

whether he represents a divine, angelic, or corporeal entity. In this respect, the category of the second power can provide a helpful conceptual framework for the mediatorial protagonist's enigmatic identity. In the light of these benefits, I will use the "powers" terminology in my analysis of the dual theophanies found in the pertinent early Jewish and Christian texts. Additionally, the two powers terminology is useful because within these accounts one can see peculiar transfers of power and authority between the theophanic dyad, whereby crucial attributes of divine sovereignty and authority represented by the divine throne or crown are suddenly transferred from the first power to the second.

The theophanic settings of early two powers accounts are indeed fluid. In some, the deity appears as an anthropomorphic being, in others, he is presented as an aniconic voice. Of course, the deity's appearances as visual or aural representations are not entirely surprising here, since already in the earliest biblical theophanies God had revealed himself both as the anthropomorphic extent¹⁶ and as the divine voice.¹⁷ Moreover, in some paradigmatic Exodus accounts, the deity chooses to reveal himself simultaneously in various theophanic modes, both aural and ocularcentric. On the surface, the deity's revelation in aural and ocularcentric modes appears to be very similar to Jewish and Christian joint theophanies that attest to the simultaneous existence of both theophanic molds. What is different, however, in comparison to the Exodus accounts, is that in the dual theophanies these molds are no longer associated with one God but are instead applied to the respective powers. Often in such accounts God becomes confined solely to the aural mode, while the second power absorbs the whole legacy of the ocularcentric trend formerly possessed by the deity. We should now proceed to a close investigation of these conceptual developments.

Daniel 7

One of the foundational witnesses to the two powers in heaven traditions is found in the Hebrew Bible. Thus, chapter 7 of the Book of Daniel narrates the appearance of two enigmatic celestial figures—the first under the name Ancient of Days, and the second bearing the title Son of Man. In later rabbinic discourses this theophany will be seen as a controversial symbolic well that generated a panoply of heretical opinions. Dan 7:9–14 reads:

As I watched, thrones were set in place, and an Ancient One took his throne, his clothing was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool; his throne was fiery flames, and its wheels were burning fire. A stream of fire issued and flowed out from his presence. A thousand thousands served him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood attending him. The court sat in judgment, and the books were opened. I watched then because of the noise of the arrogant words that the horn was speaking. And as I watched, the beast was put to death,

¹⁶ Ezek 1; Isa 6.

¹⁷ 1 Kgs 19:11–13.

and its body destroyed and given over to be burned with fire. As for the rest of the beasts, their dominion was taken away, but their lives were prolonged for a season and a time. As I watched in the night visions, I saw one like a human being coming with the clouds of heaven. And he came to the Ancient One and was presented before him. To him was given dominion and glory and kingship that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion that shall not pass away, and his kingship is one that shall never be destroyed.¹⁸

Scholars have noted that despite its use of unique mythological imagery, the theophanic language of this passage is nevertheless deeply rooted in prophetic and apocalyptic traditions. For example, John Collins says “the scene as a whole belongs to the tradition of biblical throne visions, attested in such passages as 1 Kgs 22:19; Isaiah 6; Ezekiel 1; 3:22–24; 10:1 and paralleled in writings of the Hellenistic period such as *1 Enoch* 14:18–23; 60:2; 90:20.”¹⁹ Yet while some features of the account certainly perpetuate familiar conceptual lines found in other earlier biblical and extra-biblical theophanies, it also manifests a striking departure from these earlier patterns by attempting to depict the deity *in conjunction* with another celestial “power.” Such novelty in the portrayal of the deity along with the second mediatorial figure, upon whom divine attributes are also conferred, can be understood as a portentous paradigm shift in the history of the Jewish theophanic tradition.

An important symbolic dimension that still ties the Danielic account to the long-lasting tradition of Jewish biblical and extra-biblical theophanies is its explicit anthropomorphic tendencies. In order to better understand this portentous symbolic dimension, a short excursus on its conceptual origins is necessary.²⁰

Scholars have noted that biblical anthropomorphism received its most forceful expression in the Israelite Priestly ideology,²¹ where God is depicted in “the most tangible corporeal similitudes.”²² Already in the initial chapters of the Pentateuch one

¹⁸ All biblical quotations are taken from the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) unless otherwise indicated.

¹⁹ J. J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 300.

²⁰ The conceptual origins of the biblical anthropomorphism cannot be determined with certainty. Some scholars argue that the anthropomorphic position was not entirely an invention of the Priestly tradition, but stemmed from early pre-exilic sacral conceptions regarding divine corporeal manifestations, influenced by ancient Near Eastern materials.

²¹ James Barr observes that

because the priestly *Kabod* conception is thus connected naturally with the circumstances in which the cult operated, we can see that it is not just a part of the developed priestly thought as found in P, but goes back to an earlier time; and in particular we note this kind of divine manifestation in the old story from the very beginning of the Solomonic temple (1 Kgs 8:12–13).

