ideas of existence and essence, but behind it there lies the unmistakable mythology of Elyon and his sons who were manifested in the created order. One son in particular, the Name, was deemed to be their ruler. Similarly in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the Name of the Son of God and the Son of God are synonymous; both support the whole creation (*Sim.* 9.14).

The Hermas text brings us to the second aspect of the Name; whether thought of as a heavenly being or as the sacred letters it was associated particularly with the work of creation. Indeed, Yahweh itself was thought by the Targumists to mean

---

<sup>28</sup> Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth*, p. 123.

*the Creator*. TN to Exod. 3.14 explains the divine name thus: 'He who spoke and the world was from the beginning, and shall say to it: Be! and it shall be. He has sent me to you.' TJI has 'He who spoke and the world was; who spoke and all things were...'<sup>29</sup> The command at creation was a command to separate and thus to bring order (Gen. 1). The Name as a form of sacred letters was the key to the created order. Some traditions described it as the written seal which secured the natural order; others knew the secret Name as the key to the great oath which bound the created order. These three eparation, sealing and binding-all pass into Philo's Logos imagery.<sup>30</sup>

A picture, albeit indistinct, has emerged. Yahweh was the Holy One of Israel, the chief angel of the hosts of Elyon. He was a warrior, a priest and a king. He was manifested in human form. He guided Israel in its wanderings and souls up to the presence of God. He was present in the king, his son, present in the temple, and represented by the Menorah. He was the creator, the judge and the heavenly scribe. He was the Name, and the power of the Name was the key to the processes of creation. This Great Angel became Philo's Logos. Just as he allegorized the stories of the Pentateuch and put them into the language of the philosophers, so he took the mythology of the temple cult and made it his Logos. He did this by transposing the whole system into the language and thought world of Greek philosophy. Thus his heavenly archetypes are not *derived* from Plato; the ancient Wisdom traditions of Israel already had a highly developed system of heavenly counterparts, centred upon the belief in the heavenly temple and the worshipping angels. Plato's ideas formed a point of contact between the systems. Similarly, the Logos is not *derived* from

Aristotle's Nous nor from the Stoics for whom the term meant the divine order, the reason which pervaded the universe. The Wisdom of Solomon shows that Philo's own community had had a Logos of their own for some time, and the figure is familiar. On the night of the Exodus.<sup>31</sup>

Thy all-powerful Logos leaped from heaven, from the royal throne,

---

<sup>29</sup> M. McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (Rome, 1978), pp. 103-12, lists all the various versions and discusses them.

<sup>30</sup> Wolfson (see n. 16 above). W.H. Brownlee ('The Ineffable Name of God', *BASOR* 226 [1977], pp. 39-45) gives a history of opinions as to the meaning of the divine name. It is interesting that both Merkabah and Gnostic traditions associate the revealed God with the Creator God; see P.S. Alexander, '3 Enoch' in OTP (n. 15 above), p. 236. For 'sealing' see D. Sperber, 'On Sealing the Abysses', *JSS* 11 (1976), pp. 135-59, and for 'binding' see my *The Lost Prophet* (London, 1988), ch. 6.

<sup>31</sup> But see also C.T.R. Hayward, 'The Holy Name of the God of Moses and the Prologue of St John's Gospel', *NTS* 25 (1978), pp. 16-32.

into the midst of the land that was doomed,  
a stern warrior, carrying the sharp sword of thy authentic command,  
and stood and filled all things with death,  
and touched the heaven while standing on the earth (*Wis.* 18.15).

In the original Exodus story it was Yahweh who destroyed the Egyptians. Note that the Logos links earth and heaven, and that the sword is well on the way to becoming the sword in the mouth of the Son of Man (*Rev.* 1.16). Why the Great Angel should have been called the Logos (Word) is not known, but an exactly similar term (Memra, Word) appears in the Targums as a designation for Yahweh. Philo linked the Angel/Logos of his Judaism to the Reason/Logos of the philosophers, and thus began to map the myths of his own culture onto the world of his Greek contemporaries. Hagar, he said, met the angel or divine Reason (Logos) when she fled from Sarah (*Cher.* 3). The original story (*Gen.* 16) says she met the Angel of Yahweh when driven out by a harsh mistress; Philo says that Hagar represents the lower culture and Sarah the stern ways of those who seek virtue. When Hagar fled, she met the Divine Reason/ Divine Logos who persuaded her to return. Similarly Balaam met the 'armed angel, the Logos of God' (*Cher.* 35). Again, the original (*Num.* 22) says it was the Angel of Yahweh who met Balaam with a drawn sword. When dismissing the possibility that the creator angel of the Magharians could have been the same as Philo's Logos, Wolfson said:

