

Primordial Lights

The Logos and Adoil in the Johannine Prologue and 2 *Enoch*

Introduction

The Gospel of John begins with the Prologue, which is a hymn containing complex and unique protological imagery. In contrast to the opening chapters of Genesis, which center on the creation of the world and humankind, the Prologue unveils the realities that preceded the beginning of the creational process. This emphasis on preexistent realities is very rare in early Jewish lore and found only in a few extrabiblical apocalyptic accounts. Despite the uniqueness of such imagery, not all of these apocalyptic writings have received proper attention from scholars of the Fourth Gospel. As Christopher Rowland notes, “[L]ittle attempt has been made to relate the gospel to the earlier apocalyptic texts of Judaism which either antedate the gospel or are roughly contemporary with it.”¹

One early Jewish text that deals with preexistent matters but has been consistently ignored by Johannine scholars is 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*. This text is a Jewish pseudepigraphon written in the first century CE before the destruction of the Second Jerusalem Temple, just a few years earlier than the Fourth Gospel. Like the Johannine Prologue, this Jewish writing unveils the state of affairs that preceded the creation of the world by depicting an enigmatic character—the luminous aeon Adoil—as the Deity’s helper at creation. Despite some striking parallels with the Prologue’s imagery, however, this Jewish apocalypse has been routinely neglected by major commentators and students of the Fourth Gospel. The lack of interest is striking since most Jewish

narratives contemporary to the Johannine Prologue rarely speak about preexistent mediators assisting the Deity at creation.

The aim of this chapter, then, is to explore more closely the protological developments found in *2 Enoch* and their similarities with the imagery of the Prologue of the Gospel of John.

2 Enoch

Protological descriptions, including the details of the creation of the world and humankind, represent one of the main conceptual centers found in Jewish apocalyptic accounts, as protology is so closely connected with eschatology. Many of these elaborations continue the narrative trajectory implicit already in the formative stories found in the initial chapters of the Book of Genesis. Some of these accounts, such as the Johannine Prologue, attempt to go beyond the boundaries of conventional biblical imagery and initiate their readers into the details of the reality that preceded the visible creation.

2 Enoch belongs to this unique group of early Jewish texts that divulges the realities that preceded the genesis of the world. In chapters 24–25 of *2 Enoch*, the Deity reveals to the patriarch Enoch, the translated antediluvian hero, some unique details in the mysteries of creation found neither in earlier Enochic booklets nor in any other Second Temple Jewish materials. One noteworthy aspect of this revelation concerns the order of events before the visible creation. The Deity tells the seer that prior to visible creation he summoned the luminous aeon Adoil from nonbeing, ordering him to become the foundation of all created things. It describes Adoil's transmutation into the cornerstone of creation on which the Deity establishes his throne. Both shorter and longer recensions of *2 Enoch* provide an extensive description of this revelation. In the longer recension of *2 Enoch* 24–25, the account has the following form:

Before anything existed at all, from the very beginning, whatever exists I created from the non-existent, and from the invisible the visible. Listen, Enoch, and pay attention to these words of mine! For not even to my angels have I explained my secrets, nor related to them their origin, nor my endlessness (and inconceivableness), as I devise the creatures, as I am making them known to you today. For,

before any visible things had come into existence, I, the one, moved around in the invisible things, like the sun, from east to west and from west to east. But the sun has rest in himself; yet I did not find rest, because everything was not yet created. And I thought up the idea of establishing a foundation, to create a visible creation. And I commanded the lowest things: “Let one of the invisible things descend visibly!” And Adoil descended, extremely large. And I looked at him, and, behold, in his belly he had a great light. And I said to him, “Disintegrate yourself, Adoil, and let what is born from you become visible.” And he disintegrated himself, and there came out a very great light. And I was in the midst of the [great] light. And light out of light is carried thus. And the great age came out, and it revealed all the creation which I had thought up to create. And I saw how good it was. And I placed for myself a throne, and I sat down on it. And then to the light I spoke: “You go up higher (than the throne), and be solidified [much higher than the throne], and become the foundation of the higher things.” And there is nothing higher than the light, except nothing itself. And again I bowed (?) myself and looked upward from my throne.²

The shorter recension of 2 *Enoch* 24–25 provides a slightly different description:

Before anything existed at all, from the very beginning, whatever is I created from non-being into being, and from the invisible things into the visible. And not even to my angels have I explained my secrets, nor related to them their composition, nor my endless and inconceivable creation which I conceived, as I am making them known to you today. Before any visible things had come into existence, and the light had not yet opened up, I, in the midst of the light, moved around in the invisible things, like one of them, as the sun moves around from east to west and from west to east. But the sun has rest; yet I did not find rest, because everything was not yet created. And I thought up the idea of establishing a foundation, to create a visible creation. And

I commanded the lowest things: "Let one of the invisible things come out visibly!" And Adail descended, extremely large. And I looked at him, and, behold, in his belly he had a great age. And I said to him, "Disintegrate yourself, Adail, and let what is disintegrated from you become visible." And he disintegrated himself, and there came out from him the great age. And thus it carried all the creation which I had wished to create. And I saw how good it was. And I placed for myself a throne, and I sat down on it. To the light I spoke: "You go up higher and be solidified and become the foundation for the highest things." And there is nothing higher than the light, except nothing itself. And I spoke, I straightened myself upward from my throne.³

Adoil, a luminous aeon, and here the central character of the story, is depicted as God's helper who brings the whole creation into existence.⁴ In the Slavonic apocalypse, Adoil is not merely a created entity but rather an agent of creation.⁵ The portrayal of the whole creation emerging from Adoil's body further affirms the role of this character as the generating force of creation.⁶ He belongs to the class of the "invisible things" that existed before creation. He thus does not appear during the process of creation but is "summoned" by the Deity from the circle of "invisible things," a feature that provides an additional indication of his preexistence. Instead of the familiar biblical "let there be," postulating creation *ex nihilo*, the readers of the Slavonic apocalypse hear quite different formulae, such as "Let one of the invisible things come out visibly!" The text's emphasis on the "descent" of Adoil before his participation in God's project might serve as an indication of his initial exalted status, the state that is also implied at the end of the narrative in which God orders the light of Adoil to go higher than the Deity's throne. Adoil's exact status remains shrouded in mystery. Although he is portrayed as one of the "invisible things," it is unclear if the text understands him as an angelic or a divine being or as a part of the divine Pleroma. A suggestion of the divine nature of Adoil comes from the shorter recension of *2 Enoch* 24, which places God in the midst of the invisible preexistent things; it reads: "Before any visible things had come into existence, and the light had not yet opened up, I, in the midst of the light, moved around in the invisible things, *like one of them*, as the sun moves around from east to west

and from west to east.”⁷ This depiction of the Deity “moving around” like the sun in the “invisible things” is reminiscent of a solar system in which God is envisioned as a chief luminary and the “invisible things” possibly as planets. Such a depiction might denote the divine nature of the “invisible things” as “lesser deities” or circles of the divine Pleroma.