J. Barr, “Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament,” in: *Congress Volume: Oxford 1959* (ed. G. W. Anderson; VTSup 7; Leiden: Brill, 1960), 35.

²² M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomist School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 191.

can clearly see a significant presence of this corporeal symbolism. Commenting on these developments, Benjamin Sommer posits that

in Genesis 2:7 God blows life-giving breath into the first human—an action that might suggest that God has a mouth or some organ with which to exhale. Less ambiguously, in Genesis 3:8, Adam hears the sound of God going for a stroll in the Garden of Eden at the breezy time of the day. A being who takes a walk is a being who has a body—more specifically, a body with something closely resembling legs.²³

Sommers further discerns that these portrayals of the deity point toward the possibility of the possession of a body, since the divine body portrayed in these texts is located at a particular place and at a particular time.²⁴

Already in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis, the concept of divine corporeality is closely intertwined with the etiology of humankind itself. According to E. R. Wolfson, “a critical factor in determining the biblical (and, by extension, subsequent Jewish) attitude toward the visualization of God concerns the question of the morphological resemblance between the human body and the divine.”²⁵ The Priestly ideology proposes the deity created humanity in his own image (Gen 1:27) and is therefore frequently described as possessing a human-like form.²⁶ As will become clear later, the correspondence between the deity’s form and the human body made in the divine image becomes a crucial stratagem in the construction of several “second powers” by early Christians and Jews.

Another important aspect of early Jewish anthropomorphism is its sacerdotal aspect. Early on in the Hebrew Bible, formative portrayals of the divine anthropomorphic extent, often labeled as the divine Glory or *Kavod*, are surrounded with depictions of celestial and earthly worship. Notably, these early accounts attempt to envision the

²³ B. D. Sommer, *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 2.

²⁴ Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 2.

²⁵ E. R. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 20.

²⁶ Ludwig Köhler and Moshe Weinfeld argue that the phrase, “in our image, after our likeness” precludes the anthropomorphic interpretation that the human being was created in the divine image. L. Köhler, “Die Grundstelle der Imago-Dei-Lehre, Genesis i, 26,” *ThZ* 4 (1948): 16; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomical School*, 199. In relation to these conceptual developments, Wolfson notes that

it seems that the problem of God’s visibility is invariably linked to the question of God’s corporeality, which, in turn, is bound up with the matter of human likeness to God. . . . Although the official cult of ancient Israelite religion prohibited the making of images or icons of God, this basic need to figure or image God in human form found expression in other ways, including the prophetic visions of God as an anthropos, as well as the basic tenet of the similitude of man and divinity. The biblical conception is such that the anthropos is as much cast in the image of God as God is cast in the image of the anthropos. This is stated in the very account of the creation of the human being in the first chapter of Genesis (attributed to P) in the claim that Adam was created in the image of God.

Wolfson, *Through a Speculum*, 20–21.

deity not simply as an anthropomorphic manifestation,²⁷ but rather as a crucial nexus of cultic devotion and worship. Such veneration of the divine glorious Form takes place not only in heaven, where the divine *Kavod* is surrounded by angelic worship, but also on earth, where the symbolic presence of the divine Form between the two cherubim of the Holy of Holies becomes the very center of the sacrificial cult. We will see the afterlife of these sacerdotal traditions in various early two powers accounts where the second power's invitation into the divine realm will usually coincide with the motif of angelic veneration. Moreover, in the course of such induction, the second power will often be associated with the *Kavod* or its symbolic cognates, like *panim* or *iqonin*.

Early roots of this *Kavod* imagery in Jewish lore are traceable to the mythological imagery found in the first chapter of the Book of Ezekiel, which becomes a long-lasting inspiration for generations of apocalypticists and mystics. The *Kavod* tradition, found in Ezekiel and the Priestly Source, promulgates a distinctive "visual" or "ocularcentric" theophanic mode that becomes influential in many biblical and apocalyptic depictions of God, including Daniel 7. The *Kavod* thus becomes a symbol of the theophanic ideology that presupposes visual apprehension of the divine presence. T. N. D. Mettinger has previously noted that "the *Kavod* is used in Ezekiel as a central theological term in texts where visual contact with God is important."²⁸

It is also significant that already in the earliest specimens of the *Kavod* imagery found in Ezek 1 the anthropomorphic extent of the deity is closely tied to the symbolism of the divine throne, which functions as a symbol of authority and power.²⁹ Mettinger argues that, already in the Priestly ideology, the *Kavod* "is conceived of as referring to the complete manifestation of divine majesty, both to the chariot-throne

²⁷ James Barr notes that

anthropomorphism in the understanding of theophanic occurrences is no exclusive Israelite phenomenon. The interest which it evokes in Israelite contexts is much greater because iconic representations of the deity are, if not unknown, at any rate abnormal or not regulative for the general trend of thought. The God whom Israel worships appears, if he wills to appear at all, in living human likeness. Anthropomorphism in the strict sense, in the sense of the appearance of God in human shape, depends for Israel in the earliest stages we can trace on the memory of the ancestors and the meeting of their God with them.