Philo does not identify the Logos with the God of the Old Testament, nor does he use it as an explanation for its anthropo-

87

morphic description of God... *Philo never calls the Logos an angel.*<sup>32</sup>

Such a statement seems incredible! Philo says that the Logos has many names:

...God's First-born, the Word, who holds the eldership among the angels, their ruler as it were. And many names are his, for he *is* called, 'the Beginning, and the Name of God, and His Word and the Man after His image, and 'he that sees', that is Israel (*Conf Ling.* 146).\*

The ruler of the angels and the Name were designations of Yahweh. The firstborn was not only a royal title; it shows that the Logos was begotten, a son of God. He was

neither uncreated as God, nor yet created as you (i.e. human beings) (*Rer. Div. Her.* 206).

---

<sup>32</sup> Wolfson (see n. 15 above), p. 96.

\* The quotations from Philo are taken from F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, *Philo* [Greek text with introductions and English translation] (10 vols.; Loeb Classical Library; London and Cambridge, MA, 1929-1962).

We have to envisage, perhaps, a process of creation in the divine realm, which preceded that of the material world. The Logos is

antecedent to all that has come into existence... (*Migr. Abr.* 6); ... eldest and most all-embracing of created things (*Leg. All.* 3.175).

Philo's Logos was a deity of some sort; he refers to the Logos as a second God when discussing Gen. 9.6:

For nothing mortal can be made in the likeness of the most high One and Father of the universe, but (only) in that of the second God, who is His Logos (*Quaest. in Gen.* 2.62).

Philo's name for the greater deity is the Most High and the Father, that is, the ancient El Elyon, Father of the sons of God. What was originally meant by 'humans being made in the image of God' is not known, but one could guess that God was envisaged in human form by whoever said it. Such anthropomorphism caused considerable disquiet among later interpreters who had come to reject the anthropomorphisms of the

88

Hebrew Bible.<sup>33</sup> Philo, too, makes a characteristic shift; it was the rational part of man, he said, which was formed as an impression of the Logos.

The question: How many Gods?, though raised elsewhere, is not clearly answered. When expounding the account of Jacob's dream at Bethel, a name which he takes to mean literally 'the place of God', he says:

And do not fail to mark the language used, but carefully inquire whether there are two Gods; for we read 'I am the God that appeared to thee', not 'in my place' but 'in the place of God', as though it were another's. What, then, are we to say? He that is truly God is One, but those that are improperly so called are more than one. Accordingly the holy word in the present instance has indicated Him Who is truly God by means of the articles saying 'I am the God', while it omits the article when mentioning him who is improperly so called, saying 'Who appeared to thee in the place' not 'of the God', but simply 'of God'. Here it gives the title of 'God' to His chief Word, not from any superstitious nicety in applying names, but with one aim before him, to use words to express facts [or to accommodate language to practical needs] (*Som.* 1.228-30).

'The God' means the true God (presumably the Most High, if Philo is consistent) and 'God' is a term applied to other heavenly beings such as the Logos. The argument from 'the place of God'

---

<sup>33</sup> A. Altmann, 'Homo Imago Dei in Jewish and Early Christian Theology', *JR* 48 (1968), pp. 235-59.

resembles one used by the later rabbis<sup>34</sup> and it does suggest that Philo knew of a second deity who could be referred to as 'the place'. When discussing Exod. 24.10, which in the LXX differs from the MT and reads 'they saw the place where the God of Israel stands', Philo says:

For then they shall behold the place, which in fact is the Word, where stands God the never changing (*Conf Ling.* 96).

Since Philo had here been discussing those who serve the Existent 'who in their thoughts ascend to the heavenly height', we see how he reinterprets the mystical ascent which, for the apocalyptists, had been the ascent to the presence of the divine throne. Philo says that what is seen is not the King, Yahweh of

89

Hosts (Isa. 6.5), nor the likeness as it were of a human form' (Ezek. 1.26), but the Logos. Anthropomorphism, he says, is only for the unsophisticated. Of Gen. 31.13 he says:

Accordingly, when He says 'I am the God who was seen of thee in the place of God', understand that He occupied the place of an angel only so far as appeared, without changing, with a view to the profit of him who was not yet capable of seeing the true God (*Som.* 1.238).