In the unfolding drama of creation, Adoil is portrayed as God’s servant, obediently executing the Deity’s commands and acting strictly according to the wishes of his master: “And thus it carried all the creation which I had wished to create.” The account leaves the impression that Adoil might be understood here as a demiurgic hand of the Deity. Regarding the etymology of Adoil’s name, Robert Henry Charles has proposed that it might derive from the Hebrew לֶאֱלֹהִים, translated as the “Hand of God.”⁸ Jarl Fossum offers additional insights into the demiurgic connotation of Adoil’s name by noting that “it was a Jewish doctrine that God had created the world and man with his very hand(s), and the creative Hand of God even seems to have been hypostasized.”⁹ This tradition of the demiurgic extremities of the Deity received prominent development in the later Jewish lore where Enoch-Metatron is often understood as the Deity’s hypostatic hand or his hypostatic finger.¹⁰

It is noteworthy that, in contrast to Genesis 1, where the Deity fashions the visible world and his creatures by his direct commands, in the Slavonic apocalypse, God chooses to act via a preexistent mediator, who is envisioned in the text as an anthropomorphic figure. The anthropomorphic qualities of Adoil are hinted at in the text in a reference to his belly. He is depicted as one who nurses the whole creation inside his preexistent body, and then, like a mother, gives birth to the created order. All of creation literally emerges from his broken body, depicted in *2 Enoch* as a disintegration of the primordial anthropomorphic vessel that gives birth to everything.¹¹

Another important feature of Adoil is his association with light. The shorter recension suggests that the hidden preexistent light was concealed in Adoil’s belly.¹² The luminous nature of the primordial aeon is especially evident in the longer recension, as it portrays the Deity bathing in the light produced from Adoil’s disintegration.

Similar to the demiurgic light, darkness in *2 Enoch* is also depicted as a preexistent and demiurgic entity,¹³ and has its own personified agent—Arkhas or Arukhas, who is portrayed as the foundation of the “lowest things.” The shorter recension of *2 Enoch* 26:13 provides the following portrayal of Arukhas:

And I called out a second time into the lowest things, and I said, "Let one of the invisible things come out solid and visible." There came out Arukhas, solid and heavy and very black. And I saw how suitable he was. And I said to him, "Come down low and become solid! And become the foundation of the lowest things!" And he came down and became solid. And he became the foundation of the lowest things. And there is nothing lower than the darkness, except nothing itself.¹⁴

In this account, Arukhas is depicted much like Adoil, although, in this case, he is depicted as an aeonic demiurgic "vessel" of darkness who gives birth to all lower things. Like the aeon of light, Arukhas belongs to the class of the preexistent "invisible things," and is likewise not created but "summoned." The aeonic creational processions are similar in both cases, as Arukhas also gives birth by "opening himself up." It is possible that Adoil and Arukhas are understood as the personifications of the preexistent light and darkness that paradoxically reflect each other. Despite such mirroring, the Deity clearly prefers the realm of Adoil. Disintegration of Adoil provides the foundation (Slav. *основание*) upon which God establishes the first visible manifestation of the created order, namely, his throne.

Another significant feature of this account of creation is Adoil's designation as a "revealer" found in the longer recension. His revelations are understood as "ontological," rather than verbal, disclosures; this account reads: "And the great age came out, and it revealed all the creation which I had thought up to create."

The traditions of Adoil and Arukhas, two personified primordial helpers assisting the Deity in bringing the world into existence, invite some consideration of the mediatorial proclivities of *2 Enoch*. It appears that the Deity's aids in creation in the Slavonic apocalypse are not exhausted by the figures of Adoil and Arukhas but include others. Although scholars have noted that the epilogue of the creational account emphasizes that God is the sole creator and does not have an adviser or successor to his creation, the epilogue does not deny the demiurgic assistants. Other studies have noticed that, in *2 Enoch's* creational account, God's wisdom and his word¹⁵ are also mentioned as the agents of creation.¹⁶ Indeed, in both recensions¹⁷ of *2 Enoch* 30:8, the Deity commands his wisdom to create man. Like Adoil and

Arukhas at the very beginning of creation, another demiurgic mediator, Sophia, is commissioned to help the Deity with the later stages of the creational process by assisting him in the creation of humankind. Scholars often see the Sophia traditions as the formative bedrock for later Jewish mediatorial developments, including the Johannine Prologue.¹⁸

A reference to Sophia as God's helper in *2 Enoch* 30 is important to our study because it points to the complex creational universe of the Slavonic apocalypse, which is a Jewish text that strives to accommodate several mediatorial trends. It is intriguing that in both cases (Adoil and Sophia) the demiurgic agents act as the Deity's servants who fulfill the "commands" of their master. In *2 Enoch* 30:8, the Deity narrates to the seer that he "commanded" his wisdom to create man. This expression recalls the account of Adoil in which the luminous aeon also receives a "command" from God; it reads: "And I commanded (повелѣх) the lowest things: 'Let one of the invisible things descend visibly!' And Adoil descended, extremely large." Both passages use identical Slavonic terminology (Slav. повелѣх). The reference to the divine word, which is mentioned along with Sophia¹⁹ as a demiurgic agent in *2 Enoch* 33:4,²⁰ also demonstrates that the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse are cognizant not only of early traditions of the demiurgic wisdom but also of later Jewish and Christian conceptual currents similar to those found in the Prologue of John, in which the wisdom traditions were conflated with the tradition of the divine Name.

The Johannine Prologue

Before proceeding to an analysis of conceptual parallels between the Logos and Adoil in the Fourth Gospel and *2 Enoch*, one general similarity between the two accounts deserves our attention. It appears that, despite their uniqueness, both accounts are deeply affected by the imagery found in Genesis 1 in which one finds the familiar oppositions of visible and invisible, darkness and light, categories that also play a paramount role in the Johannine and Enochic accounts. The opening phrase of the Johannine hymn, "in the beginning" (ἐν ἀρχῇ), is also present in *2 Enoch's* creational account,²¹ evoking the Genesis story. Although in Genesis the expression "in the beginning" pertains to the creation of the world, the phrase, both in *2 Enoch* and in the

Prologue, is related to precreational realities. Regarding the Johannine Prologue, Raymond Brown notes that “the opening words of verse one are similar to Genesis 1:1. While the author of Genesis is referring to creation, the author of the Fourth Gospel is speaking of eternity. There is no indication that the Word is a part of God’s created order.”²²

God’s Helpers in Creation

It appears that, like *2 Enoch*, the Prologue understands the Logos not as an independent “creator” but rather as a creational agent whose task is to execute God’s thoughts, plans, and wishes. As demonstrated earlier, in *2 Enoch*, the Deity himself affirms the “executive” nature of Adoil by saying that the luminous aeon carried all the creation that he “had wished to create.” The same pattern is discernible in the Fourth Gospel, in which the Logos is depicted not as a demiurge but rather as the helper of the Father. Scholars have noted that the Prologue makes it quite clear that “God is the Creator; his Word is the agent.”²³ Raymond Brown suggests that “in saying that it is through the Word that all things came into being, the Prologue is at distance from Gnostic thought whereby a demiurge, and not God, was responsible for material creation, which is evil. Since the Word is related to the Father and the Word creates, the Father may be said to create through the Word. Thus, the material world has been created by God and is good.”²⁴ Personifying both Adoil and the Logos further highlights the distance between the Deity and his “helpers.”²⁵ At the same time, both accounts stress that their preexistent mediators are active creative participants, not simply inert tools of the Deity. Brown observes that “the role of the Word is not a passive, but an active one. The Logos functions.”²⁶ Similarly, in *2 Enoch*, Adoil’s active participation is hinted at by his depiction as the “mother” of all creation, a caregiver that “nurses” the whole creation in the preexistent time and then gives birth to it.

Preexistent Beings

Another common feature of the two creation accounts is that both the existence of the Logos and Adoil precedes the act of creation; neither “helper” is made during its process. The exact origin of the mediators is unknown. Although both protological accounts start with the phrase

“in the beginning,” the phrase does not signify the starting point of creation as it does in Genesis 1. Instead, it brings the reader into the midst of preexistent divine reality. Both the Logos and Adoil are thus understood as a part of the divine realm. Brown rightly points out that the presence of the Logos “in the beginning,” unlike in Genesis, “refers to the period before creation and is a designation, more qualitative than temporal, of the sphere of God.”²⁷

Concealed Entities

In both accounts, the revelations of Adoil and the Logos are wrapped in language of concealment and understood as the utmost divine mysteries. The Deity in *2 Enoch* tells the seventh antediluvian hero that even his angels lack access to this revelation.²⁸ Here, the mediatorial agents who helped the Deity to bring the world into existence remain hidden from creation, which includes even celestial creatures. In the Prologue, a similar idea can be found, that the one through whom the world came into being remained hidden from the world.²⁹ It also appears that in both accounts the esoteric knowledge about preexistent realities eventually becomes revealed to the elect human beings—in *2 Enoch* to the seventh antediluvian hero and his adepts, and in the Prologue to those who believe in Christ. In both cases, the revelation of the preexistent realities has a soteriological value that provides the key to the mystery of salvation.³⁰ It is thus not coincidental that in *2 Enoch* the disclosure about Adoil is conceptually tied to the revelation about the final “age,” an entity that mirrors the primordial aeon of light.

Personified Demiurgic Lights

Also, both accounts associate their chief creational agents with pre-existent light. It has been already demonstrated in our study that in *2 Enoch* Adoil is understood not merely as a luminous entity but as a bearer of the preexistent demiurgic light. He, like the Logos in the Prologue, is himself a source of light. The fact that both light and “all creation” are situated in the belly of Adoil further elucidates that the light of the primordial aeon is indeed the demiurgic light.

In the Prologue of John, similar developments can be discerned in which the Logos is portrayed as the personification of the divine light.³¹ Scholars have remarked that “the equivocal equivalence of the

Word and the Light systems is established in the Prologue, where both are identified as agents of creation (1:3, 10), both enter the world (1:4, 9–10, 14) and, implicitly, both are the objects of ‘receiving,’ ‘knowing,’ and ‘believing.’”³² Such depiction of the light as an agent of creation indicates that we are dealing here, as in *2 Enoch*, with the concept of the demiurgic light.

Moreover, it is noteworthy that, like the Logos, who is understood as the source of both preexistent and “material” light, the “light of the world,” Adoil is also associated with both luminous entities, expressed in the longer recension of the Slavonic apocalypse as “carrying light out of light.” In John 1:5, the symbolism of light is conflated with the imagery of darkness, as in Genesis 1. Yet such juxtaposition of the light and darkness is reminiscent not only of the imagery found in the first chapter of the Hebrew Bible but also the imagery of *2 Enoch*, in which the light of Adoil is juxtaposed with the darkness of another primordial aeon, namely, Arukhas, which is clearly separated from its luminous counterpart.

Ontological Revealers

It appears, also, that both Adoil and the Logos are understood as revealers. Rudolph Bultmann suggested that “the hymn that forms the basis of the Prologue praises the Logos as the Revealer.”³³ Indeed, in the case of the Logos, the revelatory potentials are already manifested even in the title of this divine agent, namely, the Word of God.³⁴ The “revelations” of the Word are ontological disclosures, as well as “verbal” ones. As Raymond Brown notes, “the fact that the Word creates means that creation is an act of revelation. All creation bears the stamp of God’s Word.”³⁵ The entire creative process is understood, within this conceptual framework, as a continuous revelation of the Deity. The same concept is encountered in the Slavonic apocalypse in which Adoil’s activity at creation is depicted as the ontological revelation of God. The longer recension of *2 Enoch* designates Adoil as the revealer. His revelations, as with the Logos, represent ontological disclosures in his creative work. Adoil’s disintegration is identified in the text as the revelation of the created order: “And the great age came out, and it revealed all the creation which I had thought up to create.”

The ontological revelations of Adoil and the Logos seem to be present in the peculiar metamorphoses of both characters, during which their preexistent forms become shepherded into the realities

of the material world. Adoil's transformation is manifested through his disintegration, when this vessel of light bursts, giving life to all creation, while the Logos' incarnation, expressed in the Prologue as the Word becoming flesh, demonstrates his transformation.

Sources of All Creation

Another notable feature of these accounts is that both underscore the comprehensiveness of the creational efforts of their preexistent mediators. John 1:3 states that through the divine Logos "all things came into being . . . and without him not one thing came into being." The expression "all things" (πάντα) found in this passage is often understood by the interpreters as a reference to "all the creation."³⁶ Brown notes that beginning with the second century, the phrase "'all things came into being' has been taken as a reference to creation. . . . The verb 'came into being' is ἐγένετο, used consistently to describe creation in the LXX of Gen 1."³⁷

The tradition found in John 1:3 can be compared with the testimony about Adoil found in both recensions of *2 Enoch* 25, which tell that Adoil "carried *all the creation* (Slav. всю тварь) which I had wished to create."³⁸ This statement is rather puzzling since a few verses later Arukhas is also depicted as the one who brings the "lower things" into existence. Such discrepancies might reflect the creational narrative's composite nature, as it attempts to reconcile several demiurgic mediatorial trends.

It is also noteworthy that both accounts depict their respective creational agents as the demiurgic "vessels" that conceal the whole creation inside of them. In Adoil's case, the whole creation is said to be contained in the belly of the primordial aeon. A similar conceptual development might also be present in the Fourth Gospel. Some scholars have proposed that the Prologue indicates that creation was initially hidden in the Logos.³⁹ If the Prologue indeed portrays the Logos, like Adoil, as the primordial vessel of all created things, it points to a similar conceptual development in which the Deity creates the world by emptying his preexistent demiurgic vessels.⁴⁰

Heavenly Men

Both accounts also hint at the anthropomorphic nature of their respective demiurgic agents, depicting them as the Heavenly Men. As

suggested in our study, the Slavonic apocalypse unveils the anthropomorphic nature of Adoïl through the portrayal of his light-filled belly. Several studies suggest that Adoïl is envisioned in *2 Enoch* as the Heavenly Man. April DeConick argues that “the creative activity of the heavenly Man is highlighted in . . . the story of Adoïl found in *2 Enoch*. . . . where . . . a man-like figure, descends with a great light in his stomach.”⁴¹ The anthropomorphic nature of Adoïl appears to be implied, in *2 Enoch* 65, in which the final aeon, accommodating the remnant of humankind, is depicted as an eschatological replica of Adoïl. Such eschatological gathering is reminiscent of the sculpturing of the “Last Statue” in the Manichaean tradition in which the righteous remnant is predestined to reconstitute the anthropomorphic form of the Heavenly Man at the end of the world.⁴²

Similar to Adoïl’s imagery found in the Slavonic apocalypse, the Logos is also depicted as an anthropomorphic entity and, more precisely, as the Heavenly Man. This understanding of the Logos as an anthropomorphic figure is a pre-Christian development, clearly documented already in Philo’s writings in which the Logos is portrayed as the Heavenly Man. Analyzing the Logos’ speculations found in Philo’s *De Confusione Linguarum*,⁴³ Thomas Tobin argues that, in these passages, “the Logos has been identified with the figure of the ‘heavenly man.’”⁴⁴ Tobin suggests that this important conceptual development “has taken place in the Hellenistic Jewish interpretation of the Logos in connection with interpretations of texts from Genesis 1–3.”⁴⁵ Tobin concludes that “this assimilation in Hellenistic Judaism of the Logos to the figure of the heavenly man may have served as an important step in the kind of reflection that led to the identification of the Logos with a particular human being, Jesus of Nazareth, in the hymn in the Prologue of John.”⁴⁶

Demarcations of Light and Darkness

The symbolism of the opposition of light and darkness plays an equally important role both in *2 Enoch* and the Prologue of John. Much ink has been spilled about the antithetical relation between light and darkness in the Johannine hymn.⁴⁷ Thomas Tobin, among others, notes that “a second element in the hymn that moves beyond the viewpoints found in Jewish wisdom literature is the stark contrast between light and darkness . . . found in John 1:4–5.”⁴⁸ The Prologue insists that the

darkness has not been able to overcome the light. Such strict delineation between light and darkness once again brings to mind *2 Enoch*, in which darkness is not only clearly separated from light but even has its own personification in the figure of Arukhas.

It seems, then, that both in *2 Enoch* and the Prologue, Adoil and the Logos serve not only the personifications of the light but also the demarcations or the “walls” whose functions are to prevent the mixing of the light and the darkness. When the shorter recension of *2 Enoch* 65 speaks of the luminosity of the final eschatological aeon that mirrors Adoil, this imagery is conflated with the symbolism of the wall; it reads: “But they will have a great light for eternity, <and> an indestructible wall.”⁴⁹

Conclusion

It has been long recognized that the Prologue of John was influenced by the wisdom traditions. However, the complex question about the exact mold of the sapiential currents that influenced the author of the hymn remains unanswered. John Ashton notes that “we do not need to ask from what source the author of the hymn derived his ideas, for both the general theme and the specific details are abundantly illustrated in wisdom tradition. Rather we have to ask what there was in the tradition which could have stimulated his own imaginative response: what precisely did he take from it?”⁵⁰

The same can be asked of *2 Enoch*’s own appropriation of the wisdom traditions. It appears that while the tradition of the demiurgic wisdom is hidden within the Logos speculation in the Prologue, the Slavonic apocalypse clearly separates it from Adoil’s deeds by invoking the actions of Sophia in the creation of humankind later in the text. This postulation of several demiurgic mediators points to the composite nature of the creational account of *2 Enoch*, in which various mediatorial streams are forced to interact. Another important feature of *2 Enoch*’s creational account is its peculiar mediatorial pairs; in the beginning Adoil is coupled with Arukhas, and in the conclusion Wisdom is paired with the Word. The last pair is especially noteworthy because it evokes the Johannine account in which the Jewish wisdom traditions are conflated with the imagery of the divine Word. It has been noted that the Prologue seems to be influenced by a particular

mold of the sapiential tradition that emphasizes the aural revelation of the Deity; Nicola Frances Denzey, for instance, argues that the Prologue remains a representative example of not simply a Wisdom tradition, “but rather of a distinct ‘Word tradition’ which shared sapiential literature’s dependency on Genesis yet interpreted it rather differently. This tradition attributed a creative force not to God’s hypostasized forethought or Wisdom, but to his Voice or Word.”⁵¹ While the Prologue, like Philo, conflates the aural tradition of the divine Word with the anthropomorphic ideology of the Heavenly Man, it appears that, in *2 Enoch*, these two conceptual streams remain clearly separated.⁵² Moreover, in the Slavonic apocalypse the Deity uses a plethora of various demiurgic “instruments,” aural as well as anthropomorphic. While in the beginning he forcefully creates with his luminous form by bursting the anthropomorphic vessel of the primordial light, which gives birth to everything, he later chooses to mold humankind with another helper—his Wisdom, the mediator who is paired in *2 Enoch* with the divine Word but, unlike in the Prologue, not entirely fused with it. These intriguing interactions provide a unique glimpse into the complex world of Jewish mediatorial debates of the late Second Temple period and the conceptual developments that played a formative role in both the Slavonic apocalypse and the Johannine hymn.

to bow before him, but Adam teaches them to render all honor to God as their true creator; (3) the angels mistake Adam for God and wish to exclaim ‘Holy’ before him, whereupon God reduces Adam’s size.” 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* (3 vols; eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1996) 1.529–539. An important similarity can be detected between these Adamic traditions and the Metatron accounts. In *b. Hag.* 15a, for instance, God punished Metatron with sixty fiery lashes. Alan Segal observes that “just as Metatron needed correction for the false impression he gave Aher, so Adam needs correction for the false impression given the angels.” A. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA, 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977) 112. Indeed, in the Adamic “two powers” accounts, the protoplast is disciplined in various ways, including the reduction of his stature. Thus from *Gen. R.* 8:10 one can learn that when God created man in his own image “the ministering angels mistook him [for a divine being] and wished to exclaim ‘Holy’ before Him. . . . What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do? He caused sleep to fall upon him, and so all knew that he was [only a mortal] man.” Freedman and Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, 1.61. In the *Alphabet of Rabbi Akiba* the angels’ erroneous behavior is explained through reference to Adam’s gigantic body; it reads: “This teaches that initially Adam was created from the earth to the firmament. When the ministering angels saw him, they were shocked and excited by him. At that time they all stood before the Holy One, blessed be He, and said to Him; ‘Master of the Universe! There are two powers in the world, one in heaven and one on earth.’ What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do then? He placed His hand on him, and decreased him, setting him at one thousand cubits.” M. Idel, “Enoch is Metatron,” *Imm* 24/25 (1990) 220–240 at 226. For the Hebrew text, see Wertheimer, *Batei Midrashot*, 2.333–477. *Pesikta de Rab Kahana* 1:1 reflects the same tradition: “Said R. Aibu, ‘At that moment the first man’s stature was cut down and diminished to one hundred cubits.’” *Pesikta de Rab Kahana* (tr. J. Neusner; 2 vols.; Atlanta; Scholars, 1987) 1.1.

73. Regarding Enoch-Metatron’s title יהוה הקטן, see Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 136–143.

Primordial Lights: The Logos and Adoil in the Johannine Prologue and 2 Enoch

1. C. Rowland, “John 1.51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition,” *NTS* 30 (1984) 498–507 at 500.
2. Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.142–144.

3. Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.143–145.

4. Concerning the etymology of the name Adoil, see A. Orlov, “Secrets of Creation in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch,” in: idem, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (JSJSS, 114; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 191–194.

5. Alan Segal, among others, regarding the demiurgic role of Adoil, notes that “some relationship between God’s principal angel and His agent at creation may be possible in traditions about the angel Adoil.” Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 189. April DeConick also sees Adoil as a demiurgic agent. She notes that “the creative activity of the heavenly Man is highlighted in another Jewish Alexandrian source, the story of Adoil found in 2 Enoch.” A. DeConick, *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas: A History of the Gospel and Its Growth* (London: T&T Clark, 2005) 201.

6. Some scholars have difficulties seeing these demiurgic qualities of Adoil. Masanobu Endo argues that, although Adoil is personified and functions as one who obeys the command of God, he is not an agent, but rather, he is an object which is transformed and created. Endo notes that “both Adoil and Arkhas are personified and function as those who obey the command of God; however they are not described as the agents, but rather as the objects which are transformed and created.” M. Endo, *Creation and Christology: A Study on the Johannine Prologue in the Light of Early Jewish Creation Accounts* (WUNT, 2.149; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2002) 21.

7. Emphasis mine.

8. Charles, *APOT*, 2.445.

9. Fossum, *The Name of God*, 288.

10. See *Sifre to Deuteronomy. Pisqa 338. Sifre to Deuteronomy. An Analytical Translation* (tr. J. Neusner; BJS, 101; 2 vols., Atlanta: Scholars, 1987) 2.392. Cf. also 3 Enoch 48D (*Synopse* §§77–80).

11. Some additional details about the nature and qualities of Adoil are also found in chapter 65 of 2 Enoch, in which the beginning of creation is invoked again in the context of the mysteries of the last days. Scholars have noted that the protological account in 2 Enoch 25, dealing with the establishment of the created order, appears to correspond with the order of eschatological events in chapter 65, in which, during his short visit to earth, Enoch conveys to his children some eschatological secrets. The patriarch reveals that in the eschatological time all the righteous of the world will be incorporated into a luminous entity: the aeon of the righteous. The description of this final aeon bears some striking similarities to the primordial aeon Adoil depicted in chapter 25. The last aeon in many ways restores and mirrors the first aeon and the depiction of the last aeon provides additional hints at the qualities and nature of Adoil. The patriarch begins his retelling with the familiar theme of the primeval aeon already mentioned in chapter 25. These protological events

are then set in parallel with the cluster of eschatological events that, according to the authors of the apocalypse, will reintegrate the remnant of the creation into a single aeonic entity which will collect all the righteous of the world. It appears that the righteous, here, as in later Jewish mysticism, are understood as gatherers of the divine light dispersed during the disintegration of Adoil who will collect the primordial light into a new eschatological vessel. The final consummation of the chosen creation into a single aeon mirrors the initial protological disintegration of Adoil that once gave birth to the multiplicity of created forms. This eschatological depiction, which reflects the protological realities, again demonstrates Adoil's preexistence. The portrayal of the final aeon underlines its atemporal nature when it says "then the time periods will perish, and there will be neither years nor months nor days, and hours will no longer be counted." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.191–193. The final aeon also reaffirms the anthropomorphic qualities of Adoil since it will be eschatologically reassembled from the remnant of humankind.

12. ". . . the light had not yet opened up."

13. Endo rightly observes that "darkness is pre-existent at the beginning of creation, and it is the foundation of the lowest things." Endo, *Creation and Christology*, 22.

14. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.145. The longer recension of *2 Enoch* 26:1–3 offers a similar depiction: "And I called out a second time into the very lowest things, and I said, 'Let one of the invisible things come out visibly, solid.' And Arkhas came out, solid and heavy and very red. And I said, 'Open yourself up, Arkhas, and let what is born from you become visible!' And he disintegrated himself. There came out an age, dark, very large, carrying the creation of all lower things. And I saw how good it was. And I said to him, 'Come down low and become solid! And become the foundation of the lowest things!' And it came about. And he came down and became solid. And he became the foundation of the lowest things. And there is nothing lower than the darkness, except nothing itself." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.144.

15. *2 Enoch* 33:4 (longer recension) reads: "And there is no adviser and no successor to my creation. I am self-eternal and not made by hands. My thought is without change. My wisdom is my adviser and my deed is my word." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.156.

16. Endo, *Creation and Christology*, 22.

17. The shorter recension of *2 Enoch* 30:8 reads: "When I had finished all this, I commanded (повелѣх) my wisdom to create man." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.151. The longer recension of *2 Enoch* 30:8 reads: "And on the sixth day I commanded (повелѣх) my wisdom to create man out of the seven components." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.150.

18. For example, Charles Kingsley Barrett suggests that "Col 1:15–20 shows as clearly as does John 1:1–18 the use of language drawn from Jewish

speculations about Wisdom.” C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (2nd ed.; London: SPCK, 1978) 154.

19. Martin Hengel notes that in Wis 9:1 “the creative word of God and the personified Sophia appear in a *parallelismus membrorum*: ‘O God of my fathers, Lord of mercy who hast made all things by thy word and by thy wisdom hast formed man.’ Word and wisdom of God are here nearly identified.” M. Hengel, “The Prologue of the Gospel of John as the Gateway to Christological Truth,” in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology* (eds. R. Bauckham and C. Mosser; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008) 265–294 at 274.

20. “And there is no adviser and no successor to my creation . . . My wisdom is my adviser and my deed is my word.” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.156.

21. Cf. 2 *Enoch* 24: “Before anything existed at all, from the very beginning (испрѣва).” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.142.

22. R. Brown, “The Prologue of the Gospel of John,” *RevExp* 62 (1965) 429–439 at 430–431.

23. F.F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994) 32.

24. R. Brown, *The Gospel According to John I–XII*, (AB, 29; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966) 26.

25. Bruce notes that “our Evangelist has no mere literary personification in mind. The personal status which he ascribes to the Word is a matter of real existence; the relation which the Word bears to God is a personal relation: ‘the Word was with God.’” Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*, 30.

26. Brown, “The Prologue of the Gospel of John,” 431.

27. Brown, *The Gospel According to John I–XII*, 4.

28. 2 *Enoch* 24 (the shorter recension): “[N]ot even to my angels have I explained my secrets, nor related to them their composition, nor my endless and inconceivable creation which I conceived, as I am making them known to you today.” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.143.

29. John 1:10: “He was in the world, and the world came into being through him; yet the world did not know him” (NRSV).

30. Concerning the Prologue’s “mystery” language, Paul Lamarche highlights its soteriological dimension. He suggests that “if we compare John with the Pauline corpus we find that the Logos corresponds exactly to the mystery which, for Paul, is embodied in the divine person of Christ. And it is probably no accident that in one passage in Paul the words ‘logos’ and ‘mystery’ are found side by side; it is not Paul’s mission, ‘which was given to me for you [the Colossians], to make the word of God (*ton logon tou theou*) fully known, the mystery (*to mystērion*) hidden for ages and generations but now made manifest’ (Col. 1:25f.). No doubt the Pauline Logos and Johannine are not identical; nevertheless the link established by Paul between the Word of

God and mystery can pave the way for a more profound understanding of the Word as mystery—inner word, hidden mystery, plan of God.” P. Lamarche, “The Prologue of John,” in: *The Interpretation of John* (2nd ed.; ed. J. Ashton; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997) 47–66 at 53.

31. Peder Borgen notes that “John 1:1–8 seems to draw on learned Jewish exegesis, wherein Logos, לִבְרָ and light, אֹרֶךְ are connected on the basis of Gen. 1:3.” P. Borgen, “Logos Was the True Light: Contributions to the Interpretation of the Prologue of John,” *NovT* 14 (1972) 115–130 at 192.

32. N.R. Petersen, *The Gospel of John and Sociology of Light: Language and Characterization in the Fourth Gospel* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1993) 72.

33. R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John. A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971) 32.

34. Barrett notes that the choice of the term *logos* points both to the demiurgic and revelatory roles, the functions already associated with this terminology in the Septuagint. He notes that *logos* “is a very frequent word in the Greek Old Testament; here special attention may be drawn to two groups of passages. In the former the word is creative . . . in the latter, the word of the Lord is the prophet’s message, that is, the means by which God communicates his purpose to his people . . . Both creation and revelation are in mind in the Johannine Prologue, and the rest of the gospel encourages us to suppose that the influence of the Old Testament may be found here.” Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 153.

35. Brown, *The Gospel According to John I–XII*, 25.

36. J. Ashton, *Studying John: Approaches to the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994) 20–21.

37. Brown, *The Gospel According to John I–XII*, 6. He further notes that “with the appearance of ‘came into being’ (ἐγένετο) in verse 3 we are in the sphere of creation. All that is created is intimately related to the Word, for it was created not only through him, but also in him. We find the same idea in the hymn of Col 1. 16: ‘For in him were all things created . . . all things were created by him and in him.’ The same unity that exists between the Word and his creation will be applied in John 15:5 to Jesus and the Christian: ‘Apart from me you can do nothing.’” Brown, *The Gospel According to John I–XII*, 25.

38. Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.144–145, emphasis mine.

39. This tradition that can be further illuminated by Col 1:15–16: “He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in him all things in heaven and on earth were created, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or powers—all things have been created through him and for him” (NRSV).

40. Cf. Phil 2:5–8: “Let the same mind be in you that was in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not regard equality with

God as something to be exploited, but emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, being born in human likeness. And being found in human form, he humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death—even death on a cross” (NRSV).

41. DeConick, *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas*, 201. See, also, A. DeConick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 66–67.

42. Cf. *Keph.* 165: “Again, when the sun sinks from the universe and sets, and all people go in to their hiding places and houses and conceal themselves; this also pertains to the mystery of the end, as it presages the consummation of the universe. For, when all the light will be purified and redeemed in the universe at the last, the collector of all things, the Last Statue, will gather in and sculpt itself. It is the last hour of the day, the time when the Last Statue will go up to the aeon of light.” Gardner, *The Kephalaia of the Teacher*, 174. Cf. also *Keph.* 104: “The first death is from the time when the light fell to the darkness, and was mixed in with the rulers of darkness; until the time when the light will become pure, and be separated from the darkness in that great fire. The reminder left behind there can build and add to the Last Statue.” Gardner, *The Kephalaia of the Teacher*, 107–108. Regarding the Manichaean eschatological “Statue” made from the particles of light rescued by the elect, see Widengren, *Mani and Manichaeism*, 68; Heuser, “Manichaean Myth According to the Coptic Sources,” 86–87.

43. Cf. *Conf.* 41: “. . . you who have enrolled yourself as children of one and the same Father, who is not mortal but immortal—God’s Man (ἄνθρωπον Θεοῦ), who being the Word (λόγος) of the Eternal. . . .” Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, 4.32–33; *Conf.* 146: “And many names are his, for he is called, ‘the Beginning,’ and the Name of God, and His Word (λόγος), and the Man after His image.” Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, 4.88–91.

44. T. Tobin, “The Prologue of John and Hellenistic Jewish Speculation,” *CBQ* 52 (1990) 252–69 at 267. Alan Segal also notes that “Philo identifies the heavenly man with the Logos, which is identified with God’s archangel and principal helper in creation.” Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 189.

45. Tobin, “The Prologue of John and Hellenistic Jewish Speculation,” 267.

46. Tobin, “The Prologue of John and Hellenistic Jewish Speculation,” 267.

47. John Painter notes that “in John the darkness and the light are antithetical. Each excludes the other.” J. Painter, “Rereading Genesis in the Prologue of John?” in: *Neotestamentica et Philonica. Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen* (eds. D.E. Aune, T. Seland, J.H. Ulrichsen; Leiden: Brill 2003) 182. With respect to the motif of primordial light and darkness in the Johannine Prologue, see also P. Borgen, *Philo, John and Paul: New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity* (BJS, 131; Atlanta: Scholars, 1987) 89–92.

48. Tobin, "The Prologue of John and Hellenistic Jewish Speculation," 254.
49. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.191–193.
50. J. Ashton, "The Transformation of Wisdom," in: J. Ashton, *Studying John: Approaches to the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994) 7.
51. N.F. Denzey, "Genesis Traditions in Conflict? The Use of Some Exegetical Traditions in the Trimorphic Protennoia and the Johannine Prologue," VC 55 (2001) 20–44 at 28.
52. The tension between aural and anthropomorphic manifestations of the Deity can be traced to the Hebrew Bible, in which the anthropomorphic imagery of the Priestly tradition was contested by the aural paradigm of the divine Name promulgated by the Deuteronomistic school. Concerning the tensions between the paradigms of the divine Name and the divine Form in biblical materials, see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 191–201; Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 124.

Conclusion

1. P. Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2009) 5.
2. Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 11–14. Cf. also Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 106–114; Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 359–363; P. Schäfer, "The Aim and Purpose of Early Jewish Mysticism. Gershom Scholem Reconsidered," in P. Schäfer, *Hekhalot-Studien* (TSAJ, 19; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988) 277–295; idem, *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1992) 150–155; M.D. Swartz, *Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996) 29; 153–157; 170–172; 210–212.
3. Scholem argued that "subterranean but effective, and occasionally still traceable, connections exist between these later mystics and the groups which produced a large proportion of the pseudepigrapha and apocalypses of the first century before and after Christ." Scholem, *Major Trends*, 42.
4. Scholem, *Major Trends*, 67.
5. Regarding the various streams of the Metatron tradition, Scholem argued that "one aspect identifies Metatron with Jahoel or Michael and knows nothing of his transfiguration from a human being into an angel. The tal-mudic passages concerned with Metatron are of this type. The other aspect identifies Metatron with the figure of Enoch as he is depicted in apocalyptic literature. . . . When the Book of Hekhaloth, or 3 Enoch, was composed, the two aspects had already become intertwined." G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism*,

Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965) 51

6. E. Wolfson, *Luminal Darkness: Imaginal Gleanings from Zoharic Literature* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2007) 1. Wolfson further notes that like the kabbalists of the Castilian circle, the author of the *Zohar* understands a demonic realm, called by him *Sitra Ahra*, the 'Other Side,' as structurally mirroring the divine realm: both realms are constituted by ten powers. Wolfson, *Luminal Darkness*, 2.

7. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 450. Eitan Fishbane notes that the "prominent dimension of zoharic mythology is the perennial cosmic struggle between good and evil, metaphysical forces that are rooted in particular components of the tenfold divine structure. The divine self, like the world of human experience, is depicted as dominated by a tense polarity between the Right Side (Hesed—Love/Compassion) and the Left Side (Gevurah/Din—Severity/Judgment). . . ." E.P. Fishbane, "The Zohar: Masterpiece of Jewish Mysticism," in *Jewish Mysticism and Kabbalah: New Insights and Scholarship* (ed. F.E. Greenspahn; New York and London: New York University Press, 2011) 49–67 at 54.

8. Joseph Dan traces the conceptual crystallization of the demonic counterpart of the sefirotic system to a representative of the Castilian school by arguing that "the first kabbalistic dualistic system was presented in a brief treatise written by Rabbi Isaac ben Jacob ha-Cohen, entitled Treatise on the Emanations on the Left. This treatise, written in Castile about 1265, describes a parallel system of seven divine evil powers, the first of which is called Samael and the seventh, feminine one is called Lilith. While both of these figures have a long history in Jewish writings before Rabbi Isaac, it seems that he was the first to bring them together and present them as a divine couple, parallel to God and the *Shekhinah*, who rule over a diverse structure of evil demons, who struggle for dominion in the universe against the powers of goodness, the emanations on the right." J. Dan, *Kabbalah: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) 50.

9. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 451.

10. ". . . the demonic realm, which vis-à-vis the divine is considered to be the left. . . ." Wolfson, *Luminal Darkness*, 2. Wolfson notes that "already in the *Sefer ha-Bahir*, the first literary source based on a theosophic doctrine of emanations to emerge in medieval Europe, Satan is identified as one of the divine 'attributes,' the 'left hand' 'whose name is evil' and 'who is set on the north side of God.'" Wolfson, *Luminal Darkness*, 31. Wolfson adds that "in the kabbalistic circles of Castile, however, the demonic is presented not simply as one of the powers of God, but rather as a realm fully complementing that of the divine." Wolfson, *Luminal Darkness*, 31

11. Cf. *Apoc. Ab.* 22:1–2; 29:11.

12. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 451.

13. Cf. *Apoc. Ab.* 23:4–11; *Zohar* I.152b–153a. Concerning this imagery, see Orlov, “‘The Likeness of Heaven’: *Kavod* of Azazel in the Apocalypse of Abraham,” 232–253.

14. Reflecting on the antagonism of the divine and demonic in later Jewish mysticism, Joseph Dan notes that “the formulation of the powers of evil as an independent enemy of the divine, and the description of human life as being conducted in a dualistic universe in which evil and good are in constant struggle, is the contribution of the kabbalah to Jewish worldview.” Dan, *Kabbalah*, 50.

15. Wolfson notes that “the author of the Zohar, like his Castilian predecessors, was concerned with the problem of the origin of evil and the etiological relation of the divine to the demonic.” He further notes that “the dualistic posture in this circle is not of an ontological or metaphysical sort. That is, the kabbalistic conception . . . explicitly states that the one God makes both good and evil, light and dark, the good and evil impulses of the human individual. Against this conceptual background we must understand these kabbalists’ concern with the question of the genesis of the demonic left side. The underlying assumption here is that even the demonic derives from a stage in the emanative process. The demonic is thus depicted as an extension of a divine attribute, usually identified as judgment, rather than as an autonomous power.” Wolfson, *Luminal Darkness*, 3 and 31–32.

16. In relation to this concept, Elliot Wolfson notes that, “according to these kabbalists, the ‘emanations of the left’ have their origin in and are sustained by the left side of the divine realm itself. That is to say, therefore, that the demonic has a root within the divine. This gnostic theme is developed repeatedly in the Zohar; indeed, it forms one of the essentially characteristic doctrines of the work.” Wolfson, *Luminal Darkness*, 2.

17. Fishbane, “The Zohar: Masterpiece of Jewish Mysticism,” 54.

18. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 452.

19. See, for example, *Zohar* I.52a.

20. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 452. Tishby demonstrates that in the *Zohar* “an account of the victory of ‘the Other Side,’ described as the entrance of the monster into the sea of the *Shekhinah* and into the rivers that flow from it.” Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 452.

21. Whitney, *Two Strange Beasts*, 117.

22. Regarding this development, see I. Jacobs, *The Midrashic Process: Tradition and Interpretation in Rabbinic Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) 158; M.A. Fishbane, *The Exegetical Imagination: On Jewish Thought and Theology* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998) 41–55; idem, *Biblical Myth and Rabbinic Mythmaking* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) 273–285; A. Orlov, “What is Below?: Mysteries of

Leviathan in Jewish Pseudepigrapha and Mishnah Hagigah 2:1,” in *Hekhalot Literature in Context: From Byzantium to Babylonia* (eds. R. Boustán et al.; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2013) 313–322.

23. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 452.

24. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 453.

25. Tishby notes that in later Jewish mysticism “several commandments are explained as being bribes offered to *sitra ahra*, including, for example, the goat that is dispatched to Azazel, the heifer that has its neck broken, the washing of the hands after meals, and the animal hair on the phylacteries.” Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 453.

26. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 453. Wolfson notes that “in the Zohar, the *mitsvot* have one of two purposes: either to strengthen and sustain the realm of holiness by maintaining the flow of divine light from the uppermost grades to the lowest, or to neutralize the forces of evil so they do not interfere with the unity of the holy realm. Sacrifices in particular, according to the *Zohar*, are an instance where we quite literally ‘give the devil his due.’ That is, a portion of every sacrifice is set aside for *Sitra Ahra*, the one exception being the *olah*, the burnt offering, which according to Scripture is burnt entirely for God.” Wolfson, *Luminal Darkness*, 37.

27. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 453. Tishby explores the connection between the weakening of the sacerdotal presence and the power of the Other Side in the Zoharic tradition which believed that “when the tabernacle was erected the *Shekhinah* became very powerful, and the strength of ‘the Other Side’ diminished, and were it not for Israel’s subsequent iniquities ‘the Other Side’ would not have been able to exercise any further authority. But once they had returned to their evil ways ‘the Other Side’ recovered, ‘and from that day the only thing they could do was to give portion of everything to ‘the Other Side’ through the mystery of the sacrifices, the libations, and the whole-offerings.’ With the cessation of sacrifices at the destruction of the Temple, ‘the Other Side’ has to be appeased and kept at bay through correct devotion during the statutory evening prayer, uttered at night-time when the husks rule the world.” Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 454.

28. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 452.

29. “. . . in the language of the Zohar, Satan would have been removed from the sanctuary (*Shekhinah*) and the side of holiness would have ascended upwards.” Wolfson, *Luminal Darkness*, 38.

30. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 452.

31. Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 11.

32. J.L. Hagen, “No Longer ‘Slavonic’ Only: 2 Enoch Attested in Coptic from Nubia,” in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only* (eds. A. Orlov, G. Boccaccini, J. Zurawski; SJS, 4; Leiden: Brill, 2012) 7–34.

33. Cf. Charles and Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, xvii.

34. Thus, Wolfson observes that “Egypt, according to the symbolic map of the *Zohar*, represents the demonic left side.” Wolfson, *Luminal Darkness*, 3.

35. Concerning these traditions, see Wolfson, *Luminal Darkness*, 4–5.

36. *Zohar* I.83a. D. Matt, *The Zohar: The Book of Enlightenment* (Classics of Western Spirituality; New York: Paulist Press, 1983) 63.