Barr, "Theophany and Anthropomorphism," 37–38.

²⁸ T. N. D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (ConBOT 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982), 106. Mettinger asserts that

Ezekiel's choice of the word *kavod* was dictated by the earlier use of the term in the theophanic tradition. It was here those connotations were preserved which underlie the usage in the Priestly traditions. Ezekiel's visions of the divine majesty exhibit the striking combination of *kavod* with the throne, and this combination epitomizes, with emblematic density, the whole theology of Ezekiel's visions.

Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 123.

²⁹ In relation to the throne symbolism, Richard Bauckham notes that "in Second Temple Judaism, the throne of God in the highest heaven became a key symbol of monotheism, representative of one of the essential characteristics definitive of the divine identity. While a few traces of other enthroned figures associated with God's rule can be found, the subordination of such figures to God's rule is almost always stressed." R. J. Bauckham, "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus," in: *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (ed. C. C. Newman, J. R. Davila, and G. S. Lewis; JSJSS 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 43–69 at 53.

and to God himself.”³⁰ These theophanic settings of the ocularcentric *Kavod* paradigm will become an important blueprint for apocalyptic visions reflected in early Enochic accounts, including Enoch’s ascents to the heavenly throne room in *1 Enoch* 14 and *1 Enoch* 71.

Anthropomorphic symbolism also appears to play a special role in the context of Daniel 7, where the text’s antagonists are fashioned in their distinctive theriomorphic shapes. In the cryptic symbolic code of the Danielic account, the anthropomorphism of the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man signals authority and dominion.³¹ The same tendency is discernible both in Gen 1, where the anthropomorphic shape of the prelapsarian Adam endows him with authority over the animals, and in Ezek 1, where the “animals” of the upper realm—the Living Creatures or the *Hayyot*—are envisioned as servants who hold the foundation of the divine throne. Scholars have suggested that those traditions might constitute the background of Daniel 7.³² They argue that Daniel 7 is “closely connected to Gen 1:26–28, in which the human form resembles the divine and is also connected to ruling power.”³³ According to Amy Merrill Willis these traditions “situate divine anthropomorphic features in a hierarchy of bodily forms in which the human form resides at the pinnacle and signals dominion over the beasts of air, land, and sea.”³⁴ In this context the anthropomorphism of the Son of Man can be seen as a divine attribute bestowed on the second power. Merrill Willis perceptively argues that the Son of Man “is visually aligned with divine righteous rule through his shape. . . . Unlike the first beast, who must be made humanlike in a process that is never completed,³⁵ this figure possesses the divine image from the beginning.”³⁶

The important aspect of the two powers traditions found in Daniel 7 is that, unlike later rabbinic testimonies in which two powers are often depicted in polemical opposition, here in Daniel they are predestined to complement one another. Such complementarity expresses itself in the transference of divine attributes from the first

³⁰ Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 107.

³¹ In this context, the metamorphoses of some Danielic theriomorphic antagonists, including the first beast who attempts to emulate a human posture by standing on two feet, can be seen as arrogations against the divine authority. On this see A. C. Merrill Willis, *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty in the Book of Daniel* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies; London: T&T Clark, 2010), 76.

³² Amy Merrill Willis points out that

Daniel’s description of the Ancient of Days signals incomparable honor, glory, and power. Daniel clearly borrows from Ezek 1:26–28 where the description of the deity emphasizes Yahweh’s holiness and glory, which is seated on a mobile throne and surrounded by hybrid creatures. Moreover, one finds in the vision cycle Ezekiel’s language of brilliant light, fire, and the wheeled throne (Ezek 1:15, 27–28/Dan 7:9–10).

Merrill Willis, *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty in the Book of Daniel*, 74–75.

³³ Merrill Willis, *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty in the Book of Daniel*, 75.

³⁴ Merrill Willis, *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty in the Book of Daniel*, 75.

³⁵ Dan 7:4: “The first was like a lion and had eagles’ wings. Then, as I watched, its wings were plucked off, and it was lifted up from the ground and made to stand on two feet like a human being; and a human mind was given to it.”

³⁶ Merrill Willis, *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty in the Book of Daniel*, 76.

power to the second—the same process that occurs in other early Jewish and Christian accounts.

In Dan 7:14 the transfer happens when the Son of Man receives “dominion, glory and kingship.” Important to note is that while the text mentions the transfer of “glory” to the second power, such attributes are markedly absent in the description of the first power, represented by the deity. Although scholars often argue for the formative influence of the Ezekielian vision of the divine Glory on the Danielic theophany, the text does not assign the *Kavod* attributes to the first power in the form of the Ancient of Days. Instead, some of these attributes are implicitly transferred to the Son of Man. Thus, Merrill Willis noted that “as the deity bestows on the humanlike one dominion and glory, divine prerogative becomes visible. Though the passive voice obscures—grammatically speaking—divine activity, the humanlike one *brings to full visibility, in the sight of the nations, the glory of the Most High*.”³⁷ This insightful comment accentuates one of the essential features of the joint theophanies, when the “visibility” of the deity is gradually transferred to the second power, who will eventually become the image of the invisible God. Of course, at the starting point of this important conceptual trajectory, in Daniel 7, the deity is still far away from being invisible. Yet the first steps, especially in relation to the portentous symbol of the ocularcentric ideology—the divine *Kavod*, are already made. In this respect Merrill Willis perceptively notes that in the Son of Man “the reader encounters the language of honor or glory that was notably missing from the use of Ezek 1 to speak of the Ancient of Days. Ironically, the humanlike one, as the undistorted embodiment of divine glory, one who is totally dependent upon the divine, underscores the incomparability of the divine.”³⁸