He continues with an explanation of the relationship between the two Gods:

For just as those who are unable to see the sun itself see the gleam of the parhelion and take it for the sun, and take the halo round the moon for that luminary itself, so some regard the image of God, His angel the Word, as His very self (*Som.* 1.239).

Philo seems to be criticizing *those who have identified the Logos with the Most High, that is, Yahweh with Elyon*. He recognized several heavenly beings, but only one of them was the true God.<sup>35</sup>

He identified the Logos with the Angel of Yahweh mentioned in Exod. 23.20; the Logos led all seekers after God until they attained 'full knowledge' and became themselves like angels.

For as long as he falls short of perfection, he has the Divine Word as his leader: since there is an oracle which says, 'Lo, I send My messenger before thy face... for he will by no means withdraw from thee; for My name is on him'. But when he has arrived at full knowledge, he will run with more vigorous effort, and his pace

---

<sup>34</sup> Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, p. 131.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. the hostility to the creator God described in Gnostic texts, when he said he was the only God: *NHC* 2.4.94; 2.5.100.



will be as great as that of him who before led the way; for so they will both become attendants on the All-leading God (*Migr. Abr.* 174-75).

Here he is allegorizing. The story of the desert wanderings becomes the journey into the presence of God which others had called the ascent.

... Moses has already made it manifest that the sublime and heavenly wisdom is of many names; for he calls it 'beginning' and 'image' and 'vision of God' (*Leg. All.* 1.43).

90

'Full knowledge' for Philo is the same as the apocalyptists' wisdom, that vision of God which transforms the mystic to the angelic state. 'All who lived in the knowledge of the One are rightly called sons of God' (*Conf. Ling.* 145); in the underlying system, the sons of God were the angels, those who had the heavenly knowledge. Beneath this passage, then, we glimpse the Angel who led the seeker into the presence of God where he achieved divine status and became a son of God. This heavenly guide had formerly been Yahweh; in the approximately contemporary Apocalypse of *Abraham* it was the angel Yahoel, and in the later *3 Enoch* it was Metatron, the Lesser Yahweh. Philo identified the guiding angel with Reason; it was the Logos who brought the seeker into the presence of God. In another exposition of Exod. 23.20, the Logos is described as the judge and mediator (*Quaest. in Exod.* 13), titles which derived directly from the ancient roles of Yahweh.

One of the most complex and illuminating of the roles of the Logos is that of High Priest (*Migr. Abr.* 102).<sup>36</sup> His temple was the whole universe.

For there are, as is evident, two temples of God: one of them this universe, in which there is also as High Priest His First-born, the divine Word, and the other the rational soul, whose Priest is the real Man (*Som.* 1.215; cf. *Fug.* 108).

Here Philo is adapting what we know from 4QShirShabb to have been current beliefs about the temple and its cult. 4QShirShabb, which are approximately contemporary with Philo, depict a heavenly liturgy, but they are so fragmented that much is not clear. There is no pre-eminent angel who could have been the heavenly High Priest, even though other texts, as we have seen, do describe such a figure. The High Priest was important because he could pass through the veil of the sanctuary, that is, he could pass from the material, visible world into the invisible presence of God.<sup>37</sup> He wore special multi-coloured robes (Exod. 28; 39), but when he entered the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement, he wore white garments (Lev. 16; *b. Yoma* 35a). The Pentateuch does not say

---

<sup>36</sup> E.R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light. The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (New Haven, 1935), ch. 4.

<sup>37</sup> Alexander, '3 Enoch', OTP, I, p. 236.

why he dressed as he did. Philo says that every part of the dress was significant: the garments represented the world; the blue robe was the air, the flowers and pomegranate patterns were the fruits and waters of the earth, the breastplate was heaven, the twelve precious stones were the signs of the zodiac and so forth (*Migr. Abr.* 102; *Vit. Mos.* 2.117-26; *Spec. Leg.* 1.85-87). When the High Priest passed through the veil he went from the material world into the presence of God where he wore white linen. White robes were the garb of the angels, and although Philo does not say this, he hints at it when he says that the robes were made of linen, not of wool, 'the product of creatures subject to death' (*Spec. Leg.* 1.84). He also says that the High Priest puts on a robe

of linen made from the purest kind, a figure of strong fibre, *imperishableness, most radiant light*: for fine linen is hard to tear, and is made from no mortal creature, and moreover when carefully cleaned has a *very brilliant and luminous colour* (*Som.* 1.216-17).

Thus the High Priest wears the stuff of this world when he is outside the, sanctuary, and the dress of angels within it. Having said that the High Priest is the Logos, Philo then makes his transposition. What he says about the cosmic significance of the Logos must have been the original significance of the High Priest, since it is this which Philo both assumes and interprets. Others had known similar beliefs:

For upon his long robe the whole world was depicted, and the glories of the fathers were engraved on the four rows of stones, and thy majesty on the diadem upon his head (*Wis.* 18.24).

The Word, he says, as the High Priest, passed through the veil from the presence of God and thus became robed in the four elements; that is, he took a material form. This must refer the older belief in a visible manifestation of Yahweh perhaps in the temple, since the Logos passes from the sanctuary, through the veil whose likeness he adopts, and thus into the visible world.

Now the garments which the supreme Word of Him that IS puts on as raiment are the world, for He arrays Himself in earth and air and water and fire and all that comes forth from these (*Fug.* 110).

The High Priest, the outward and visible image,

offers the prayers and sacrifices handed down from our fathers, to whom it has been committed to wear the aforesaid tunic, which is a copy and replica of the whole heaven, the intention of this being that the universe may join with man in the holy rites and man with the universe (*Som.* 1.215).

Goodenough said that such 'cosmic worship' was one clear example of how Philo differed from the Stoics:

The Stoic saw union or harmony with the cosmos as harmony with the ultimate. Philo sees it only as a way of joining in with the hymn of all creation to the Creator who is infinitely beyond the world.<sup>38</sup>

The Logos/High priest passes back into the presence of God as Mediator.

To His Word, His chief messenger (*archangelos*), highest image and honour, the Father of all has given the special prerogative, to stand on the border and separate the creature from the Creator. This same Word both pleads with the immortal as suppliant for afflicted mortality and acts as ambassador of the ruler to the subject (*Rer. Div. Her.* 205).

Discussing the veil of the sanctuary, Philo speculates about how the Logos can become visible:

The incorporeal world is set off and separated from the visible one by the mediating Logos as by a veil. But may it not be that this Logos is the tetrad, through which the corporeal solid comes into being? (*Quaest. in Exod.* 2.94).

Philo is certain about the Logos at the conjunction of the visible and invisible worlds; what he wonders is whether this relates in any way to the geometry of solids! The Logos was also the Shadow, used as the means of creation:

God's shadow is His Word, which he made use of like an instrument, and so made the world (*Leg. All.* 3.96).

The significance of the veil and the shadow become apparent in the later Gnostic writings, which clearly derive from similar beliefs.

93

A veil exists between the world above and the realms that are below; and shadow came into being beneath the veil; and that shadow became matter; and that shadow was projected apart... It assumed a plastic form molded out of shadow, and became an arrogant beast resembling a lion. It was androgynous ... he became arrogant saying, 'It is I who am God, and there is none other apart from me' (*Hypostasis of the Archons* 94-95).<sup>39</sup>

After this the lion-God made himself a chariot of cherubim and surrounded himself with angel ministers. The untitled work (*NHC* 2.5.98-101) is similar. It describes a veil which separates humans from those belonging to the (sphere) above. A shadow brings the lower creation into

---

<sup>38</sup> Goodenough, *By Light, Light*, p. 117.

<sup>39</sup> English translations in J.M. Robinson (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Library* (Leiden, 1977), p. 167.

being, and thinks he is the only God. He is a lion figure who presides over a creation clearly modelled on Genesis 1. There follows an intricate account of the origin of seven androgynous powers, with names like Yao and Eloai. These seem very close to Philo's powers, and beneath the hostility we see the Great Angel of Israel whom some had identified with the High God.

The turban of the High Priest was significant; on it was a golden plate which Exod. 28.36 says bore the words 'Holy to Yahweh'. Philo knew another tradition; on the turban was a golden plate

with four incisions, showing a name which only those whose ears and tongues are purified may hear or speak in the holy place, and no other person, nor in any other place at all. That name has four letters (*Vit. Mos.* 2.114; cf. *Migr. Abr.* 103).

Thus the High Priests bore the name Yahweh.