The notion of transferred glory represents a portentous aspect of the two powers traditions. This conceptual development will play a formative role not only in Jewish sources, but also in early Christian materials, such as the transfiguration accounts. In the latter Jesus is endowed with the ocularcentric glorious attributes of the *Kavod*, while God is withdrawn in the aniconic void of his aural manifestation.

Vital for our study, however, is that the roots of such a process go back to the very first example of the two powers tradition in early Jewish lore: the theophany of Dan 7. Here the attributes of the divine *Kavod* are for the first time transferred to the second power in the form of the Son of Man.

Another crucial “gift” that newly endowed second powers receive in Jewish apocalyptic and mystical accounts is the attribute of the divine seat, which, by its essential role in the *Kavod* iconography, signals the unique celestial status of its owner.³⁹ It is therefore not coincidental that such attributes become the main

³⁷ Merrill Willis, *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty in the Book of Daniel*, 77, emphasis is mine.

³⁸ Merrill Willis, *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty in the Book of Daniel*, 77.

³⁹ Darrell Hannah states,

a Rabbinic baraita holds that “on high there is no sitting and no emulation, no back and no weariness” (*b. Hag.* 15a; cf. 3 *Enoch* 18:24). To drive this point home some of the rabbis asserted that angels have no knees and so could not sit even if they so wished (*y. Ber.* 1:12c; *Gen. Rab.* 65:21; *Lev. Rab.* 6:3; *Pes. Rab.* 22:6). Now it is just possible that this idea, that

stumbling block for Aher in later rabbinic and Hekhalot materials, forcing him to take the enthroned angel for the second divinity or power. Already in Daniel 7 one detects an occurrence of the divine seat motif in the construction of the second power.

Recall now, the Danielic theophany begins with an announcement that multiple thrones “were set in place” (Dan 7:9). Although this account does not assign the heavenly seat explicitly to the second power—the door for such an interpretation is left open, as later Jewish exegetes amply illustrate. It has been noted that “from an early time, v. 9 was taken to refer to two thrones, one for the Ancient of Days and one to be occupied later by the ‘one like a son of man.’”⁴⁰ With respect to this tradition, Daniel Boyarin notes that “although in Daniel read on its own, it certainly seems that the thrones are multiple and set up for the Court, it is clear from here as well as from other passages that late-ancient Jews read the thrones as two, one for the Ancient of Days and one for the One Like a Son of Man.”⁴¹

Other details of the account, including a reference to the Son of Man’s endowment with the kingdom, provide further evidence for his possible possession of the seat. In relation to these developments John Collins suggests that “the ‘one like a human being’ who appears in v. 13 is given a kingdom, so it is reasonable to assume that he is enthroned, even though his enthronement is not actually described.”⁴² Collins further concludes the analysis of the multiple thrones theme by suggesting that “there is plenty of evidence, then, that the plural ‘thrones’ was understood to accommodate a second heavenly being, who is represented in Daniel as ‘one like a human being,’ although originally there was probably a more inclusive reference to the divine council.”⁴³

Book of the Similitudes

Another instance of the “dual theophany” where both powers appear in their complementary relationships can be found in the extra-biblical Jewish apocalypse known to us as the *Book of the Similitudes*, where the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man are again depicted as anthropomorphic manifestations. Although this Enochic text is not found among the Qumran fragments of the Enochic writings, the current

angels are not able to sit, is actually much earlier than the rabbinic period. For example, a fragmentary text from the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* may state categorically that angels do not sit.

D. D. Hannah, “The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch,” *ZNW* 94 (2003): 68–96 at 89.

⁴⁰ Collins, *Daniel*, 301.

⁴¹ Boyarin, “Beyond Judaisms,” 337.

⁴² Collins, *Daniel*, 301.

⁴³ Collins, *Daniel*, 301.

scholarly consensus holds that the book was likely composed before the second century CE.⁴⁴ *1 Enoch* 46:1–2⁴⁵ provides the following description of two powers:

And there I saw one who had a head of days, and his head (was) white like wool; and with him (there was) another, whose face had the appearance of a man, and his face (was) full of grace, like one of the holy angels. And I asked one of the holy angels who went with me, and showed me all the secrets, about that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, (and) why he went with the Head of Days.⁴⁶

Although this description draws heavily from Daniel 7, several other important details are added. Analyzing this account, George Nickelsburg and James VanderKam note that in this joint theophany the deity is not enthroned and the reference to his enthronement is deferred to chapter 47.⁴⁷ The author prefers to focus solely on the two figures, and in vv. 2–3 on the identity of the human-like figure. In this respect the text differs from Dan 7:13, where his identity is taken for granted.⁴⁸

Another important dimension of the *Similitudes*' account in comparison with Daniel 7 is the text's prolonged attention to the functions and offices of the second

⁴⁴ In his conclusion to the Enoch Seminar's volume devoted to the *Book of the Similitudes*, Paolo Sacchi writes: "In sum, we may observe that those scholars who have directly addressed the problem of dating the *Parables* all agree on a date around the time of Herod. Other participants of the conference not addressing the problem directly nevertheless agree with this conclusion." P. Sacchi, "The 2005 Camaldoli Seminar on the Parables of Enoch: Summary and Prospects for Future Research," in: *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting of the Book of Parables* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 510. See also D. Suter, "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables," in: *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 415–43; G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch: Chapters 37–82* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 58–63.

⁴⁵ Regarding this passage Hurtado notes,

the effects of the heavenly divine agent concept may be seen especially in *1 Enoch* 46:1–3, where, employing imagery from Dan 7:9–14, the writer pictures the "Son of Man"/"Chosen One" in a heavenly scene, prominently associated with God, possessing an angelic aspect, and privy to all heavenly secrets. In this theophanic scene, the writer pictures God and "another," manlike in appearance, whose face was "full of grace, like one of the holy angels," who "will reveal all the treasures of that which is secret." The writer of *1 Enoch* 46 apparently saw the figure in Dan. 7:13–14 as a real being bearing heavenly (angelic) qualities and as God's chosen chief agent of eschatological deliverance. Whether this interpretation reflects the meaning intended by the author of Daniel 7 or was a later development, in either case I suggest that such an interpretation is evidence of the concept of a heavenly divine agent, a figure next to God in authority who acts as God's chief representative.

Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 54.

⁴⁶ M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 2.131–32.

⁴⁷ *1 Enoch* 47:3: "And in those days I saw the Head of Days sit down on the throne of his glory, and the books of the living were opened before him, and all his host, which (dwells) in the heavens above, and his council were standing before him." Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.133.

⁴⁸ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 156.

power, which permeate the *angelus interpretes*' explanations following the theophany.⁴⁹ As Nickelsburg and VanderKam indicate,

Enoch does not inquire about the Head of Days but only about “that Son of Man.” The audience knows who the deity is. However, Enoch’s Son of Man, who is so central to his text, is different from the Danielic figure and must be explained to the author’s audience. He is the judge of the kings and the mighty—a function that Daniel 7 does not ascribe to him—and as such he is the object of the audience’s faith and hope.⁵⁰

This emphasis on the Son of Man figure in the dual theophany is noteworthy, since he distinctly absorbs some traits of the first power. One of the intriguing features of his description is a reference to his “face (which was) full of grace.”⁵¹ This attention to the “face” of the second power does not appear to be coincidental. The imagery of the face, or the *panim*, also plays an important role in other early two powers theophanies, often serving as a symbolic correlate to notions of the divine *Kavod* and the divine *Tselem* (Image). In the *Similitudes*, it is also possible that the imagery of the face appears as a divine attribute. Reflecting on the Son of Man’s face, Nickelsburg and VanderKam note that the text further “expands the description of the figure’s face, likening it to that of one of the holy angels (v. 1d). That is, the deity is accompanied by another divine figure. The expression ‘full of grace’ is not used here theologically but denotes a physical characteristic.”⁵² Comparable to Dan 7, it is possible that the second power in *1 Enoch* 46:1–2 absorbs the features of the divine Glory. This transference is more readily apparent in other parts of the *Similitudes*. In these sections the “Throne of Glory,” also depicted

⁴⁹ *1 Enoch* 46: 3–8 reads:

And he answered me and said to me: “This is the Son of Man who has righteousness, and with whom righteousness dwells; he will reveal all the treasures of that which is secret, for the Lord of Spirits has chosen him, and through uprightness his lot has surpassed all before the Lord of Spirits for ever. And this Son of Man whom you have seen will rouse the kings and the powerful from their resting-places, and the strong from their thrones, and will loose the reins of the strong, and will break the teeth of the sinners. And he will cast down the kings from their thrones and from their kingdoms, for they do not exalt him, and do not praise him, and do not humbly acknowledge whence (their) kingdom was given to them. And he will cast down the faces of the strong, and shame will fill them, and darkness will be their dwelling, and worms will be their resting-place; and they will have no hope of rising from their resting-places, for they do not exalt the name of the Lord of Spirits. And these are they who judge the stars of heaven, and raise their hands against the Most High, and trample upon the dry ground, and dwell upon it; and all their deeds show iniquity . . . and their power (rests) on their riches, and their faith is in the gods which they have made with their hands, and they deny the name of the Lord of Spirits. And they will be driven from the houses of his congregation, and of the faithful who depend on the name of the Lord of Spirits.”

Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.132.

⁵⁰ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 157.

⁵¹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam bring attention to this feature by noting that, in comparison with Dan 7:13, *1 Enoch* 46:1 mentions the *face* of the Son of Man. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 156.

⁵² Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 157.

as an attribute of the deity, is transferred to the second power, who is described by the author with several designations, including the appellation Elect One/Chosen One. As *1 Enoch* 45:3 recounts, “the Chosen One will sit on the throne of glory”⁵³ Darrell Hannah comments on this striking transferal, arguing that “in the *Similitudes* the Son of Man or Elect One, who is also identified as the Messiah (48:10; 52:4), is said to sit on the throne of Glory, which must mean for our author God’s own throne.”⁵⁴ Moreover, Hannah notes that

significantly, in 47:3 and 60:2 of the *Similitudes* the phrase “the throne of his glory” is used with reference to the Lord of Spirits. In these two passages it is the Lord of Spirits, or the Chief of Days, as he is there termed, who sits “on the throne of his glory.” So the precise phrase “the throne of his glory” is used both for the Son of Man and for the Lord of Spirits, without any indication that a different reality is intended. One cannot help concluding that our author speaks of one reality, the one throne of glory.⁵⁵

As discerned in the present study, already in the earliest instances of the *Kavod* symbolism there exists a curious symbiosis between the deity’s anthropomorphic shape and the divine seat as they often appear as a single inseparable entity. Given this, it is possible that the second power, through the possession of the seat of glory, becomes an embodiment of the deity’s glory. Jarl Fossum argues that “in the *Similitudes* the ‘Elect One’ or ‘Son of Man’ who is identified as the patriarch Enoch, is enthroned upon the ‘throne of glory.’ If ‘glory’ does not qualify the throne but its occupant, Enoch is actually identified with the Glory of God.”⁵⁶ Fossum also suggests a connection to other Jewish two powers accounts, including the tradition of Jacob’s *iqonin*,⁵⁷ arguing

⁵³ Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.131. On the throne of glory see also *1 Enoch* 51:1; 55:4; 61:8; 62:5; 69:27, 29.

⁵⁴ Hannah, “The Throne of His Glory,” 82. In relation to these traditions Laszlo Gallusz notes that it is necessary to discern the difference between the passages indicating the throne occupancy by the Elect One and the scene of his enthronement. In this sense, 45.3; 51.3 and 55.4 can be considered as anticipatory references to the enthronement, an event of major significance taking place in 61.8, towards which the whole book is progressing. Not only has the identity of the throne’s occupant been questioned; the ultimate ownership of the “throne of glory” has also been the subject of debate ... Moreover, in 47.3 and 60.2 the “throne of glory” is used also in reference to God, who as “the Antecedent of Time” appears as its occupant. There is no indication in the text that this “throne of glory” is different from the “throne of glory” occupied by the Elect One.

L. Gallusz, *The Throne Motif in the Book of Revelation* (LNTS 487; London: T&T Clark, 2014), 63–64.

⁵⁵ Hannah, “The Throne of His Glory,” 86.

⁵⁶ J. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (NTOA 30; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 145.

⁵⁷ On *iqonin* as the Aramaic transliteration of εἰκὼν/εἰκόνιον see M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: Judaica Press, 1996), 60 and 297; S. N. Bunta, “The Likeness of the Image: Adamic Motifs and *Tselem* Anthropology in Rabbinic Traditions about Jacob’s Image Enthroned in Heaven,” *JSJ* 37 (2006): 55–84 at 62–63.

that “the ‘Similitudes of Enoch’ present an early parallel to the targumic description of Jacob being seated upon the ‘throne of glory.’”⁵⁸

As in the Book of Daniel, where the attribute of the glory is transferred to the Son of Man in the deity’s presence, some arguing by God himself, in the *Book of the Similitudes* the Elect is also placed on the throne of glory by the deity who is designated as the Lord of Spirits.⁵⁹ Regarding the installment of the second power, Hannah notes that

in 61:8–9 the Lord of Spirits in explicitly portrayed installing the Son of Man on the throne and investing him with the authority to pronounce eschatological judgment: “And the Lord of Spirits placed the Elect One on the throne of glory.” . . . The Ethiopic verb here is the equivalent of a Hebrew causative verb: The Lord of Spirits causes the Elect One to sit on the throne of glory.⁶⁰

Here in the *Similitudes* the transference of the attribute of the throne of glory functions complementarily, as in the Book of Daniel. Hurtado notes the complementary nature of the second power in the *Similitudes* by observing that the Son of Man

seems to act as judge on God’s behalf (“in the name of the Lord of Spirits,” e.g., *1 Enoch* 55:4) and in this capacity sits upon a throne that is closely linked with God: “On that day the Chosen One will sit on the throne of Glory” (45:3; see also 51:3; 55:4; 61:8; 62:2, 3, 5–6; 70:27). The meaning of this is not that the figure rivals God or becomes a second god but rather that he is seen as performing the eschatological functions associated with God and is therefore God’s chief agent, linked with God’s work to a specially intense degree.⁶¹