The Logos was also the central stem of the menorah, dividing three lamps from three lamps (*Rer. Div. Her.* 215-25). Philo argues from this fact towards Heracleitus's theory of opposites, but he must have begun with the fact that the Logos was represented by the central stem of the lamp. Earlier traditions had linked the lamp with the presence of Yahweh in the Temple, and the seven branches of the lamp were the seven eyes of Yahweh (*Zech.* 4.10). Philo's near-contemporary, the seer John, described these seven lamps as the seven spirits before the throne (*Rev.* 1.4). More interesting for this

94

enquiry is that the angel of fire and bronze was the central stem of the sevenfold lamp. (This surely lies behind the present 'one like a son of man in the midst of the lampstands' [*Rev.* 1.141.]) The seven are also the eyes of the lamb (*Rev.* 5.6), as they had been the eyes of Yahweh. Philo knew of the plural nature of Yahweh implied by this symbolism, and used it as the basis for what he says about the Powers.<sup>40</sup>

The Powers are closely associated with the Logos; they too can enter matter. They were the ancient angels, both the higher ranks and the angels of the natural order., The latter are described in *Jub.* 2.2, and there are lists of these angels' names in *1 Enoch* 6 and 69. In each list most of the names are compounded with *-el*. Although we are far from understanding the roles of the angels, they do seem to represent visible and tangible aspects of God. God is One, says Philo, but around him he has the numberless Powers which all assist and protect the created order (*Conf Ling.* 171).

That aspect of Him which transcends His Potencies cannot be conceived of at all in terms of place, but only as pure being, but that Potency of His by which He

---

<sup>40</sup> E.R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman Period*, vol. 4 (New York, 1953), p. 84, and L. Yarden, *The Tree of Light* (London, 1971), plate 69, show several representations of the menorah with a prominent central shaft.

made and ordered all things, while it is called God... holds the whole in its embrace and has interfused itself through the parts of the universe (*Conf. Ling.* 137).

These Potencies (Powers) were integral to Philo's Judaism; he distinguishes carefully between what Moses says, and the teaching of the 'Chaldaeans'. Moses says that

the complete whole around us is held together by invisible powers which the Creator has made to reach from the ends of the earth to the heaven's furthest bounds, taking forethought that what was well bound should not be loosened: for the powers of the Universe are chains that cannot be broken (*Migr. Abr.* 181).

There is nothing in our reading of Moses which says this, a warning that there is much beneath even the familiar texts of the Old Testament which Philo knew and we do not, his Judaism's 'oral tradition', perhaps. What he says here sounds very

95

like the 'cosmic covenant', especially since the Powers are the angels, the host of heaven whose breaking loose is the theme of *1 Enoch*. Philo's Moses says:

By Thy glory I understand the powers that keep guard around Thee (*Spec. Leg.* 1.45).

Moses was told that he could not see that face of Yahweh but only what was behind him (Exod. 33.23); this was understood to mean the angels, the Powers. There is an exactly similar understanding of the passage in the Targum:

And I will make the troop of angels pass by who stand and minister before me and you will see the Word of the Glory of my Shekinah but it is not possible for you to see the face of the Glory of my Shekinah (*TN Exod.* 33.23).

Thus Philo draws on a tradition of interpretation common to his community and that which produced *Targum Neofiti*.<sup>41</sup> He adapts it and says that 'the Powers around the Glory', what humans can see of the presence of God, means their visible form in the universe.<sup>42</sup> This is like the Platonic 'Forms' but again, this is only a comparison. The original existed already in his own Judaism (*Fug.* 165; *Mut. Nom.* 9). Yahweh the King surrounded by his hosts is the oldest of the temple visions (Isa. 6; 1 Kgs 22). Philo must have understood the song of the seraphim to mean that the whole earth was full of the Glory, i.e. the Powers, of Yahweh.

---

<sup>41</sup> There is no agreement as to its date and origin; see A.D. York, 'The Dating of Targumic Literature', *JSJ* 5 (1974).

<sup>42</sup> M.D. Hooker ('The Johannine Prologue and the Messianic Secret', *NTS* 21 [1974], pp. 40-58) suggests that Exod. 33.12-23 also forms the background to Jn 1.14-18, the revelation of the Glory.

These powers were closely linked to the Logos, who was their head, just as Yahweh had been the chief of the angels. Philo uses several illustrations for this, for example the six cities of refuge which are 'colonies of the Logos' (*Fug.* 94). It is interesting that he uses the six-plus-one theme again here, reminiscent of the menorah and its branches. The nature of these powers is also interesting; their leader is creative power, the second is royal power, the third gracious power (at this point there is a break in the text). Were these derived from the

96

archangels whose names were compounded with *-el*? We should perhaps ponder the fact that Elohim, the other name for Yahweh in the Old Testament, is a plural noun, meaning angels or gods, and that it was the Deuteronomists, those who suppressed anthropomorphism and the memory of the older cult, who gave us the impossible text: 'Yahweh our Elohim is one' (Deut. 6.4). Similarly, the golden plate on the High Priest's turban represented the single behind the plurality:

the original principle behind all princilAes, after which God shaped or formed the universe (*Migr. Abr.* 103).