In our ongoing analysis of the two powers’ complementary template contained in early Jewish and Christian accounts, it is essential not only to note the gradual endowment of the second power with attributes of the deity, but also the first power’s steady abandonment of its previous roles and functions. In this respect, alongside the transference of attributes of the divine authority and power in the form of the divine seat and Glory to the Son of Man/Chosen One in the *Similitudes*, one detects another related process, namely, the deity’s withdrawal from his traditional ocularcentric “visible” offices to invisibility. Observing these changing roles of the deity in the *Similitudes*, George Nickelsburg and James VanderKam note that despite God being found in every subsection of the book except one, either by name or by implication

he is never described in any detail, and he is rarely depicted as doing anything himself. Almost everything that is ascribed to him takes place by means of agents.

⁵⁸ Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 145.

⁵⁹ *1 Enoch* 61:8 reads: “And the Lord of Spirits set the Chosen One on the throne of his glory, and he will judge all the works of the holy ones in heaven above, and in the balance he will weigh their deeds.” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.149.

⁶⁰ Hannah, “The Throne of His Glory,” 86–87.

⁶¹ Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 53.

Various angels function as mediators with the human world, interceding for the suffering righteous and exacting punishment on the sinners, both in ancient times in the flood and in the future after the great assize. The chief agent of this future judgment is the Son of Man, the Righteous One and God's Chosen and Anointed One, the second-most dominating figure in the *Parables*. Thus, for example, the Lord is not the divine warrior whose epiphany is described in the introduction to the Book of the Watchers (*1 Enoch* 1); rather it is the Chosen and Anointed One whose appearance melts the mountains like wax (52:4, 6, 9; 53:6–7; cf. 38:2, “the Righteous One”). Thus, the deity dominates the narrative world of the Parables and at the same time is himself absent from the world that is inhabited by its chief actors, the righteous and chosen, the kings and the mighty, and the demonic hordes of Azazel.⁶²

Another important feature of the *Similitudes* is that the second power in this text is explicitly linked to its earthly counterpart in the form of the seventh antediluvian patriarch, Enoch. This development manifests a new step in comparison with Daniel 7 where the Son of Man is not openly linked to his earthly correlative. This understanding of the second power as the heavenly counterpart of a human seer plays a significant role in many other early two powers theophanies, including the *Exagoge*, *2 Enoch*, and the *Ladder of Jacob*.⁶³

The heavenly counterpart tradition serves as the formative blueprint for early Christian developments, where the Son of Man figure becomes a designation for the heavenly identity of the Christian exemplar.⁶⁴ The seeds of this understanding—that is, of the second power as a heavenly counterpart of an earthly seer—is already present in *1 Enoch* 71:9–14, in which Enoch is identified as the second power in the form of the Son of Man. The metamorphosis is described as follows:

And Michael and Raphael and Gabriel and Phanuel, and many holy angels without number, came out from that house; and with them the Head of Days, his head white and pure like wool, and his garments indescribable. And I fell upon my face, and my whole body melted, and my spirit was transformed; and I cried out in a loud voice in the spirit of power, and I blessed and praised and exalted. And these blessings which came out from my mouth were pleasing before that Head of Days. And that Head of Days came with Michael and Gabriel, Raphael, and Phanuel, and thousands and tens of thousands of angels without number. And he [that angel] came to me, and greeted me with his voice, and said to me: “You are the Son of

⁶² Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 42, emphasis is mine.

⁶³ Some later Hekhalot accounts continue this tradition by envisioning Enoch as the earthly counterpart of the second power in the form of the supreme angel Metatron.

⁶⁴ Some scholars entertain the connections between the synoptic transfiguration accounts and the *Book of the Similitudes*. On this see C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT 2.94; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 44–45; S. S. Lee, *Jesus' Transfiguration and the Believers' Transformation: A Study of the Transfiguration and Its Development in Early Christian Writings* (WUNT 2.265; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 42–43.

Man who was born to righteousness, and righteousness remains over you, and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not leave you.”⁶⁵

With respect to this passage, Nickelsburg and VanderKam see connections with other two powers accounts (both apocalyptic and rabbinic), suggesting that “the identification of Enoch as the Son of Man can be read as a first step toward the angelification of the seer in *2 Enoch* 22 and of his identification with Metatron in *3 Enoch*.”⁶⁶ When compared to the Danielic joint theophany and the dual theophany reflected in *1 Enoch* 46:1–2, one can detect not only a simultaneous presentation of the two powers, but also a description of the human being’s initiatory endowment to the office of the second power.