Neither of these statements about the plurality of the Logos can have derived from the text in question. Philo illustrates from each that this was the case, and that the many Powers were ruled by, and in some way a part of, the Logos. The sacred name was the name of the Powers:

The third [commandment] is concerned with the name of the Lord, not that name the knowledge of which has never even reached the world of mere becoming... but the name which is given to His Potencies. We are commanded not to take this name in vain (*Rer. Div. Her.* 170).

Time and again we find that the Logos is the visible, the manifested God. Discussing Deut. 4.39, 'Yahweh is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath', Philo says:

Let no one suppose that He that *IS* is spoken of... What is meant is that potency of His by which He established and ordered and marshalled the whole realm of being (*Migr. Abr.* 182).

This is reminiscent of the Logos in Wisdom, which touched the heaven while standing on the earth (*Wis.* 18.15).

There were two chief Powers, called God (Elohim) and Lord (Yahweh), but these were but two aspects of the One. They were linked to or represented by the two cherubim of throne.

And the two primary Potencies of the Existent, namely that through which He wrought the world, the beneficent, which is called God, and that by which He rules and commands what He made, that is the punitive, which bears the name of Lord, are as Moses tells us, separated by God Himself standing above and in the midst of them. 'I *will* speak to thee', it says, 'above the mercy-seat in the

midst of the two Cherubim. He means to shew that the primal and highest Potencies of the Existent, the

97

beneficent and the punitive, are equal, having Him to divide them (*Rer. Div. Her.* 166).<sup>43</sup>

Philo uses the imagery of the cherubim in many ways; elsewhere it is Reason/Logos who stands between the two cherubim, to unite them.

While God is indeed one, His highest and chiefest powers are two, even goodness and sovereignty... And in the midst between the two is a third which unites them, Reason, for it is through reason that God is both ruler and good. Of these two potencies sovereignty and goodness the Cherubim are symbols, as fiery sword is the symbol of reason (*Cher.* 27-28).

Here Philo equates the cherubim of the Garden of Eden with those of the temple which represented Eden. Between the two cherubim in the Jerusalem temple was not the flaming sword (Gen. 3-24 does not say the sword was between them) but the throne.<sup>44</sup> It is impossible to assess exactly what Philo does with the underlying tradition, because we can only make comparisons if evidence has survived elsewhere. The cherubim and what they symbolized remain a mystery.<sup>45</sup> What is clear is that Philo associates aspects of the Logos with the throne, and the two cherubim with the aspects known as Elohim and Yahweh. The gracious power is represented by the mercy seat in which Philo outlines this theory is not at all clear, nor is it consistent with what he says elsewhere—a warning, perhaps that he cannot be pressed too hard in his transpositions.

... the lid of the ark, which he calls the Mercy-seat, representing the gracious power; while the creative and kingly powers are represented by the winged Cherubim that rest upon it. The Divine Word, who is high above all these, has not been visibly portrayed, being like to no one of the objects of sense. Nay, He is Himself the Image of God, chiefest of all Beings intellectually perceived, placed nearest, with no intervening distance, to the Alone truly Existent One. For we read: 'I will talk to thee from above the Mercy-seat, between the two Cherubim' (Exod. 25.21) (*Fug.* 100-101).

98

Had he said no more, we should have concluded that the Logos was the one who spoke to Moses, that is, the Logos was Yahweh. But Philo then adds that the Logos is the charioteer to

---

<sup>43</sup> Cf. *Quaest. in Gen.* 57; *Deus Imm.* 109.

<sup>44</sup> The sword may have been a symbol of Yahweh for Philo.

<sup>45</sup> See R. Patai, *The Hebrew Goddess* (New York, 1967), ch. 3.

whom the occupant of the throne speaks! Both the highest Powers, it should be noted, are equal and parallel, and both are subordinate to the High God.<sup>46</sup>

The combined name Yahweh-Elohim which occurs so often in the Pentateuch, stands for the two Powers combined.

Why does (Scripture) say that when Abraham was ninety-nine years old, 'The Lord God appeared to him and said, I am the Lord thy God'? It gives the appellations of the two highest powers... for by them the world came into being, and having come into being, it is governed by them (*Quaest. in Gen.* 3.39).

In the same work Philo speaks later of 'uttering a double invocation to the powers of the Father, (namely) the creative and kingly'(Quaest. in Gen. 4.87).

The Logos was also the royal figure, 'he who is at once High Priest and King(*Fug.* 118). He was a human figure:

God's Man... the Word of the Eternal...

He is called, 'the Beginning', and the Name of God and His Word and the Man after His image, and 'he that sees', that is Israel (*Conf. Ling.* 41; 146).

The image of God is the Word through whom the whole universe was framed (*Spec. Leg.* 1.81).

He was the Branch of Zech. 6.12, a messianic text (*Conf Ling.* 62), and he was the viceroy appointed to sustain the universe:

[I] sustained the universe to rest firm and sure upon the mighty Word, who is My viceroy (*Som.* 1.241; cf. *Agric.* 51).

This status was symbolized by the High Priest's diadem:

... the symbol not of absolute sovereignty but of a an admirable vicerealty (*Fug.* 112).

The Logos was the key to the cosmic covenant and its stability; he is actually called 'His Logos which he calls his Covenant'(Som. 2.237; cf *Migr. Abr.* 181 and *Conf Ling.* 137).

46. Segal (*Two Powers in Heaven*) does not emphasize the difference between the High God and the Angel (one pair of powers in heaven) and the two equal powers described by Philo.

99

This must be read alongside the fact that the Logos was the head of the powers, and it was the Powers which bound the creation together.

---

<sup>46</sup> Segal (*Two Powers in Heaven*) does not emphasize the difference between the High God and the Angel (one pair of powers in heaven) and the two equal powers described by Philo.



... the everlasting Word of the eternal God is the very sure and staunch prop of the Whole. He it is, who extending Himself from the midst to its utmost bounds and from its extremities to the midst again, keeps up through all its length Nature's unvanquished course, combining and compacting all its parts. For the Father Who begat Him constituted His Word such a Bond of the Universe as nothing can break (*Plant.* 8-9).

Of the Logos as High Priest, Philo says:

And the oldest Logos of God has put on the universe as a garment. .. 'He does not tear his garments' for the Logos of God is the bond of all things, as has been said, and holds together all parts, and prevents them by its constriction from breaking apart and becoming separated (*Fug.* 112).

The Logos was also the seal of the universe:

The Word of Him who makes it is Himself the seal, by which each thing that exists has received its shape (*Fug.* 12; cf. *Som.* 2.45).

Philo must have known the tradition of Yahweh's name being the seal but he rejected the original magical associations such as are found in the tale of sealing the abysses. Rather than the seal which secures it, for him the seal becomes the mould which forms the shape of the universe.

The Logos also created by dividing, as did God in Genesis 1:

... the Severer of all things, that is his Word... (*Rer. Div. Her.* 130),

and he maintained order by keeping the conflicting powers apart:

... the earth shall not be dissolved by all the water... nor fire be quenched by air; nor, on the other hand, air be ignited by fire. The Divine Word stations Himself to keep these elements apart ... he mediates between the opponents amid their threatenings, and reconciles them (*Plant.* 10).

Cf. the role of Yahoel in the Apocalypse of Abraham:

100

*I am the one who has been charged ... to restrain the threats of the living creatures of the cherubim against one another... I am appointed to hold the Leviathans (Ap. Abr. 10.9-10).*<sup>47</sup>

The imagery underlying Philo's exposition of the Logos is unmistakable; the temple cult of Jerusalem was the source of a very great deal of it, and given that we only know of that cult

---

<sup>47</sup> Cf. the role of Yahweh in Job 41.

fragments that can be reconstructed from many sources, it may well be that far more of his allusions and imagery could fit did we but know the master picture. What, for example, lies behind Philo's image of the Logos as food (*Leg. All.* 3.173)? Commenting on Exod. 16.15, he says that the Logos is the heavenly bread. A similar tradition must underlie Jn 7.48-51.<sup>48</sup> Again, what gave rise to the picture of the Logos 'that brings man to repentance and salvation by entering the soul and making man aware of his sins and bidding them be cleared out in order that the Logos might be able to perform the necessary work of healing' (*Deus Imm.* 134-35; cf. *Rer. Div. Her.* 63-64)?<sup>49</sup> Might this twofold process be based upon the twofold ritual of the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16)? One goat rid the people of sin and the blood of the other effected atonement. The atoning goat was the one 'for Yahweh' (or 'as Yahweh'; the Hebrew could mean either). The High Priest, who bore the name of Yahweh, took the blood into the sanctuary and thus effected atonement not only for the people but also for the temple (cf. Deut. 32.43; Heb. 9.12).<sup>50</sup>

Finally, brief mention must be made of two other aspects of the Logos-brief because they are fully covered in all works on Philo. First, the Logos was closely connected with Moses, but significantly in the context of the royal cult; and second, the Logos has much in common with Wisdom, again in this context. Philo knew of the traditions drawn upon by Ezekiel the tragedian in his *Exodus*.<sup>51</sup> Both writers associated Moses with

101

a mystic ascent, as a result of which he was given both divine and royal status.

... he was named god and king of the whole nation, and entered, we are told, into the darkness where God (*b Oe6;*) was *Vit. Mos.* 1.158; cf. *Som.* 2.189).

Moses was not merely a man, but one who belonged to both worlds (*Som.* 2.189; cf. *Rer. Div. Her.* 84). If Philo is consistent in his usage, 'the God' denotes the High God, and 'God' denotes the Logos. This means that Philo associated Moses with the ancient royal traditions, with the mystical ascent which lay at the heart of the ancient temple cult and was depicted in the vision of Daniel 7. A man could become 'God and King just as the God and King could be in human form.'<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> P. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo* (Leiden, 1965).

<sup>49</sup> R. Williamson, *Jews in the Hellenistic World. Philo* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 114.

<sup>50</sup> Both, of course, could be Christian additions.

<sup>51</sup> Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 9.29.

<sup>52</sup> Cf *The Older Testament*, p. 150.

Second, both the roles and the imagery associated with the Logos resembled those of Wisdom. The Wisdom described in *Wis.* 7.25 is exactly Philo's Logos:

...a breath of the power of God,  
And a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty.

Since Wisdom's roles were almost exactly those of the Spirit of Yahweh in the Old Testament, this is another link between the Logos and Yahweh. The initial objection might be that Wisdom is a female figure and the Logos male, but Philo does not think this gender difference a problem. Wisdom was second after God, he said, and femininity expressed the subordinate role:

Let us, then, pay no heed to this discrepancy in the gender of the words, and say that the daughter of God, even Wisdom, is not only masculine but also father, sowing and begetting in souls aptness to learn (*Fug.* 52).

Cf. *Rer. Div. Her.* 119, where it is the Logos who implants this seed.

Both Wisdom (Prov. 8.30) and Logos (*Migr. Abr.* 5-6) were the agents of creation. Both Wisdom (Prov. 8.22-24) and Logos were the firstborn.<sup>53</sup> Wisdom was created but eternal (*Sir.* 24.9; cf. *Conf Ling.* 41). Wisdom penetrated all things (*Wis.* 7.24);

102

Logos was the bond of the creation (*Plant.* 9). Wisdom (*Sir.* 24.8) was given Israel for its special heritage; Logos was the angel of Israel. Wisdom ministered before the creator in Zion (*Sir.* 24.8); Logos was the High Priest Wisdom was the guide of Israel's Exodus and wanderings (*Wis.* 10.15ff.). Wisdom was an angelic being who could find no place on earth and so returned to heaven (*1 Enoch* 42). Wisdom sat beside the divine throne or shared it as the consort (*Wis.* 8.3-4; 9.4, 10; *1 Enoch* 84.5). Most striking of all is the fact that Wisdom is a person in some texts, and in others just a body of teaching. Philo has done something similar with the Logos; although it is clearly a person, he has grafted it into the philosophical systems of his day.<sup>54</sup>

E.R. Goodenough observed long ago that, despite all efforts, Philo remained an enigma.

No one seems to have tried to read Philo, if I may say so, with the grain instead of against it, to understand what Philo himself thought he was driving at in all his passionate labours.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Although Prov. 8.22 says that Wisdom was brought forth by Yahweh.

<sup>54</sup> It is the fashion to assume that personifications are a late development; I doubt this and think that 'gods' preceded demythologizing.

<sup>55</sup> Goodenough, *By Light, Light*, p. 5.

Can it be that Philo was demythologizing? We know so little of the mythology of ancient Israel (indeed it is said that there was none!) that it is virtually impossible to appreciate the extent and the genius of the transformation he effected.

It is with mixed feelings that I offer this little piece to Dr Bammel; I am happy to contribute to this volume as a token of affection and gratitude, but sad that it marks the end of an era in Cambridge.