Another important aspect of the *Similitudes* is its tendency to portray the human protagonist both as a visionary who contemplates the second power and as the second power himself. Such a tendency in the simultaneous depiction of Enoch both as a recipient of the vision and the object of the vision is present in one of the earliest Enochic booklets—the *Book of the Watchers*. There, in one of his visions reflected in *1 Enoch* 14, the seventh antediluvian hero enters into the heavenly temple as an angelic priest. In Helge Kvanvig’s analysis of this account, the dream about the celestial temple “is told by Enoch from two perspectives. The first tells the whole series of events, emphasizing that Enoch stays on the earth during the entire dream. . . . The second perspective focuses on Enoch as the protagonist of the dream itself, and he is carried away to the heavenly temple.”⁶⁷ If Kvanvig is correct, the seer appears to be in both realms: dreaming in his sleep on the earth while at the same time functioning as the sacerdotal servant in the heavenly temple. As will be shown below, depictions of the double identity of a human adept is widespread in various accounts of the two powers traditions.

Kvanvig sees these early Enochic developments as a crucial conceptual step in shaping the subsequent tradition of Enoch’s identification with his heavenly persona in the form of the Son of Man in the *Book of the Similitudes*. Accordingly, “in *1 Enoch* 13–14 Enoch sees himself as a visionary counterpart in heaven. In [the *Similitudes*] 70–71 Enoch is actually taken to heaven to be identified as the Son of Man.”⁶⁸ Both perspectives occur in the *Similitudes*: Enoch first describes the Son of Man’s mighty deeds and is later identified with this celestial figure.⁶⁹ Kvanvig claims that “the two perspectives thus constitute two ways of reporting a dream experience where the dreamer sees himself. In the first the dreamer reports what happened in retrospect, depicting how he sees himself

⁶⁵ Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.166.

⁶⁶ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 328.

⁶⁷ H. Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” in: *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting of the Book of Parables* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 181.

⁶⁸ Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 182. For criticism of this position see J. Collins, “Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig,” in: *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting of the Book of Parables* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 218.

⁶⁹ Helge Kvanvig has argued that “Enoch sees the Son of Man in visions of the future, not in disclosures of the present. He is seeing what he will become.” Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 201.

acting in the dream; in the second he remains in the dream experience itself, where only one of the figures is involved, the figure seen in the dream.”⁷⁰

The portrayal of the protagonist as both contemplating and becoming the divine mediator is especially significant, since this narrative device is present in many Jewish and Christian two powers in heaven accounts. Thus, in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian Moses first sees the divine figure enthroned on the mountain, after which he himself becomes this figure. In the *Ladder of Jacob*, Jacob sees a vision of his own heavenly identity in the form of his *iqonin* installed in heaven. Along these lines, the baptism and transfiguration accounts found in the synoptic gospels also seem to depict Jesus as a visionary and the center of the theophany.

Another relevant aspect of the *Similitudes* is that, in the course of the two powers theophany of *1 Enoch* 71, we also have a revelation of the celestial voice, although the speaker’s identity is not entirely clear. In some manuscripts, it is an angel who speaks; in others, it is the voice of the deity.⁷¹ If the utterance comes from the mouth of the deity, the aural affirmation of the second power’s newly acquired status is significant. As we will see, such affirmations of the first power regarding the heavenly status of the second power play an essential role in early Christian accounts, where the deity is entirely withdrawn from the visual plane. Another striking feature of this initiatory scene is the peculiar form of the address, which recalls the deity’s utterances in the baptism and transfiguration accounts where Jesus is endowed—for the first time in the Christian tradition—with the ocularcentric attributes of the deity.

In conclusion, a summary might be helpful regarding the order of the two powers’ appearances in the *Similitudes’* theophanies. As we remember in Dan 7, the first power in the form of the Ancient of Days appears first; only after this does the text recount the epiphany of the second power, represented by the Son of Man. A similar procession of two powers are also reflected in the *Book of the Similitudes*, where the theophanies of the first power (rendered there as the Head of Days) are routinely followed by the appearances of the Son of Man. Some of these accounts represent “visionary reports,” where the order is often established through the successive descriptions of the “reporter.” As we recall in *1 Enoch* 46:1, the seer reports the advent of the Head of Days before describing the second figure represented by the Son of Man.⁷² In *1 Enoch* 71:9–14, the text again attests to the same order of processions—first, we have the

⁷⁰ Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 181.

⁷¹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam note that

in v. 14a the MSS. differ as to who is speaking to Enoch. Instead of “and he” (*wawētu*) some MSS. read “and that angel” (*wawētu malak*). This looks like an attempt either to identify the vague “he” or to keep the text from saying that the deity spoke directly to the seer. If “that angel” is original, the text is vague as to which angel is speaking to Enoch. However, if the author can depict God as actually approaching Enoch, there seems to be no reason why the Head of Days should not address him directly, although the third person reference to the Head of Days seems odd if the Head of Days is speaking.

Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 327–28.

⁷² “And there I saw one who had a head of days, and his head (was) white like wool; and with him (there was) another, whose face had the appearance of a man, and his face (was) full of grace, like one of the holy angels.” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.131.

The Glory of the Invisible God

*Two Powers in Heaven Traditions
and Early Christology*

Andrei A. Orlov

t&tclark

LONDON • NEW YORK • OXFORD • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY