



“THE MYSTERY OF (RE)INCARNATION AND  
THE FALLEN ANGELS”: THE REINCARNATIONS  
OF ADAM, ENOCH, METATRON, (JESUS),  
AND JOSEPH—AN ANTI-CHRISTIAN  
POLEMIC IN THE ZOHAR

*Jonatan M. Benarroch*  
*Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

ABSTRACT

The reincarnation of Adam in Joseph, the fallen angels (‘Azza and ‘Azza’el) and Joseph’s brothers, a possible Christian polemic concerning Metatron and Jesus, the mystery of “divine physiognomy,” the “book of Rabbi Kruspedai,” and the meeting with his mother on the day of R. Kruspedai’s death—are all included in some Zoharic passages printed in *Tikkunei haZohar*, at the end of Tikkun 70 (134b–136a), which is the focal text of this article. The main purpose of this article is to discuss the multifaceted linkage between Metatron and Jesus as part of the hidden Zoharic polemics against Christianity.

KEYWORDS: Zohar, Adam, Enoch, Metatron, Jesus

In some Zoharic passages at the end of Tikkun 70 (134b–136a), printed in *Tikkunei haZohar* (*TZ*), the later stratum of the classic Castilian Kabbalistic work known as *Sefer ha-Zohar* (thirteenth–fourteenth centuries),<sup>1</sup> a number of textual traditions are combined together: the reincarnation of Adam in Joseph, the fallen angels ‘Azza and ‘Azza’el and Joseph’s brothers, a linkage between the archangel Metatron and Jesus, the mystery of “divine physiognomy,” the “book of Rabbi Kruspedai,” and the meeting with his mother on the day of R. Kruspedai’s death. The main themes that connect all of these depictions are the figure of Metatron, the question of incarnation, and complex hidden polemics against Christianity.<sup>2</sup>

The figure of the archangel Metatron and his ambivalent and complex affinities with Jesus are a central theme of this article.<sup>3</sup> A number of textual traditions that appear at the end of Tikkun 70 in *TZ* are all linked to the figure of Metatron, his reincarnation in Joseph, his ties with the figure of R. Kruspedai, and even his association with “divine physiognomy”<sup>4</sup> and

the question of incarnation. The main goal of this article is to emphasize the multifaceted linkage between Metatron and Jesus as part of the hidden Zoharic polemics against Christianity.

#### “THE BOOK OF GENERATIONS” AND THE MYSTERY OF REINCARNATION

The text discussed in this article appears in several Byzantine manuscripts, which make up a unique group of old Zoharic manuscripts (fourteenth–fifteenth centuries), and in the Cremona printed edition of the Zohar (sixteenth century), with the following opening: “(Gen. 5:1) ‘This is the book of generations of Adam (*toledot adam*),’ ‘This is’—as there are a few books: the book of Rav Hamnuna Sava, the book of Rav Kruspedai, the book of Enoch the youth, about whom it is stated: (*idem*, 24) ‘Enoch walked with God; then he was no more, because God took him.’ And why did they call it ‘generations of Adam’? But here is the mystery of reincarnation.”<sup>5</sup> This passage begins with a homily on the opening words of Genesis 5:1: “This is the book of generations of Adam. When God created humankind, he made them in the likeness of God” (NRSV; with some corrections of mine). The current homily focuses on the initial clause, building on its literal meaning, “This is the book of generations of Adam.”<sup>6</sup> The homilist states that the phrase “book of generations of Adam” is modified by the demonstrative pronoun *this* to hint at the unique nature of the book,<sup>7</sup> which is unlike others in the “celestial library,” which includes the book of Rav Hamnuna Sava, the book of Rav Kruspedai, and the book of Enoch the youth.<sup>8</sup>

This passage probably alludes to a similar passage in the writings of R. Eleazar of Worms (twelfth–thirteenth centuries), who deals with the book of generations of Adam:

The image of the soul is above. (Gen. 5:1) “This is the book of generations of Adam.” “This”—as there is another [book]. There is the book of Chronicles and the book of Josippon which started from Adam. “This is the book of generations of Adam,” And there is a book of above, which all the angels that have the images of all future human beings are written in it, as (Zechariah 3:1): “Then he showed me the high priest Joshua standing before the angel of the Lord,” and as (Gen. 32:25–32) the image of the angel that Jacob saw, as seeing the face of God. And there are all the images of the face of man that

Daniel saw. And the image of man that is in charge on the lower [worlds] as (Daniel 7:13) “I saw one like a son of man coming with the clouds of heaven” and as the image of man that is in charge on the upper [worlds]: (Ezekiel 1:26): “and seated above the likeness of a throne was something that seemed like a human form” and it is written: (Daniel 7:13): “And he came to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him.” And when the angel that is in charge of pregnancy needs to form the face of the fetus, he looks at the book of images after which zodiac sign and which angels [image] were written for this child. . . . As it was written in the days of Genesis, as it is said: (Gen. 5:1) “This is the book of generations of Adam. When God created Adam he made him in the likeness of God.”<sup>9</sup>

The “book of generations” is described here as the “book of images” that form the faces of all humankind in the likeness of the images of God described in Ezekiel and Daniel. This text probably also influenced the formation of the Zoharic composition known as the *Raza deRazin* (lit. “Secret of Secrets”),<sup>10</sup> which deals with the science of physiognomy, also opening with the Genesis 5:1 verse.<sup>11</sup>

The homilist in *TZ* then asks why the book is named “the generations of Adam.”<sup>12</sup> He answers that the word *generations* in the title hints at the “mystery of reincarnation” (רזא דגלגולא) concealed within this book.<sup>13</sup> Before discussing the rest of the homily in depth, it should be noted that two of the books mentioned here, the book of Rav Kruspedai and the book of Enoch the youth, appear nowhere else in Zoharic literature (which does have many references to “the book of Enoch”).<sup>14</sup>

It should be noted further that the homily quoted above appears in other manuscripts and early printed editions in a different version. In that version, the reference to the book of Rav Kruspedai is followed by the story of the visit of Rabbi Kruspedai’s mother on the day of his death. Furthermore, the reference to the book of Enoch the youth appears as a separate homily, after the story about R. Kruspedai. In it, “the book of the generations of Adam” is identified with the book of Enoch the youth: “Another word, (Gen. 5:1) ‘this is the book of the generations of Adam’—This is the Book of Enoch the youth, about whom it is stated (idem, 24) ‘Enoch walked with God; then he was no more, because God took him,’ and why is it called ‘generations of Adam’? But here is the mystery of reincarnation.”<sup>15</sup> This additional homily on the opening words of Genesis 5:1 is important because of the identification of “the book of the generations of Adam” with the book of Enoch

the youth. Therefore, the question: Why is the book named “the generations of Adam”? refers not to the book mentioned in the verse but, rather, to the book of Enoch the youth. In this version, the question is actually: Why is the book of Enoch the youth named “the generations of Adam”?<sup>16</sup>

Although it cannot be determined unequivocally, it is my opinion that the version in the Byzantine manuscripts and the Cremona edition is later.<sup>17</sup> The story about the death of R. Kruspedai (and the transformation of the reference to the book of Enoch the youth into an additional homily on the verse from Genesis) is probably a later reworking of the prior version found in the Byzantine manuscripts.<sup>18</sup>

In all versions, the homily continues by explicitly identifying the book of Enoch the youth with “the book of the generations of Adam” and raising the question of why the book of Enoch the youth is known by the latter name:

And why did they call it [the book of Enoch the youth] (Gen. 5:1) “The generations of Adam”? . . . [F]or it is from him [Adam] that he [Enoch] emerged, and he [Enoch] was an offspring of him [Adam]. And why is he (Enoch) called “Youth”? But here is the mystery [of] (Job 33:25) “. . . he shall return to the days of his youth,” as he was before. After which, he descended into him [Joseph] of whom it is stated: (Gen. 37:2)<sup>19</sup> “and the lad [Heb. *na’ar*, also translated as “servant”] was with the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, his father’s wives; and Joseph brought unto his father their evil report.” (TZ 137b)

On the surface, this version is more consistent with the later identification between the book of Enoch the youth and the book of the generations of Adam, which may be why a later editor made the identification into a separate homily. Here it is clear that the words “‘The generations of Adam,’ as he came forth from him” should be understood as referring to the image of Enoch the youth, the hero of the book of Enoch the youth, also known as Metatron “the youth” (as described in the *Third Book of Enoch*),<sup>20</sup> who is described as a “descendant” and reincarnation of Adam. Indeed, the next question is why Enoch is named “youth.” The answer hints that Enoch, who “returned to the days of his youthful vigor” (Job 33:25), returns to his first incarnation as Adam, hence identifying Adam with Metatron.<sup>21</sup>

“The book of Enoch the youth” is a distinctive Zoharic phrase and clearly hints at the *Third Book of Enoch*, which tells how the human Enoch, son of Jared, became the archangel Metatron, whose many epithets in the book include “Youth.”<sup>22</sup> The Zoharic description here tells how the soul of

Primordial Adam (“Adam Kadmon”) was reincarnated as Enoch and then transformed into the Youth-Metatron, returning to “the days of his youthful vigor,” namely, his first incarnation as the soul of Adam. This description of the reincarnation of Adam’s soul as Enoch and then Metatron is also found in the Zohar, in the section dealing with the light that was lost to Adam after he sinned and the transfer of that light from Adam to Enoch.<sup>23</sup> The homilies in *TZ*, which are the focal point of the present article, are closely connected to this segment and to an additional source in the Zohar that describes a similar process of the reincarnation of Adam’s soul (described as “the bright soul of the upper speculum”—גשמחא זהרא דאספקלריא דלעילא) in Enoch.<sup>24</sup> From what has been demonstrated thus far, a significant association can be found between the image of God and the figures of Adam, Enoch, Metatron, Rav Hamnuna Sava, and Rav Kruspedai.

#### HOMILIES ON THE “BOOK OF GENERATIONS OF ADAM” IN *TZ* AND IN *RAZA DERAZIN*

The homily under consideration continues by describing the reincarnation of Adam as another youth, namely, Joseph, about whom Genesis (37:2) says, “He was a helper/servant [Heb. *na’ar*, also translated as “youth”] to the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah” (*TZ* 135b). This is followed by a dialogue between Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochai and his son, Rabbi Elazar, that formulates the identity of the soul shared by the three youths or *na’arim*: Adam, Metatron, and Joseph.<sup>25</sup> This section is actually the continuation of a dialogue that begins in the printed editions (sixteenth century) shortly after the beginning of Tikkun 70:

(Gen. 5:1) “This is the book of generations of Adam.” R. Shimon opened and said: I raise my hands to the One Who created the world, Who shall reveal to us higher sealed secreted concealed mysteries [רזין רזין עלאין סתימין גניזין סמירין], [in order] to utter [them] before Shekhinah. . . . He opened and said: “This is the book of generations of Adam.” . . . “This” certainly [alludes to] the four faces of the Lion; four faces of the Ox; four faces of the Eagle. Through which are made known the faces of people. . . . (Exod. 18:21) “And you shall behold from all the people.” By the hair. . . . By the forehead. . . . By the ears. . . . By the eyes. . . . By the nose. . . . By the mouth. . . . By the hands . . . by the colors of the hair: White hair is of those able men [אנשי חיל] for it is stated upon them:

(Daniel 7:9) “and the Ancient of Days was sitting, His garment white like snow, and the hair of His head like pure clean wool.” (Tikkun 70, 121a–122)

It should be noted that although the section under consideration begins with this text in all of the versions available to us, in the Byzantine manuscripts it is also the beginning of the entire Tikkun, which is numbered “Tikkun 61,” rather than “Tikkun 70.”<sup>26</sup> Both Tikkun 70 (in the printed editions) and Tikkun 61 (in the Byzantine manuscripts) begin with a homily on Genesis 5:1: “This is the book of the generations of Adam.” Furthermore, the entire passage (Tikkun 70, 121a–138b) is very similar to the Zoharic composition known as the *Raza deRazin*,<sup>27</sup> which begins with a section stylistically akin to the first part of Tikkun 61 in the Byzantine manuscripts:

“And you shall behold from all the people” (Exodus 18:21). This is the book of generations of Adam [*toledot adam*] [or of Human Features] (Gen. 5:1)—this is one of the concealed and profound books.

Rabbi Shimon said: “I raised my hands in prayer to the One who created the world; for even though concealed, ancient, and exalted matters are revealed in this verse, one must examine and gaze into the secrets of this ancient book, from which the hidden Book of King Solomon was derived.

“This—on which everything depends. . . . This is the book—to understand concealed, deep knowledge that was transmitted to Primal Adam concerning the features of human beings. This lore was conveyed to King Solomon; it was bequeathed to him and he wrote it down in his book.

“We have learned that Moses was perplexed by this [wisdom] until Shekhinah arrived and instructed him. She viewed and selected all the men with distinctive visages. It was there that Moses learned this wisdom, entering into it, as is written: ‘And you shall behold from all the people’ (Exodus 18:21). . . . And you, you shall behold and examine this—you, and no other, to know and to gaze upon sixty myriads. ‘Six characteristics to examine in people’s faces, to fathom the wisdom clearly: by the hair, eyes, nose, lips, face, and hands.’”<sup>28</sup>

Both of these passages comment on the same verse, Genesis 5:1, and this homily of *Raza deRazin* has much in common with the one in *TZ*; both deal with the science of physiognomy hinted at in this verse (Gen. 5:1): since the

human being is created “in the image of God,” every physical feature conveys profound meaning.<sup>29</sup> In both, the “book of the generations of Adam” is tied to other “concealed books,” and the list continues with “the hidden Book of King Solomon,” which is closely related to the book of Rav Hamnuna Sava.<sup>30</sup>

Moreover, in the opening passages of both Tikkun 61 (Byzantine mss.) and *Raza deRazin*, R. Shimon Bar Yochai is described as raising his hands in prayer to the Creator that the concealed Torah be revealed to him. The main “mysteries of Torah” referenced in these selections relate to the science of physiognomy; both of them interpret Exodus 18:21—“And you shall behold from all the people”—as referring, in this context, to Moses’s knowledge of this wisdom. For the current discussion, it should be noted that the physiognomy in Tikkun 61 (Byzantine mss.) is closely related to both the four visages of the upper chariot and the visages of the Greater and Lesser Countenances (Arikh Anpin and Ze’eir Anpin). In the print editions, this section opens with an editor’s gloss that consists primarily of a severe warning lest the reader err in understanding the anthropomorphic descriptions of God and relating this to the warning given by R. Shimon at the beginning of *Idra Rabbah*, which also deals with homilies concerned mainly with *tikkun* (“repair” or “rectify”) of the Greater and Lesser Countenances of God (see Mantua, 120a–b).<sup>31</sup> In this subsection, it has been demonstrated that the homilies on the “book of generations of Adam” in both *TZ* and *Raza deRazin* create a linkage between the science of physiognomy and the image of God—and in *TZ* even to the visages of the Greater and Lesser Countenances (Arikh Anpin and Ze’eir Anpin)—as referring to the “divine physiognomy.”

#### THE ANGELS’ QUARREL AGAINST ADAM (AND ENOCH-METATRON)— TRANSFORMED INTO THE SIN OF SELLING JOSEPH

Returning to the mystery of the incarnations of Adam-Metatron-Joseph, as described in the main passage under consideration, the passage draws parallels between the tradition concerning the angelic objections to the creation of Adam and the tradition concerning the fallen angels’ objection to the cult of Metatron,<sup>32</sup> which is connected to the quarrel between Joseph and his brothers:

After which, he descended into him [Joseph] of whom it is stated: (Gen. 37:2) “and the lad [Heb. *na’ar*, also translated as “servant”] was

with the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, his father's wives; and Joseph brought unto his father their evil report." What is meant by "their evil report"? But they were of the stock of those who said: (Psalms 8:4–5)<sup>33</sup> "what are human beings that you are mindful of them, mortals that you care for them? Yet you have made them a little lower than God,"—for You have given him all the treasure of heaven, and all of its keys are in his hand, and the governance of all is his, like the king who said to Joseph: (Gen. 41:40) "only the throne shall I make greater than you."

He [R. Elazar] said to him [R. Shimon]: And yet 'Azza and 'Azza'el were these! He [R. Shimon] said to him: And yet others were gathered with him. R. Elazar said to him: And yet, the Blessed Holy One, before He took counsel with His hosts (i.e. Angeles) had not made Adam, for He said: (Gen. 1:26) "Let us make a human [Adam] in our image, according to our likeness." He [R. Shimon] said to him: in order to teach humankind a lesson on how Greater took counsel from the lesser [דניטיל רברבא עצה מדועיר מניה]. And moreover, there is another mystery here: [it is compared] to a king who had a faithful messenger, to whom he wanted to give his reward. He [the king] said to his hosts: I wish to make this my messenger a ruler over you, because he is faithful. Whoever knows something else about him should speak. When there was not found anyone who denounced him, He said: (Gen. 1:26) "Let us make a human [Heb. Adam]." . . . This is Metatron corresponding to Joseph below. But there were others who hated him, and they said: (Psalms 8:4) "what are human beings that you are mindful of them," and because of this: (Gen. 37:2–4) "and Joseph brought unto his father their evil report . . . they hated him, and could not speak peaceably unto him." And not that these were 'Azza and 'Azza'el, but these were others who gathered [were included] with them. (Tikkun 70, 137b–138a)

Immediately after describing the incarnation of the "youth's" (*na'ar*) soul of Adam-Metatron into Joseph, the passage draws a parallel between Joseph's brothers and those who said, "What are human beings that you are mindful of them?" (Ps. 8:4). Conversely, God gives Adam-Metatron "all treasures of heaven and all his keys" (a description clearly identified with Metatron in many places in the Zohar),<sup>34</sup> which is similar to the authority granted to Joseph. Here the question arises: Who asked, "What are human beings that you are mindful of them?"? Who was "the stock" from which Joseph's



brothers emerged? R. Elazar responds to R. Shimon's homily (indicating that the entire opening homily under consideration is attributed to R. Shimon Bar Yochai) and contends that his father is certainly referring to the fallen angels 'Azza and 'Azza'el.<sup>35</sup> However, R. Shimon retorts that he was not referring to the fallen angels 'Azza and 'Azza'el but, rather, two other angels who opposed Adam.

Concealed within these two positions are hints at two early, apocalyptic traditions: one related to Enoch and the other related to Adam.<sup>36</sup> Each of these recounts a tradition of a human apotheosis to a near-divine status. However, in later stages of development, these two apocalyptic traditions sometimes merged into descriptions of the ties between Adam and Enoch. The description exerting the strongest influence on this Zoharic homily seems to be the description of the angels who opposed the transformation of Enoch-Metatron into an archangel and the chief angel in the kingdom of heaven, as described in 3 Enoch, known in Jewish tradition as *Sefer Hekhalot* (seventh–eighth centuries):<sup>37</sup>

R. Ishmael said: Then I questioned the angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence. I said to him, "What is your name?" He answered, "I have seventy names . . . however, my King calls me 'Youth' [*Na'ar*]." R. Ishmael said: I said to Metatron, "Why are you called by the name of your Creator with seventy names? You are greater than all the princes, more exalted than all the angels, more beloved than all the ministers, more honored than all the hosts, and elevated over all potentates in sovereignty, greatness, and glory; why, then, do they call you 'Youth' in the heavenly heights?" He answered: Because I am Enoch, the son of Jared. When the generation of the Flood sinned and turned to evil deeds, and said to God, (Job 21:14) "Go away! We do not choose to learn your ways," . . . [t]herefore the Holy One, blessed be he, brought me up in their lifetime, before their very eyes, to the heavenly height, to be a witness against them to future generations. And the Holy One, blessed be he, appointed me in the height as a prince and a ruler among the ministering angels. Then three of the ministering angels, 'Uzza, 'Azza and 'Aza'el came and laid charges against me in the heavenly height. They said before the Holy One, blessed be He: "Lord of the Universe, did not the primeval ones give you good advice when they said, Do not create man!" The Holy One, blessed be he, replied: "I have made and will sustain him; I will carry and deliver him." When they saw me they said before him, "Lord

of the Universe, what right has this one to ascend to the height of heights? Is he not descended from those who perished in the waters of the Flood? What right has he to be in heaven?” Again, the Holy One, blessed be He, replied and said to them, “What right have you to interrupt me? I have chosen this one in preference to all of you, to be a prince and a ruler over you in the heavenly heights.” At once they all arose and went to meet me and prostrated themselves before me, saying, “Happy are you, and happy your parents, because your Creator has favored you.” Because I am young in their company and a mere youth among them in days and months and years—therefore they call me “Youth” [*Na’ar*].<sup>38</sup>

The descriptions here incorporate two elements important for the current discussion. First is the description of Enoch-Metatron’s transformation into a divine being, called by the name of God and becoming the chief angel; second is the reason for the designation *na’ar*. In the context of Enoch-Metatron becoming the chief angel, it is also mentioned that three of the ministering angels, Uzza, ‘Azza, and ‘Azza’el, objected to that transformation. One argument that supports their claim is the mention of the “first ones” who objected to the creation of Adam, showing that as early as 3 Enoch there is a connection between Enoch-Metatron and Adam. The description of the “first” angels in 3 Enoch (“Said not the First Ones rightly before you”) is in fact a quotation from the words of the angels quoted in the Babylonian Talmud (BT) *Sanhedrin* 38b, where they object to the creation of Adam and quote the verse also cited in *TZ*, “What are human beings that you are mindful of them?” (Ps. 8:4).<sup>39</sup>

Finally, the citation from 3 Enoch explains why Enoch-Metatron is called *na’ar*. This name was given to him because he was the youngest of the angels to ascend in rank, beginning as a human known from the scriptures as “Enoch ben Jared” and only recently becoming the angel Metatron. In my opinion, this description is the main proof that “The book of Enoch the youth” referred to in *TZ* is indeed 3 Enoch (*Sefer Hekhalot*), because this is the primary source that makes a connection between the designation *na’ar* and the transformation of Enoch ben Jared into the angel Metatron, who is elevated to the rank of an archangel and becomes godlike.

Another interesting reference to the fallen angels Azza and ‘Azza’el, who are mentioned together with Metatron, appears on a Aramaic incantation bowl (third–seventh centuries): “All of them are brought to an end and annulled by the command of the jealous and avenging God, the one who

sent Azza, Azrael and Metatron, the great prince of his Throne.”<sup>40</sup> This incantation bowl was used as a magical amulet for protection from different demonic forces, identified here with Azza and Azrael, and successfully vanquishing them. This was done by using the power of the “avenging God” and “Metatron, the great prince of his Throne.”

Furthermore, the description of the angels Uzza, ‘Azza, and ‘Azza’el in 3 Enoch is very familiar in the tradition of Enochic literature, and they stand in direct relationship with the fallen angels Shemhazai and Azazel, who had sexual relations with human females and fathered the giants, as described in 1 Enoch.<sup>41</sup> However, it seems that the principal sources that influenced the descriptions of ‘Azza and ‘Azza’el in the Zohar are 3 Enoch and the “Midrash of Shemhazai and ‘Azza’el” described in *Midrash Bereishit Rabbati* (Moshe haDarshan, eleventh century), which is clearly a reworking of motifs from 1 Enoch and 3 Enoch.<sup>42</sup> This midrash describes the objection of the fallen angels Shemhazai and Azazel to the creation of Adam (again citing the verse “What [is Adam] that you are mindful of him?”) and also refers to Metatron as God’s messenger to Shemhazai, who informs him of the future destruction that will be brought upon the world.

It indeed seems that the description of the angels ‘Azza and ‘Azza’el in the Zohar was influenced by the description of the three fallen angels Uzza, ‘Azza, and Azza’el in 3 Enoch (who objected to the ascension of Enoch-Metatron) and the two fallen angels in the midrash of Shemhazai and Azazel (who objected to the creation of Adam). However, the description in *TZ*, particularly R. Shimon Bar Yochai’s objection to counting ‘Azza and ‘Azza’el among the angels who objected to the creation of Adam, is also influenced by the account of the ministering angels in BT *Sanhedrin* 38b.

It is apparent that the discussion in *TZ* developed from two important passages in the Zohar dealing with similar incidents. The first is printed in the Zohar on *Parashat Balak*,<sup>43</sup> while the other, which is actually part of *TZ*, is printed in the Zohar on *Parashat Bereishit*.<sup>44</sup> In addition, there are various passages in Zoharic literature dealing with the fallen angels ‘Azza and ‘Azza’el.<sup>45</sup> In the first passage, from Zohar *Balak*, R. Shimon Bar Yochai expounds the verse Psalm 8:4—“What are human beings that you are mindful of them?”—and describes the Holy Blessed One’s consultation with the angels when He wanted to create Adam.<sup>46</sup> After several groups of higher angels objected to the creation of Adam and were burned, the final group goes before the Holy Blessed One, poses the question “What are human beings that you are mindful of them?” and inquires as to Adam’s nature. God replies that Adam will be created in the image of the higher

beings (angels) and will exceed them in wisdom. Finally, after Adam is created and sins, 'Azza and 'Azza'el go before God to denounce him, whereupon God banishes them from heaven. This is similar to the description in 3 Enoch of Uzza, 'Azza, and 'Azza'el objecting to the ascension of Enoch-Metatron to the top of the angelic hierarchy and quoting the ("first") ministering angels who objected to the creation of Adam by asking the same question from Psalm 8:4. In this context, it is interesting to note that the Zohar also describes the removal of Adam's "light"/soul (*zihara 'ila'ah*) and its transfer to Enoch as occurring after Adam sins.<sup>47</sup>

In this description, which is influenced by various discussions in rabbinic literature, there are hints of the superiority of Adam over the angels, but there is no explicit reference to him becoming the object of a cult and ruler over the heavenly kingdom. Furthermore, although there are hints at a connection between Adam and Enoch-Metatron, they are implicit, and most of the emphasis is on the image of Adam, as described in BT *Sanhedrin* 38b and *Bereishit Rabbati*.

However, in the second description in *TZ*, which is printed in Zohar *Bereishit*,<sup>48</sup> there is an addition that is very important: when God created Adam, He wanted to make him "the leader superior to all the higher ones," who would be subordinate to him, like Joseph. The remainder of the description is very similar to that of the fallen angels Shemhazai and Azazel in *Bereishit Rabbati*.

The mention of Joseph in connection to the superiority of Adam also appears in the homily from *TZ* under consideration, and it seems that it is unique to the *TZ* strata. However, even in the descriptions in the printed Zohar *Bereishit*, where there is no explicit mention of Enoch-Metatron, there is surely a strong hint in the description of Adam's superiority and control, which is similar to the description of Enoch-Metatron in 3 Enoch where he becomes the "chief of angels" and their superior ("I delight in this one more than in all of you, and hence he shall be a prince and a ruler over you in the high heavens").<sup>49</sup>

It seems that the most explicit description of Enoch-Metatron and his connection to Adam is in the passage in *TZ* under discussion. Most likely, this is the reason that R. Shimon Bar Yochai insisted (unlike in his homily in *TZ* printed in Zohar *Bereishit*) that it was not 'Azza and 'Azza'el to whom 3 Enoch refers (and *Bereishit Rabbati* hints) but, rather, other angels, apparently the ministering angels mentioned in BT *Sanhedrin* 38b, who were reincarnated as Joseph's ten brothers. R. Elazar represents the prevailing Zoharic tradition (in both Zohar *Balak* and *TZ* printed in Zohar *Bereishit*) that these

angels were indeed 'Azza and 'Azza'el, while God consulted and created Adam with the ministering angels, following the interpretative tradition for understanding Genesis 1:26: "Let us make man [Heb. Adam]." <sup>50</sup> R. Shimon Bar Yochai, however, reinforces the "Adamic template" and emphasizes that the consultation was solely in order to give His "emissary" (i.e., Adam) power over them, and when no one was found to object, Adam was created.

In terms of the homily's form, it appears that the author of *TZ* wants to maintain the tension between Adam and Enoch, since BT *Sanhedrin* 38b makes no mention at all of fallen angels. This author was apparently influenced by the Adamic tradition, as the homily later hints at Adam's divinity.<sup>51</sup> By contrast, 'Azza and 'Azza'el are clearly identified with Enoch-Metatron in 3 Enoch. Precisely because of the many hints at 3 Enoch (including the distinctive Zoharic phrase "The book of Enoch the youth"), and the emphasis on the reincarnation of Adam as Metatron the *na'ar* (who is then reincarnated as Joseph), it was important for the author of *TZ* to also preserve the Adamic tradition that was originally unrelated to the fallen angels 'Azza and 'Azza'el.

#### RABBI JOSEPH ANGELET ON METATRON THE NA'AR, JOSEPH THE KING, AND JOSEPH'S SALE BY HIS TEN BROTHERS

The unique tradition in this text, which identifies the angels who opposed Adam/Enoch-Metatron with Joseph's brothers, still requires clarification. Is this tradition also related to the unwillingness of R. Shimon Bar Yochai to identify the angels with 'Azza and 'Azza'el?

One way to answer this question is to identify the possible source of the homily in *TZ*. There is a close connection between the homily and the writings of R. Joseph Angelet, who uses several motifs that are very similar to those in *TZ*. I would like to emphasize that I do not believe that it can be determined with any certainty that Angelet authored the homily; he might have only edited it. Another possibility is that the similar motifs in both the homily under consideration and Angelet's writings indicate only that this homily (or similar ones unknown to us) influenced Angelet. In this case, however, one can see him as an interpreter, writing his commentary or reworking the text shortly after its composition and in very close proximity to the authorship of *TZ*.<sup>52</sup>

The closest parallels to the homily under consideration are found in the same Byzantine manuscripts of the Zohar where it appears as Tikkun

61. This text is not included in printed versions of the Zohar and is not part of *TZ* in these manuscripts; rather, it appears in the Byzantine manuscripts as Zohar on *Vayeshev*.<sup>53</sup> Ronit Meroz was the first to publish these passages and note their close connection to the writings of R. Joseph Angelet in his books *Kupat Harokhlin* and *Livnat haSapir*.<sup>54</sup> This text also includes clear hints as to the identification of Metatron and Joseph, using the designation *na'ar* for both; and an adjacent text even deals with the mystery of the sin Joseph's ten brothers committed by selling him. These homilies are also based on the verse quoted in our homily: "and [Joseph] the lad [Heb. *na'ar*, also translated as "servant"] . . . brought unto his father their evil report" (Gen. 37:2).<sup>55</sup> Joseph, the "king," is described as a *na'ar* in the time of exile and is then transformed from *nahar* (lit. "river") to *na'ar*, which is a clear reference to Metatron, who is described in several places as the ruler during exile, often derived from Ecclesiastes 10:16, "Alas for you, O land, when your king is a servant [*na'ar*]," which is also cited here.

This is followed by the concept, well known from the *hekhalot* literature and liturgical poems, of the sin of Joseph's ten brothers being reincarnated in the ten rabbis martyred by the Romans.<sup>56</sup> In this context, note also the close connection of Metatron to the mystery of "the human sacrifice" and the death of martyrs.<sup>57</sup>

Further support for the association between this homily in *TZ* and the writings of Rabbi Joseph Angelet is found in the aforementioned similarity between *Raza deRazin* and the main sections of Tikkun 61 (in the Byzantine mss.)—which contains the dialogue between R. Shimon Bar Yochai and his son on the mysteries of physiognomy. Indeed, Meroz contends that Angelet authored this passage.<sup>58</sup> Interestingly, in order to substantiate her claim, Meroz points to characteristic signs of Angelet's literary style found in *Raza deRazin*, even though they are not quantitatively sufficient to make a definite claim. These include references to books from the celestial library: *Sifra deAdam Kama'a*, *Sifra deShlomo Malka*, *Sifra deHanokh* (Angelet also refers to *Sifra deRav Hamuna Sava* on several occasions).<sup>59</sup> Similarly, there is the important parallel to the idea that Adam's soul was reincarnated in Enoch and Metatron (the *na'ar*) as described in *Zohar Hadash Terumah*,<sup>60</sup> and Meroz claims that it is a "nearly certain assumption" that most of *Zohar Hadash Terumah* belongs to Rabbi Joseph Angelet.<sup>61</sup>

Yet, despite all of the above, the connection between Joseph's brothers and the angels who objected to the creation of Adam is found nowhere in

the writings of R. Angelet; to the best of my knowledge, it does not appear in any other kabbalistic text from this period. I would like to propose that the legend of the ten martyrs rectifying the souls of the brothers (mentioned in the closest parallel to our homily found in the Byzantine manuscripts of the Zohar) is a key to understanding the idea that the angels, on account of their sin, were reincarnated in Joseph's brothers. In order to clarify this claim, it is necessary to understand the possible Christian influence in linking Joseph's brothers to the ten martyrs. In the process, I will also reveal the possibility that our homily is, *inter alia*, an anti-Christian polemic.

THE ANTI-CHRISTIAN POLEMIC IN THE MYSTERY OF THE  
REINCARNATIONS OF ADAM, ENOCH, METATRON,  
AND JOSEPH (AND JESUS)

As Yehuda Liebes (and others) points out, the story of the ten martyrs that appears in the *hekhlot* literature was apparently influenced by patristic Christian commentators.<sup>62</sup> In these commentaries the sale of Joseph by his brothers is paralleled to Jesus's Jewish brethren handing him over for crucifixion;<sup>63</sup> this interpretation was also used as the proof text for Israel being exiled for the sin of killing Jesus.<sup>64</sup> This influence is indeed evident in the writings of Rabbi Joseph Angelet and the Zoharic literature, which both interpret the same verse used by the church fathers in this context, Amos 2:6: "Thus says the Lord: For three transgressions of Israel, and for four, I will not revoke the punishment; because they sell the righteous for money."<sup>65</sup> There is a strong chance that Castilian kabbalists were familiar with patristic literature, from both direct and indirect sources, including anti-Christian Jewish polemics. One of the important sources for the matter at hand, from which we also learn about the Christian interpretation of the sin of Joseph's brothers, is the anti-Jewish polemic of Raymond Martini, *Pugio Fidei*, written in Catalonia during the thirteenth century, which was known to both Rabbi Moses ben Nahman Girondi (known as "Nahmanides" or "Ramban") and Rabbi Shlomo ben Aderet (known as "Rashba") and was very likely known to Castilian kabbalists as well.<sup>66</sup> *Pugio Fidei* includes a clear reference to the verse from Amos that links the sale of Joseph—"the fourth crime" in Martini's terminology (intimated by the phrase "quod justum argento mercati sunt" [selling a righteous man for money])—and the handing over of Jesus to his death.<sup>67</sup> This verse is also

interpreted in a parallel homily in *TZ* (preserved in the printed edition of *Livnat haSapir*) and in the Byzantine manuscripts presented above, immediately after the description of the ten martyrs as a rectification for the sin of selling Joseph,<sup>68</sup> and is cited in parallel passages in Angelet and *Zohar Ḥadash* on *Vayeshhev* that postulate the sin of selling Joseph as the cause of all exiles imposed on the Jewish people.<sup>69</sup> It is also interesting to note that as early as the *hekhhalot* literature (second–eighth centuries), it is Sama’el, the angel of Esau, frequently identified with Christianity, who is responsible for implementing the decree against the ten martyrs.<sup>70</sup> Moreover, Rabbi Ishmael is informed of the decree by none other than “Suriel Prince of the Divine Presence” (*Sar haPanim*), who is described as “Metatron Prince of the Divine Presence” (*Sar haPanim*) in other versions.<sup>71</sup>

In my opinion, the homily in *TZ* was written with full consciousness of both the idea that the death of the ten martyrs was a rectification for the sin of selling Joseph and the Christian interpretation offered by the church fathers. For the former, the sin of selling Joseph was the origin of all exiles, a clear response to the patristic interpretation that sees the sin as a representation of the Jews’ guilt for sending the Messiah to his death. It now remains to be clarified how the sin of the brothers relates to the angelic argument against Adam/Metatron and R. Shimon bar Yochai’s insistence that these angels are not ‘Azza and ‘Azza’el, although elsewhere in the *Zohar* they are named explicitly so.

First, the description of ‘Azza and ‘Azza’el as the angels who opposed the ascension of Metatron to near-divine status can apparently be a mirror image to the Christian depiction of the Jews opposing the deification of Jesus (closely related to Enoch-Metatron).<sup>72</sup> Moreover, in the *Zohar* ‘Azza and ‘Azza’el are perceived as having a close connection to Jesus,<sup>73</sup> because they are considered the sources of magic and sorcery (and idolatry) in the world;<sup>74</sup> from them, Balaam learned the science of sorcery,<sup>75</sup> and it is known that anti-Christian polemics often describe Jesus as a sorcerer and identify him typologically as Balaam.<sup>76</sup>

Moreover, in *TZ*, *Tikkun 66*,<sup>77</sup> there is a rare explicit reference to Jesus in one of the uncensored recensions of this text:

R. Shimon said: “Woe to those who abstain from the study of the Torah, which is said on her: (Gen. 3:22) “and take also from the tree of life,” and from her laws, which are the fruits of the tree [of life], which is said on her: “and eat, and live forever,” and they follow instead the ones who seduce them from the side of the primordial serpent



. . . to be “like God, knowing good and evil” . . . and that is why God ordered Adam: )Gen. 2:17): “but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat.” And *Jesus* [in the censored printed edition: Balaam] *the sinner* was engaged in this . . . and the Blessed Holy One uproots them from this world and from the world to come. And this is: (Idem): “for in the day that you eat of it you shall die.” (Tikkun 69, 97a; italics added)<sup>78</sup>

Jesus is identified here as one of the forces “from the side of the primordial serpent” who lures victims to refrain from the study of the Torah and from obeying its laws. According to this *TZ* passage Jesus, the same as the primordial serpent, seduces people to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. This description is also adequate for describing ‘Azza and ‘Azza’el, who are further described as fallen angels who came down to earth in order to seduce men and women to sin.<sup>79</sup> The fact that this text appears in some versions of *TZ* close to a passage that might belong to the same *TZ* texts discussed in this article is another hint at the possibility that our text in describing ‘Azza and ‘Azza’el deals with a hidden anti-Christian polemic.

Furthermore, ‘Azza and ‘Azza’el are also identified with the mythical character “Azazel,” to whom the scapegoat is sacrificed on the Day of Atonement. The Zohar probably understands “Az-El,” אַז-יָ (which can be read also as אַז-יָ, “the Goat of God”), as being closely connected to Jesus, the *agnus dei* (lamb of God), a connection that is beyond the scope of the present article.<sup>80</sup>

In essence, the descriptions of the angels ‘Azza and ‘Azza’el’s arguments against the deification of Metatron and Adam are also a polemical account refuting Christian depictions of Jesus as a “second Adam”<sup>81</sup> and even Christian descriptions of the angels’ opposition to Jesus.<sup>82</sup> On the other hand, there is a Christian tradition interpreting Genesis 1:26 depicting Jesus as the one God consulted with when creating Adam. This Christian reading is even mentioned in the Jewish anti-Christian polemic *Nizzahon Vetus*: “‘Let us make man/Adam’ [Gen. 1:26], and they interpret it as meaning that the father told the son [Jesus], ‘Let the two of us make man.’” As mentioned above, there is a known Zoharic tradition that the angels with whom God consulted were the ministering angels ‘Azza and ‘Azza’el, following the interpretative tradition of Genesis 1:26.<sup>83</sup> Therefore, it seems very plausible that the description of the angels’ opposition to the deification of Adam/Metatron and his transformation into “supreme ruler” of all worlds is an

inversion of the Christian reading: Jesus, the archsorcerer, becomes in the Zohar 'Azza and 'Azza'el, the fallen angels who were incarnated in human form after their fall; while the image of the Jewish Messiah, the true "Son of God," becomes identified with Adam and Enoch-Metatron (and Joseph the "righteous"), who represent the reverse—a human who is transformed into a near-divine angel.<sup>84</sup>

It seems that the author of the homily wanted to maintain its internal tension, as well as its proximity to anti-Christian polemic. For R. Shimon bar Yochai, Joseph's brothers are not 'Azza and 'Azza'el (whom he apparently identifies with Jesus) but, rather, ministering angels who did indeed sin and cause a major disruption, which led to the exile of the Jewish people; but their sin would also be rectified in the future by the ten martyrs,<sup>85</sup> whose martyrdom is described as being characterized by great messianic fervor.

On this point, it should be noted that in *Emeq ha-Melekh*, the work of the seventeenth-century kabbalist Naftali Hertz Bakhrakh (born in Frankfurt am Main), appears a passage that deals with the idea of the reincarnation of Adam's soul in Enoch and Metatron (based on some Zoharic sources). Bakhrakh's interpretation deals extensively with the process of purifying Adam's soul of the impurities that have attached to it, principally those of Jesus of Nazareth (whom he defines as "the last excrement"). The rectification and purification, as described there, are accomplished by martyrs who were killed to sanctify God and by hurling Christianity down "the ladder of Metatron" while they hold onto it.<sup>86</sup> Likewise, the foundation of the homily in *TZ* is a fierce struggle against Christianity, waged by adopting and inverting Christian interpretations. Possibly, the words of Martini in *Pugio Fidei* influenced the authors of the Zohar when selecting their polemical message: "What would be more joyous for a Christian," asked Martini, "than if he could most easily twist the sword of his enemy from his hand and then cut off the head of the infidel with his own blade?"<sup>87</sup> The authors of the Zohar, who considered language their sword, use the power of the homily, which is based on the Christian homily, to combat the competing religion using its own interpretation.<sup>88</sup>

This is a struggle over the messianic character of Joseph, using a homily on the mystery of the soul of Adam-Enoch-Metatron and its reincarnation in Joseph, who becomes the symbol of the "righteous" Messiah,<sup>89</sup> saving Israel through his struggle against the Christian Messiah<sup>90</sup>—a struggle that is apparently also reflected in the messianic self-consciousness of the authors of the Zohar and *TZ*.<sup>91</sup>

SIFRA DE-RAV KRUSPEDAI AND THE “UPPER TZADIK”:  
MYTHOPOEIC ASPECTS

Let us return to the list of books in the celestial library quoted at the beginning of the passage and to their linkage with the “book of the generations of Adam.”<sup>92</sup> Above I suggested that “The book of Enoch the youth” can be identified as 3 Enoch, but what is *Sifra de-Rav Kruspedai*, which appears nowhere else in the Zoharic literature? Answering this question requires us to first ask, Who was R. Kruspedai? This Zoharic personality is influenced by descriptions of R. Kruspedai in the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds, where he is depicted as a third-generation amora of the Land of Israel. One of his better-known statements appears in the Babylonian Talmud tractate *Rosh Hashanah* 16b: “R. Kruspedai said in the name of Rabbi Yohanan: Three books are opened on the New Year: One for the wholly wicked, one for the wholly righteous, and one for those between.” A paraphrase of this statement in the Zohar develops a connection between the “book of the generations of Adam” and the book of the “wholly righteous,” further identifying Adam with the Tzadik (lit. “Righteous”).<sup>93</sup> In another version, printed in close proximity to our homily, R. Shimon bar Yochai expounds on the verse “this is the book of the generations of Adam” by dividing it into two segments: “this is the book”—this is the ever-living righteous man, and “the generations [*Toledot*] of Adam”—who produces offspring (*Toladot*) (see Tikkun 70, 138a).

In Zoharic literature, especially in *Midrash haNe'elam*, R. Kruspedai is described without any mythical connotations,<sup>94</sup> similar to the characters of the Sava (the Old Man) and Yanuka (the Child Prodigy) in the midrash.<sup>95</sup> The first important appearance of this character is in *Midrash Ruth*, which tells the story of the death (or near-death experience) and resurrection (or coming back to life) of R. Kruspedai.<sup>96</sup> This is the first literary reworking of the character, and the author of our homily in *TZ* was doubtless aware of it. *Midrash Ruth* is apparently one of the earliest texts in the “intermediary stratum,” between the main strata of the Zohar (*Guf haZohar*) and the later *TZ* and *Ra'ya Meheimna*. Many of the stories included in this intermediate stratum are the first to present a richer and more mythically complex literary adaptation of the early *Midrash haNe'elam*'s stories.<sup>97</sup> In this story, the character is known as “R. Kruspedai Sava,” Tzadik (Righteous), and “Light of Torah,”<sup>98</sup> similar to the epithet of Rav Hamnuna Sava.<sup>99</sup> Indeed, it seems to me that the character of R. Kruspedai had the

same potential as Rav Hamnuna Sava to become a central, mythical figure in Zoharic literature, though the latter was eventually chosen. I believe that *Sifra de-Rav Kruspedai* and especially his character as identified with Adam—as divine Anthropos—are realized in the character of the Tzadik, the Yesod (the ninth *sefirah*), and even the Lesser Countenance. Likewise, Rav Hamnuna Sava is sometimes named in TZ and *Ra'ya Meheimna* the “Primordial Adam.”<sup>100</sup>

The identification of R. Kruspedai with Yesod is even more apparent in the unit called *Rav Metivta*, which belongs to the same intermediary stratum, where the death of R. Kruspedai is mentioned (in a clear allusion to the story in *Midrash Ruth*) and explicitly identified with the upper Tzadik (the supernal Righteous One):

The Head of the Academy saw it, and engraved on it above was this verse: *The name of YHVH is a tower of strength; the righteous one runs into it and is secure* (Proverbs 18:10). The Head of the Academy explained this verse. *The name of YHVH*—Assembly of Israel. *The righteous one* ירוץ [*garuts*], runs, into it—רעותיה [*re'uteih*], the desire of, *the righteous one* is always for it. Therefore, *it is secure*—that tower, so that it will never fall, as it did.

“Rabbi Kruspedai, desired by the heart, explained this verse before he passed away, explaining it well. *A tower of strength*: the תיבה [*teivah*], pulpit, and the Torah scroll, which is *strength*, to be placed on it and taken out of the היכל [*heikhal*], ark—image of the inner *heikhal*, from which emerges Torah. That *tower is the name of YHVH* and His image, and it must have six steps.

“*The righteous one runs into it*. Into what: into the tower or in the Torah scroll? Well, he expounded the verse both ways. When he interpreted it as ‘into the tower,’ then this *righteous one* must be the *h'Azzan* of the synagogue—truly righteous, image of the supernal Righteous One. When he interpreted it as referring to the Torah scroll, the one reading must be *righteous*, and is called *righteous*.

“Of all of them, who is called *righteous*? The sixth one ascending among those seven.”

Rabbi Shimon said, “Surely, for all his life he ascended only sixth among those ascending. *The righteous one runs in it*—in the Torah scroll run the words of this *righteous one*.

“*And is secure*—from what? From fear of the Angel of Death, for he lived a long life. *And is secure*—never to be harmed.”<sup>101</sup>

It is beyond the scope of the current article to elaborate on the meaning of the story in *Rav Metivta*, which describes the journey of R. Shimon bar Yochai and his companions in the upper worlds and has a close connection to the midrash *Seder Gan Eden*.<sup>102</sup> Inter alia it describes the (martyred) son of the Messiah as the “supernal Righteous One” in the tower (also known as *Kan Tzipor*—the “Bird’s Nest”). This mythic portrait was developed, primarily in *TZ*, into the Righteous One, who protects the Shekhina by fighting the Serpent (which symbolizes, among other things, Christianity) coiled around the tower in which the Shekhina resides.<sup>103</sup>

One of the verses at the heart of this story is Proverbs 18:10: “The name of YHVH is a tower of strength; the righteous one runs into it and is secure.” Among the homilies quoted in *Rav Metivta* on this verse is that given by R. Kruspedai before his death. R. Kruspedai is here named “desired by the heart” (חמיד לבא), a clear reference to a trait of a righteous man who desires only the Shekhina (ביה רעותיה דצדיק תירי). His homily identifies the Tower of Torah as a symbol of the Shekhina, thereby revealing sensitivity to the distinction between the mythic and the concrete and asking “to where” the righteous desires—in the language of the verse, “To where does he run?” Is it to the tower where the Shekhina resides or to the reading of the actual Torah scroll in the synagogue? He answers that the verse refers to both forms of the Shekhina, the one ensconced in the mythic “tower” and the actual Torah scroll. When the reference is to the tower, the righteous is “the Supreme Righteous”; when it is to the ritual of reading the Torah scroll on the Sabbath, the righteous is the person called to recite the blessings (or the *H’Azzan* of the synagogue). The person called for the sixth section of the reading is considered the most righteous, because this section corresponds to the Yesod, which is identified with the Supreme Righteous One. Immediately, R. Shimon bar Yochai appears and testifies that R. Kruspedai is indeed the Righteous One for whom the most righteous sixth portion is always saved.<sup>104</sup> Because of this honor, he merited long life and was saved from the angel of death as told in the *Midrash Ruth* story.

Surely the *Sifra de-Rav Kruspedai*—which appears in the homily regarding the character of the messianic *na’ar*, Joseph (as an instantiation of the mythic Righteous One) and Metatron (as a reincarnation of the soul of Primordial Adam)—is closely connected to the image of R. Kruspedai here. This is the same R. Kruspedai, “desired by the heart,” who gives the homily about the tower and the righteous before his death and is described by R. Shimon bar Yochai as a person for whom the sixth Torah portion is reserved because he is the most righteous of all. All of these points appear

in the story of *Rav Metivta*, which is concerned solely with describing the Messiah as the Righteous One, who is closely associated with Gadiel the youth (*na'ar*)—obviously tied to Metatron the youth (*na'ar*)—the martyred Messiah who died to sanctify God's name hosted in the mythic-messianic tower of *Kan Tzipor* (Bird's Nest).<sup>105</sup>

Regarding R. Kruspedai's connection to Metatron, in one of the *Ta Hazei* passages (which Scholem identified as later than the main strata of the Zohar and claimed were written in the early fourteenth century),<sup>106</sup> R. Kruspedai's statement is described as the highest human achievement of divine "light," which is the light that "comes from behind the *Pargod* [lit. "screen"]," the "light of the great intellect that is formed from the brightness of His Glory."<sup>107</sup> This is a clear reference to Metatron, who is frequently identified with the "Active Intellect," who stands behind the *Pargod* (as described in the story of the ten martyrs), and whose light is formed from the brightness of God's glory.<sup>108</sup>

In some manuscripts and printed editions, a seemingly later addition is inserted after the reference to *Sifra de-Rav Kruspedai*. It tells a remarkable story about the nocturnal meeting of the sages (as yet unidentified) with R. Kruspedai's mother (Tikkun 70, 136a–b),<sup>109</sup> who lights their way with a seven-branched candelabrum and gives them her son's book. The story stresses that this occurred on the night of the Shavuot holiday, the night of *tikkunei hakallah*. When the sages read the book, the entire heavenly host descended and surrounded them, as if they were surrounding the bride and groom under the wedding canopy. Furthermore, the soul of R. Kruspedai's father descended together with the Holy Blessed One to hear the words of his son.

From there the text continues with the description of another nocturnal encounter with R. Kruspedai's mother on the day of his death, but stressing that his mother did not yet know that he had died. She wonders why words of Torah are not being spoken in her home. The sages, who dread revealing the bad news, deliver a homily that deals entirely with the soul and its departure. In the end the mother looks at the candle she had previously lit in honor of the sages—which represents a real candle and is simultaneously also the allegorical representation of her son's soul—and sees that it has been extinguished. She goes outside and makes a dove swear to find out whether her son is living or dead.<sup>110</sup> When the dove returns to her, it ruffles its feathers and digs with its beak; Kruspedai's mother then refuses to be comforted; she cries out, and her soul, too, departs. The text continues with the story of R. Shimon bar Yochai and

his companions walking on their way and expounding the journeys of the soul.

The passage ends when Rabbi Elazar asks R. Shimon why the early generations lived for so long but the human life span became increasingly shorter beginning with Abraham. R. Shimon responds that the long life spans were derived from the Greater Countenance while shorter life spans are derived from the Lesser Countenance (Tikkun 70, 138b). In this context, it should again be stressed that nearly all of Tikkun 61 in the Byzantine manuscripts deals with “divine physiognomy,” making close connections to the divinity of the Greater Countenance and the Lesser Countenance,<sup>111</sup> and concludes with the homily on which this article focuses, concerning the reincarnation of Adam-Enoch-Metatron-Joseph.

The reference to the “book of R. Kruspedai” is closely related to all these. In fact all of the books in the celestial library that are listed at the beginning of the passage are interconnected: *Sefer Toldot Adam*, *Sifra de-Rav Hamnuna Sava*, *Sifra de-Rav Kruspedai*, and “The book of Enoch the youth.” The characters on whom these books focus—Adam, Hamnuna Sava, R. Kruspedai, Enoch, and Metatron—all have strong connections to the higher Divine Countenances. Just as Rav Hamnuna Sava is closely tied to the Greater Countenance (and Enoch), so R. Kruspedai is tied to the Lesser Countenance (and Metatron); he also plays the role of the “son,” the messianic “son of God” (as the story here describes him as the deceased “son” of his mother, similar to the character of the Yanuka in the printed versions of Zohar on *Balak*, who is closely connected to Metatron).<sup>112</sup>

If R. Kruspedai Sava is indeed linked to Adam, who is sometimes identified with Tiferet, or the Lesser Countenance, then his mother (like that of the Yanuka of the Zohar on *Balak*) is also tied to the Shekhina (or *Binah*).<sup>113</sup> My main argument regarding R. Kruspedai is that he is an instantiation of the Supreme Righteous One, who is incarnated in the narrative figure of R. Kruspedai, just as the “Ancient Holy One” (or Greater Countenance) is incarnated in the narrative figure of Rav Hamnuna Sava and the Lesser Countenance is incarnated in the form of his son (the Yanuka). In other words, *Sifra de-Rav Kruspedai* is actually the book of the “upper Tzadik” (the Supreme Righteous One), identified also with *Sefer Toldot Adam* (the book of generations of Adam or, as in *Raza deRazin*, the book of Divine Physiognomy).

In summary, the late editing of *TZ*, combining the different textual traditions printed at the end of Tikkun 70 (134b–136a), emphasizes their hidden ambivalence toward Christianity and especially toward the possibility

of Divine incarnation. The figure of Metatron, who is deeply linked to R. Kruspedai, becomes the focal concern of these textual traditions. The main goal of this article is to show how the combined depictions printed at the end of Tikkun 70 make up yet another example of the complex linkage between Metatron and Jesus and of the hidden Zoharic polemics against Christianity, as a discourse that both borrows from and refutes its Christian opponents.

## NOTES

This article was first presented at the “Zohar—East and West” International Matanel Conference, Ben-Gurion University, Beersheba, and the Ben Zvi Institute, Jerusalem, 2015, and also at the 49th Association for Jewish Studies Annual Conference, Washington, D.C., 2017. I wish to thank all the participants for their valuable comments. I also want to deeply thank the anonymous readers and Yehuda Liebes, Moshe Idel, Gideon Bohak, Andrei Orlov, and Joel Hecker for their numerous suggestions and comments, which are incorporated in this final version of the article.

1. On Zoharic literature, see Gershom Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, foreword by Robert Alter (Jerusalem: Schocken, 1941; repr., New York: Schocken Books, 1995), 156–204; Yehuda Liebes, *Studies in the Zohar*, trans. Arnold Schwartz, Stephanie Nakache, and Penina Peli, SUNY Series in Judaica: Hermeneutics, Mysticism, and Religion, ed. Michael Fishbane, Robert Goldenberg, and Arthur Green (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), 85–138; Elliot Wolfson, *Language, Eros, Being: Kabbalistic Hermeneutics and Poetic Imagination* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2005), 48; Elliot Wolfson, “The Anonymous Chapters of the Elderly Master of Secrets—New Evidence for the Early Activity of the Zoharic Circle,” *Kabbalah: Journal for the Study of Jewish Mystical Texts* 19 (2009): 143–94, at 173–77; Ronit Meroz, “‘And I Was Not There?!’ The Complaints of Rabbi Simeon bar Yohai According to an Unknown Zoharic Story,” *Tarbiz* 21 (2001–2): 163–93, at 187–91; Ronit Meroz, “Zoharic Narratives and Their Adaptations,” *Hispania Judaica* 3 (2000): 3–63, at 4; Ronit Meroz, “The Path of Silence: An Unknown Story from a Zohar Manuscript,” *European Journal of Jewish Studies* 1, no. 2 (2008): 319–42, at 320; Boaz Huss, *Like the Radiance of the Sky: Chapters in the Reception History of the Zohar and the Construction of Its Symbolic Value* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 2008), 43–44; Ronit Meroz, “*Sefer ha-Zohar* as Canonical, Sacred, and Holy Text: Changing Perspectives of the Book of Splendor between the Thirteenth and the Eighteenth Centuries,” *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 7 (1998): 257–307, at 268–71; Daniel Abrams, “The Invention of the Zohar as a Book: On the Assumptions and Expectations of the Kabbalists and Modern Scholars,” *Kabbalah: Journal for the Study of Jewish Mystical Texts* 19 (2009): 7–142, at 89, 111–13, 139; Daniel Abrams, *Kabbalistic Manuscripts and Textual Theory: Methodologies of Textual Scholarship and Editorial Practice in the Study of Jewish Mysticism* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2010), 224–428. On *Tikkunei ha-Zohar*, see Pinchas Giller, *The Enlightened Will Shine: Symbolization and Theurgy in the Later Strata of the Zohar* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993); Biti Roi, *Love of the Shekhina: Mystical and Poetics in Tikkunei ha-Zohar* [Hebrew] (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2017).

2. For a complete list of publications on the reaction toward Christianity in Zoharic literature, see Abrams, *Kabbalistic Manuscripts and Textual Theory*, 126–34, 154–56; Daniel Abrams, “The Virgin Mary as the Moon that Lacks the Sun—A Zoharic Polemic Against the Veneration of Mary,” *Kabbalah* 21 (2010): 9–13, nn. 7–17, 18 n. 26. See also Daniel Abrams, “Chapters from an Emotional and Sexual Biography of God: Reflections on God’s Attributes in the Bible, Midrash, and Kabbalah” [Hebrew], *Kabbalah* 6 (2001): 263–86; Yitzhak Baer, “The Historical Context of Ra’aya Mehemna” [Hebrew], *Zion* 5 (1940): 1–44; Yehuda Liebes, “Christian Influences on the Zohar,” in *Studies in the Zohar*, 139–61, 228–44; Elliot R. Wolfson, “Patriarchy and the Motherhood of God in Zoharic Kabbalah and Meister Eckhart,” in *Envisioning Judaism: Studies in Honor of Peter Schäfer on the Occasion of His Seventieth*



*Birthday*, ed. Ra'anan S. Boustan and Alex Ramos (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), vol. 2, 1049–88; Elliot R. Wolfson, “Re/membering the Covenant: Memory, Forgetfulness, and the Construction of History in the Zohar,” in *Jewish History and Jewish Memory: Essays in Honor of Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi*, ed. Elisheva Carlebach, John M. Efron, and David N. Myers (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1998), 214–46; Elliot R. Wolfson, *Venturing Beyond: Law and Morality in Kabbalistic Mysticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 129–85; Elliot R. Wolfson, *Along the Path: Studies in Kabbalistic Myth, Symbolism, and Hermeneutics* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), 63–88; Avishai Bar Asher, “The Doctrine of Atonement and Fasting of Moses de León and the Zoharic Polemic with the Christian Monks” [Hebrew], *Kabbalah* 25 (2012): 293–319; Ellen Haskell, “The Death of Rachel and the Kingdom of Heaven: Jewish Engagement with Christian Themes in *Sefer ha-Zohar*,” *Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures* 38 (2012): 1–31; Ellen Haskell, *Mystical Resistance: Uncovering the Zohar’s Conversations with Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016); Jonatan M. Benarroch, “God and His Son: Christian Affinities in the Shaping of the Sava and Yanuka Figures in the Zohar,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 107, no. 1 (2017): 38–65; Jonatan M. Benarroch, “‘Son of an Israelite Woman and an Egyptian Man’: Jesus as the Blasphemer (Lev 24:10–23)—An Anti-Gospel Polemic in the Zohar,” *Harvard Theological Review* 110, no. 1 (2017): 100–124. Cf. Hartley Lachter, “Kabbalah, Philosophy, and the Jewish-Christian Debate: Reconsidering the Early Works of Joseph Gikatilla,” *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 16, no. 1 (2008): 1–58. On the comparison between the messianic figures of Rabbi Shimon Bar Yohai and Jesus, see Yehuda Liebes, “The Messiah of the Zohar,” in *The Messianic Idea in Jewish Thought: A Study Conference in Honor of the Eightieth Birthday of Gershom Scholem* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1982), 230–32; Elhanan Reiner, “From Joshua Through Jesus to Simeon Bar Yohai: Towards a Typology of Galilean Heroes,” in *Jesus Among the Jews: Representation and Thought*, ed. N. Stahl (London: Routledge, 2012), 94–105.

3. On Metatron and Jesus, see Yehuda Liebes, “The Angels of the Shofar’s Voice and Yeshu’a Sar ha-Panim,” in *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought*, vol. 6 (Proceedings of the International Conference of the History of Jewish Mysticism—1: Ancient Jewish Mysticism) [Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1987), 171–96; Daniel Abrams, “The Boundaries of Divine Ontology: The Inclusion and Exclusion of Metatron in the Godhead,” *Harvard Theological Review* 87, no. 3 (1994): 316–21; Daniel Abrams, “Metatron and Jesus—The Longue Durée of Rabbinic and Kabbalistic Traditions: An Eighteenth-Century Manual of Christian Proselytizing in German and Yiddish,” *Kabbalah* 27 (2012): 13–105; Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa, “Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ: For Shlomo Pines,” *Harvard Theological Review* 76, no. 3 (1983): 269–88; Moshe Idel, *Ben: Sonship and Jewish Mysticism* (London: Continuum, 2007), 147, 236–39, 298–99. Cf. Daniel Boyarin, “Is Metatron a Converted Christian?” *Judaïsme Ancien* 1 (2013): 13–62. On the connection between the figure of Jesus and Metatron in Zoharic literature, see Johan Kemper, *Mate Moshe o Makel Ya’akov*, MS. Uppsala—Universitetsbibliotek O.Heb.24 (Uppsala, 1713), *Sha’ar Metatron*, 113a–152b. On Johan Kemper (and on Metatron in his writings), see Elliot R. Wolfson, “Messianism in the Christian Kabbalah of Johann Kemper,” in *Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture*, vol. 1, *Jewish Messianism in the Early Modern World*, ed. M. D. Goldish and R. H. Popkin (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001), 139–87; Elliot R. Wolfson, “Angelic Embodiment and the Feminine Representation of Jesus: Reconstructing Carnality in the Christian Kabbalah of Johann Kemper,” in *The Jewish Body: Corporeality, Society, and Identity in the Renaissance and Early Modern Period*, ed. M. Diemling and G. Veltri (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 395–426.

4. See Ron Margolin, “Physiognomy and Palm Lines: From Foretelling the Future to Therapy and Amendment of the Human Being; Zohar II, 70a–78a; TZ, Tikkun 70” [Hebrew], in *Hidushei Zohar; Mehkarim Hadashim be-Sifrut ha-Zohar*, ed. Ronit Meroz (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 2007), 199–249.

5. See MS. Toronto, Friedberg 5-015 (fourteenth–fifteenth centuries), fol. 86b; MS. Vatican 206 (fifteenth century), fol. 165b; MS. Paris 778 (fifteenth century), fol. 128b; MS. Vatican 208 (fifteenth century), fol. 176b; cf. MS. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 203 (Spanish script, sixteenth century), fol. 228a; *Zohar*, 1st ed. (Cremona, 1558), 173. The *Tikkunei haZohar* translations are from David Solomon, *An English Translation of ‘Tiqqunei haZohar*,” (forthcoming), made available by the author, with some corrections of mine. They are hereafter cited in the text by TZ book and folio numbers.

6. On “the book of generations of Adam” in TZ, see Tikkun 70, 121a, 136a, 137a, 138a.

7. Cf. Tikkun 70, 138a; *Zohar* I, 37a–b.

8. On the Zoharic “celestial library,” see Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 174. According to Scholem, most of the books mentioned in the Zohar are fictional and should be understood as part of the author’s sense of humor. Cf. Simon Neuhausen, *Sifriyah shel Ma’alah* (Berehove, Ukraine: Samuel Klein, 1937). However, as will be shown below, this is not the case with “the book of Enoch the youth” mentioned here. On the “book of Enoch” in the Zohar, see Avishai Bar Asher, “Concepts and Images of Paradise in 13th Century Kabbalah” [Hebrew] (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 2015), 234–35.

9. R. Eleazar of Worms, *Sodei Razzaya haShalem* (Tel Aviv: Barazani, 2004), 401–2; my translation.

10. Zohar II, *Yitro* (*Raza deRazin*), 70a–75a; and Zohar *Hadash*, 35b–37c (trans. Joel Hecker, in *Zohar: Pritzker Edition*, vol. 12, 317–69).

11. On physiognomy in the Zohar and other Kabbalistic traditions, see Yehuda Liebes, “Knowing the Face in Kabbalah” [Hebrew], *Pe’amim* 104 (2004): 21–40; Margolin, “Physiognomy and Palm Lines.”

12. On “the book of Adam” (*Sifra de’Adam*), see Zohar I, 17b, 58b, 72b; Zohar II, 131a. On “the book of the ancient/first Adam” (*Sifra de’Adam Kadma’u*), see Zohar II (*Raza deRazin*), 70a, 73a, 143b, and more.

13. Cf. Ramban (*Nachmanides*) on Gen. 5:1.

14. I will expand on these books and their uniqueness and importance below.

15. See MS. Oxford Bod. 1917, fols. 140b–141a; London, British Library 10763, fols. 113b–114a; Moscow Ginsburg 130, fols. 78a–79b; Parma 351, fols. 545a–b; Or Yaqaq, vol. 3, *Sha’ar 5*, 274–77; *Tikkunei haZohar* (Mantua, 1558), 135b; *Tikkunei haZohar* (Constantinople, 1719), 136b–137a.

16. Cf. Zohar I, 37b.

17. On the importance of the Byzantine manuscripts as reflecting one of the first editorial stages of the Zohar in Candia (Heraklion), see Daniel Abrams, “The Earliest Manuscript of the Zohar—Ms. Vatican 202, Circa 1300: A Quote in Aramaic in the Name of R. Shimon bar Yohai in ‘The Secret of Leverage Marriage’ and the Various Copyings of Zoharic Texts in the Manuscript” [Hebrew], *Kabbalah* 35 (2015): 316 n. 3; Avraham Elqayam, “The Holy Zohar of Shabtai Tzevi,” *Kabbalah* 3 (1998): 345–87.

18. Below I shall explain that this homily (apparently in its early Byzantine version) has close ties to the writings of Rabbi Joseph Angelet and may even have been authored by him.

19. Translation as per KJB, with some corrections of mine. In this case I did not use the NRSV (Gen. 37:2) version, as it lacks the reference to the lad/youth, using instead the word *helper*.

20. On Metatron as “Youth,” see Idel, *Ben*, 130–36, 146–47.

21. See Moshe Idel, “Enoch Is Metatron,” *Immanuel* 24–25 (1990): 220–40, at 226.

22. See Andrei A. Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 133–36, cf. 157–59, 222–26; Andrei A. Orlov, *The Greatest Mirror: Heavenly Counterparts in the Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2017), 21–22, 25–31, 49, 83, 126, 164–65, 170, 173, 213.

23. Zohar *Hadash*, *Terumah*, 42d (trans. Hecker, *Zohar: Pritzker Edition*, vol. 12, 317–69).

24. Zohar *Hadash*, *Shir haShirim*, 69a–b. See R. Elijah of Vilna’s commentary on Tikkun 70.

25. Cf. Hugo Odeberg, 3 *Enoch*; or, *The Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1973), 102, 122–23. Some scholars argue that there are similarities between the heavenly double of Joseph and Metatron in the pseudepigraphon called “Joseph and Aseneth”; see Ross S. Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 123–27; Orlov, *Greatest Mirror*, 121–22, 131–35, 140–41.

26. See MS. Toronto, fol. 78a.

27. See Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 174; Neuhausen, *Sifriyah shel Ma’alah*; Bar Asher, “Concepts and Images of Paradise in 13th Century Kabbalah.”

28. Zohar II, *Yitro* (*Raza deRazin*), 70a–b (trans. Hecker, *Zohar: Pritzker Edition*, vol. 12, 317–21).

29. See Liebes, “Knowing the Face in Kabbalah.”

30. On the links between Hamnuna Sava and King Solomon, see Jonatan Benarroch, “Sava and Yanuqa—Two that Are One: Allegory, Symbol, and Myth in Zoharic Literature” [Hebrew] (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 2011), 202–4.

31. Cf. Margolin, “Physiognomy and Palm Lines,” 228–38.

32. On the traditions of the fallen angels in Judaism and Christianity, see Moshe Idel, "SHMYHZH—Shamhazay/Shamhaza'y/Shmayya'a + Haze'/Shamayyahaze" [Hebrew], *Leshonenu* 78, a–b (2016): 37–42; Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Jarl E. Fossum, "The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis," in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion; Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag. Bd. I: Judentum*, ed. Peter Schäfer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 529–39.
33. According to the Greek numbering (Psalms 8:5 according to the Masoretic numbering).
34. See Jonatan Benarroch, "The Mystery of the Yanuqa and the Radiance of Sava: Poetic and Mythopoetic Aspects in the Shaping of the 'Yanuqa' Figure in the *Balak* Section of the Zohar" [Hebrew] (Master's thesis, Hebrew University, 2007), 95–96.
35. Cf. Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews: From the Creation to Exodus—Notes for Volumes 1 and 2*, vol. 5 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 152 n. 56, 170–71 n. 10.
36. John C. Reeves, in his forthcoming research on the early Jewish mythologies of evil, provides a helpful description of the main tenets of the Enochic and Adamic paradigms of the origin of evil, which he calls the "Enochic Template" and "Adamic Template." See John C. Reeves, *Sefer 'Uzza Wa'Azaziel: Exploring Early Jewish Mythologies of Evil* (forthcoming).
37. On Enoch-Metatron, see Orlov, *Enoch-Metatron Tradition*; Idel, "Enoch Is Metatron"; Lawrence J. Kaplan, "Adam, Enoch, and Metatron Revisited: A Critical Analysis of Moshe Idel's Method of Reconstruction," *Kabbalah* 6 (2001): 73–119; Elliot R. Wolfson, "Metatron and Shi'ur Qomah in the Writings of Haside Ashkenaz," in *Mysticism, Magic, and Kabbalah in Ashkenazi Judaism. International Symposium Held in Frankfurt a.M. 1991*, ed. Karl Erich Grözinger and Joseph Dan (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995), 66–68. Cf. Daniel Abrams, "Metatron, the Lesser Lord, the Angel Called 'Elohim': A Kabbalistic Treatise from Thirteenth-Century Castile; Text, Translation, and Commentary," *Kabbalah* 34 (2016): 7–26.
38. "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch (Fifth to Sixth Century A.D.)," trans. P. Alexander, in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983), 257–59; my corrections. See *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, ed. Peter Schäfer, Margarete Schlüter, and Hans Georg von Mutius (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981), §§ 5–6 (MS. Vat. 228, fols. 46a–b). Cf. Odeberg, 3 *Enoch*, "Part III: Hebrew Text with Critical Notes," chap. IV, 6–13.
39. Cf. M. Genesis Rabbah, Genesis, ed. Theodor Albek, para. 8; M. *Bamidbar Rabbah*, Hukat, ed. Vilna, para. 19,3; M. *Tanhuma*, Hukat, ed. Buber, sim. 12; M. *Tanhuma*, Behukotai, ed. Buber, sim. 6, 12; Zohar Ḥadash, TZ, 116b–c.
40. Charles D. Isbell, *Corpus of the Aramaic Incantation Bowls* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 112–13 (text 49, ll. 10–11). For bowls and *hekhalot* literature, see Shaul Shaked, "Peace Be upon You, Exalted Angels: On Hekhalot, Liturgy, and Incantation Bowls," *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 2 (1995): 197–219; Shaul Shaked, James Nathan Ford, and Siam Bhayro, *Aramaic Bowl Spells, Magical and Religious Literature of Late Antiquity I* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 23–27; Gideon Bohak, "Observations on the Transmission of Hekhalot Literature in the Cairo Genizah," in *Hekhalot Literature in Context: From Byzantium to Babylonia*, ed. Ra'anan S. Boustán, Martha Himmelfarb, and Peter Schäfer, TSAJ 153 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 220–21; Christa Müller-Kessler, "Eine ungewöhnliche Hekhalot-Zauberschale und ihr babylonisches Umfeld: Jüdisches Gedankengut in den Magischen Texten des Ostens," *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge* 38 (2013): 69–84.
41. See 1 Enoch, chaps. 6–8. See Archie T. Wright, *The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6:1–4 in Early Jewish Literature* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015).
42. See M. *Bereshit Rabbati*, ed. Theodor Albek, 29.14–31.8. Cf. Raymundi Martini, *Pugio fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos* (Paris, 1651), 728–29.
43. See Zohar III, 207b–208a.
44. See Zohar I, TZ, 25a–b. On the identification of these Zoharic sections as TZ, see Gershom Scholem, *Kabbalah* (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1974), 218–19.
45. See Zohar I, 37a, 58a, 126a; Zohar III, 144a, 212a–b, 233a–b; Zohar Ḥadash, *Ruth*, 81a–b; Zohar Ḥadash, TZ, 116b–c.
46. Cf. BT *Sanhedrin* 38b.
47. Cf. Orlov, *Enoch-Metatron Tradition*; Orlov, *Greatest Mirror*.
48. See Zohar III, 207b–208a.
49. See Orlov, *Enoch-Metatron Tradition*; Idel, "Enoch Is Metatron"; Kaplan, "Adam, Enoch, and Metatron Revisited"; Wolfson, "Metatron and Shi'ur Qomah in the Writings of Haside Ashkenaz"; Abrams, "Metatron, the Lesser Lord, the Angel Called 'Elohim.'"

50. See “3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch (Fifth to Sixth Century A.D.)”; *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*; Odeberg, 3 *Enoch*.

51. Urbach argued that the Talmudic sages probably knew about gnostic beliefs regarding the deification of Adam. See Ephraim E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, vol. 1 [Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1969), 201–4.

52. On R. Joseph Angelet and TZ, see Ronit Meroz, “R. Joseph Angelet and His Zoharic Writings” [Hebrew], in *Hiddushei Zohar: Mehqarim Hadashim be-Sifrut ha-Zohar*, ed. Ronit Meroz, Te’udah 21–22 (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 2007), 334–40.

53. Cf. Zohar Ḥadash, *Vayeshev*, 29a–d (trans. Hecker, *Zohar: Pritzker Edition*, vol. 12, 560–72).

54. See Meroz, “R. Joseph Angelet and His Zoharic Writings,” 372–73.

55. MS. Toronto 015-5, fol. 116b; MS. Paris 778, fol. 65a; MS. Vat. 206. Cf. R. Joseph Angelet, *Kupat Harokhlin*, MS. Oxford Bod. 228, 103b–104a; R. Joseph Angelet, *Linat haSapir* (Jerusalem, 1912); *Mishpatim*, 95c (probably belongs to TZ and not to Angelet, as noted in Scholem, *Kabbalah*, 219).

56. On this issue in Angelet’s writings, see Meroz, “R. Joseph Angelet and His Zoharic Writings,” 329–33.

57. See Jonatan Benarroch, “‘The Mystery of Unity’: Poetic and Mystical Aspects of a Unique Zoharic Shema Mystery,” *AJS Review* 37, no. 2 (November 2013): 246; cf. Elliot R. Wolfson, “Martyrdom, Eroticism, and Asceticism in Twelfth-Century Ashkenazi Piety,” in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Michael A. Signer and John Van Engen (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 171–220.

58. See Meroz, “R. Joseph Angelet and His Zoharic Writings,” 308–9 n. 11.

59. *Ibid.*

60. See Orlov, *Enoch-Metatron Tradition*; Orlov, *Greatest Mirror*.

61. Meroz, “R. Joseph Angelet and His Zoharic Writings,” 305 n. 4.

62. See *Hekhalot Rabati*, in *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, § 108. This legend is familiar primarily from the liturgical poem “These I Recall” (“‘Ele ’Ezkerah”) attributed to Rabbi Yehuda Hazak.

63. See Michael A. Signer, “The *Glossa ordinaria* and the Transmission of Medieval Anti-Judaism,” in *A Distinct Voice: Medieval Studies in Honor of Leonard E. Boyle, O.P.*, ed. Jacqueline Brown and William P. Stoneman (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), 591–605. On the possible influence of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Zohar, see Jonatan M. Benarroch, “‘Christum qui est Hædus Iudæis, Agnus Nobis’—A Medieval Kabbalistic Response to the Patristic Exegesis on Exod. 23:19” (forthcoming).

64. Yehuda Liebes, “In the Margins of Kabbalah: A Review of Chaim Wirszubski’s Book: ‘Between the Lines’” [Hebrew], *Tarbitz* 60 (1990): 131–38. On the influence of Christian sources on the text of the ten martyrs, see also Paul Mandel, “Was Rabbi Aqiva a Martyr? Palestinian and Babylonian Influences in the Development of a Legend,” in *Rabbinic Traditions Between Palestine and Babylonia*, ed. Ronit Nikolsky and Tal Ilan (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 306–7; Ra’anan S. Boustán, *From Martyr to Mystic: Rabbinic Martyrology and the Making of Merkavah Mysticism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Ra’anan S. Boustán, “Blood and Atonement in the Pseudo-Clementines and the ‘Story of the Ten Martyrs’: The Problem of Selectivity in the Study of ‘Judaism’ and ‘Christianity,’” *Henoch* 30, no. 2 (2008): 333–64; Joseph Dan, “Heikhalot Rabbati and the Legend of the Ten Martyrs” [Hebrew], *Eshel Be’er Sheva* 2 (1981): 63–80; Michal Oron, “Parallel Versions of the Story of the Ten Martyrs and of Heikhalot Rabbati” [Hebrew], *Eshel Be’er Sheva* 2 (1981): 81–95; Solomon Zeitlin, “The Legend of the Ten Martyrs and Its Apocalyptic Origins,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 36, no. 1 (1945): 7–8, 10–11.

65. See Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, IV 40; David Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages: A Critical Edition of the Nizzahon Vetus with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1979), 134[124]; Jacob ben Reuben, *Milhamoth ha-Shem*, ed. J. Rosenthal (Jerusalem: Mossad ha-Rav Kook, 1963), 129; R. Joseph b. R. Nathan Official, *Sefer Joseph ha-Mekane*, ed. J. Rosenthal (Jerusalem: Mekitsei Nirdamim, 1970), 86–87; Yair Ben Shabtai, *Herev Pifiyot*, ed. J. Rosenthal (Jerusalem: Mossad ha-Rav Kook, 1957), 84; cf. *Nizzahon Vetus*, 57[22]. It should be mentioned that the verse from Amos 2:6 is mentioned even in some versions of the legend of the ten martyrs; see *Ma’aseh ‘asarah harugei malkhut*, version B, M. Beit Hamidrash, *Heder* 6, 19.

66. Cf. Benarroch, “Son of an Israelite Woman and an Egyptian Man”; 1 Enoch; Wright, *Origin of Evil Spirits*.

67. See Raymundi Martini, *Pugio fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos*, photographic facsimile of the edition published at Leipzig in 1687 (Farnborough, U.K.: Gregg, 1967), 845–46: “Apud Amos cap. 2 v. 6: Sic ait Dominus super tribus sceleribus Israel, et super quattuor non convertam vel non reducam eum super mercatione sua, vel propter hoc quia mercati sunt argento justum. . . . Quantum scelus fuit, quod justum argento mercati sunt, et morti postmodum tradiderunt, videlicet Dominum Jesum Christum Messiam nostrum.”

68. See MS. Toronto 015-5, fol. 116b; MS. Paris 778, fol. 65a; MS. Vat. 206; Angelet, *Kupat Harokhlin*, MS. Oxford Bod. 228, 103b–104a; *Mishpatim*, 95c. Cf. Angelet, *Livnat haSapir*, 39a, 55d–56d (corrected pages).

69. See Zohar Ḥadash, *Vayeshev*, 29a.

70. See Meroz, “R. Joseph Angelet and His Zoharic Writings,” 305 n. 4.

71. See ‘Ele ‘Ezkerah, M. Beit haMidrash B, 157; cf. *Ma’aseh ‘asarah harugei malkhut*, version B, M. Beit Hamidrash, *Heder* 6, 19.

72. See Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*; Liebes, *Studies in the Zohar*; Wolfson, *Language, Eros, Being*; Wolfson, “Anonymous Chapters of the Elderly Master of Secrets; Meroz, “And I Was Not There?!”; Meroz, “Zoharic Narratives and Their Adaptations”; Meroz, “Path of Silence; Huss, *Like the Radiance of the Sky*; Meroz, “*Sefer ha-Zohar* as Canonical, Sacred, and Holy Text; Abrams, “Invention of the *Zohar* as a Book; Abrams, *Kabbalistic Manuscripts and Textual Theory*; Giller, *The Enlightened Will Shine*; Roi, *Love of the Shekhina*.

73. Cf. Zohar I, 37a. See Benarroch, “Sava and Yanuqa,” 144–45, 249.

74. See *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, § 8; Yehuda Liebes, *The Cult of the Dawn: The Attitude of the Zohar Towards Idolatry* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Carmel Publishing House, 2011), 52–53.

75. See Zohar I, 126a, 208a; Liebes, *Cult of the Dawn*, 216.

76. See Benarroch, “Son of an Israelite Woman and an Egyptian Man”; Ephraim E. Urbach, “Homilies of the Rabbis on the Prophets of the Nations and the Balaam Stories in Light of the Jewish-Christian Debate” [Hebrew], in *Me’olamam Šel Ḥakhamim: Koveš Mehkarim* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 537–55; Peter Schäfer, *Jesus in the Talmud* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 32–33, 84–87; Israel Yuval, “All Israel Have a Portion in the World to Come,” in *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, ed. Fabian E. Udoh, Susannah Heschel, Mark A. Chancey, and Gregory Tatum (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008), 116, 132 n. 12. Cf. Benarroch, “Sava and Yanuqa,” 179.

77. This Tikkun appears in the printed edition near a paragraph that, according to some manuscripts (e.g., MS. Oxford Bod. 1917, fol. 141a; MS. London Brit. Lib. 10763, fol. 114a), ends the series of homilies of Tikkun 70 that are discussed in this article.

78. MS. Sassoon, David Solomon London England Ms. 27 (Spanish script, Zefat, 1543), [F 9126] p. 277 (127b). I thank my friend Amiel Vick for his help in finding this reference.

79. Cf. Isbell, *Corpus of the Aramaic Incantation Bowls*; Shaked, “Peace Be upon You, Exalted Angels”; Shaked, Ford, and Bhayro, *Aramaic Bowl Spells*; Bohak, “Observations on the Transmission of Hekhalot Literature in the Cairo Genizah”; Müller-Kessler, “Eine ungewöhnliche Hekhalot-Zauberschale und ihr babylonisches Umfeld.”

80. On early connections between Jesus and Azazel in the Apocalypse of Abraham, see Andrei A. Orlov, *The Atoning Dyad: The Two Goats of Yom Kippur in the Apocalypse of Abraham* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 58–78; Andrei A. Orlov, *Divine Scapegoats: Demonic Mimesis in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2015), 103–26.

81. Cf. “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch (Second Century B.C.–First Century A.D.),” trans. E. Isaac, in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1, ed. James Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 10. On the tradition of Enoch as the second Adam, see Philip Alexander, “From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch,” in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, ed. M. E. Stone and T. A. Bergren (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press, 1998), 102–4; Idel, “Enoch Is Metatron.”

82. See Hebrews 1:5–6. Ginzberg comments on this verse: “It is quite possible that Hebrews 1:6 goes back to *Vita Adae* [The Book of Adam and Eve] . . . and in Midrashic fashion, makes the angels worship the second Adam (= Jesus), instead of the first.” Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, chap. II: “Adam,” 85. Cf. Benarroch, “God and His Son,” 55 n. 63.

83. See “3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch (Fifth to Sixth Century A.D.);” *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*; Odeberg, 3 *Enoch*; Orlov, *Enoch-Metatron Tradition*; Idel, “Enoch Is Metatron”; Kaplan, “Adam, Enoch, and Metatron Revisited”; Wolfson, “Metatron and Shi’ur Qomah in the Writings of Haside Ashkenaz”; Abrams, “Metatron, the Lesser Lord, the Angel Called ‘Elohim.’”

84. Cf. Tishbi, *The Wisdom of the Zohar* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1975), vol. 1, 455.



85. Cf. the Vilna Gaon on Tikkun 70.
86. Naftali Hertz Bakhrahk, *Emek ha-Melekh* (Amsterdam, 1648), 5, 32:20d–21a.
87. Martini, *Pugio fidei*, 2–4, cited in Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982), 138.
88. See Zohar I, 177b–178a. Regarding weaponry in Zoharic literature, see Zohar 2:98a, 100b, 109a, 110a–b; 3:188a–189a, 190b–191a; Zohar, *Hadash*, 67c (*Shir haShirim*); Oded Yisraeli, *The Interpretation of Secrets and the Secret of Interpretation: Midrashic and Hermeneutic Strategies in Sabba de-Mishpatim of the Zohar* [Hebrew] (Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2016), 85–93; Benarroch, “Sava and Yanuqa,” 15–17.
89. On Enoch/Metatron and righteousness, see Idel, *Ben*, 123–24, 135–37, 180 n. 172, 215–16, 645–56.
90. Cf. Orlov, *Divine Scapegoats*, 122–23.
91. Cf. Benarroch, “Sava and Yanuqa,” 170–76, 211–13, 223–24.
92. See Liebes, “Angels of the Shofar’s Voice and Yeshu’a Sar ha-Panim”; Abrams, “Boundaries of Divine Ontology”; Abrams, “Metatron and Jesus”; Stroumsa, “Form(s) of God”; Idel, *Ben*; Boyarin, “Is Metatron a Converted Christian?”; Kemper, *Mate Moshe o Makel Ya’akov*; Wolfson, “Messianism in the Christian Kabbalah of Johann Kemper”; Wolfson, “Angelic Embodiment and the Feminine Representation of Jesus.”
93. See Zohar I, 37a–b.
94. See Zohar I, *Midrash haNe’elam*, Vayera, 100a; Zohar *Hadash*, *Midrash haNe’elam*, Noah, 21c.
95. On the Sava and Yanuqa in *Midrash haNe’elam*, see Benarroch, “Sava and Yanuqa,” 41–131.
96. eSe Zohar *Hadash*, *Ruth*, 80b–c.
97. Cf. Benarroch, “Sava and Yanuqa,” 259–330.
98. Zohar *Hadash*, *Ruth*, 80c: “The blessed Holy One shines in this darkness for the upright one—Rabbi Kruspedai—powerful light, beacon of Torah” (trans. Hecker, *Zohar: Pritzker Edition*, vol. 11, 129).
99. See Zohar I, 6a, 7b. Cf. Benarroch, “Sava and Yanuqa,” 292.
100. See Jonatan Benarroch, “Metatron ‘the Youth’ and the Bride: A Zoharic *Hieros Gamos*” [Hebrew], in *The Zoharic Story—Studies of Zoharic Narrative*, ed. Jonatan M. Benarroch, Yehuda Liebes, and Melilla Hellner-Eshed (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2017), 603–53.
101. Zohar III, *Rav Metivta*, 164a–b (trans. Daniel Matt, in *Zohar: Pritzker Edition*, vol. 9, 79–81).
102. See Nathan Wolski and Merav Carmeli, “Those Who Know Have Wings—Celestial Journeys with the Masters of the Academy,” *Kabbalah* 16 (2007): 83–114. See also Leore Sachs Shmueli, “*Seder Gan Eden*—Critical Edition and Study (with Annotations by Gershon Scholem),” *Kabbalah* 28 (2012): 191–299; Gershon G. Scholem, “Mekorotav shel Ma’ase R. Gadiel ha-Tinok be-sifrut ha-Kabbalah,” in *Devarim be-Go*, ed. Avraham Shapira (Tel Aviv: ‘Am ‘oved, 1976), 270–83.
103. See Benarroch, “Sava and Yanuqa,” 52–58.
104. This is the source of the Lurianic tradition on the importance of the sixth portion. See Vital, *Sha ‘ar hakavanot*, *Drushei kidush leil Shabbat*, *Drush a* (Jerusalem: Makhon Pardes ha-Ari, 2016); see also Matt’s comments in *Zohar: Pritzker Edition*, vol. 9, 81 n. 77.
105. See Benarroch, “Sava and Yanuqa,” 69–79.
106. Scholem, *Kabbalah*, 217–19.
107. Zohar, *Bereshit*, 8a, cf. 10d.
108. See Shifra Asulin, “*Midrash haNe’elam Bereshit*—Between Henrew and Aramaic” [Hebrew], in *And This Is for Yehuda—Studies Presented to Our Friend Professor Yehuda Liebes, on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Jonathan Garb, Maren R. Niehoff, and Ronit Meroz (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 2012), 228–29.
109. On this story, see Haviva Pedaya, “Light as Interior, Light as Surround” [Hebrew], in *Urim—ha’Or baSifrut, baHagut, uVaomanut*, ed. Amitia Mendelson, Emilie Bilsky, and Avigdor Shenan (Tel Aviv: ‘Am ‘oved, 2005), 162–63.
110. On the motif of the bird’s “wisdom” (ornithomancy) in the Zohar, see Avishai Bar-Asher, “The Soul Bird: Ornithomancy and the Theory of the Soul in the Homilies of Zohar Pericope *Balak*” [Hebrew], in *The Zoharic Story—Studies of Zoharic Narrative*, ed. Jonatan M. Benarroch, Yehuda Liebes, and Melilla Hellner-Eshed (Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute, 2017), 354–92.

111. See Yehuda Liebes, "Ha-Mashiah shel ha-Zohar: Lidmuto ha-Meshihit shel R. Shim'on bar Yohai," in *Ha-Ra'yon ha-Meshihi be-Yisra'el*, ed. Shemuel Re'em (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1982), 189 n. 347. Cf. Pinchas Giller, *Reading the Zohar: The Sacred Text of the Kabbalah* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 91, 108, 110, 126, 128, 133.

On the connections between Enoch and the Greater Countenance, and Metatron and the Lesser Countenance, see Jonatan Benarroch, "Sava-Yanuka and Enoch-Metatron as James Hillman's Senex-Puer Archetype: A Post-Jungian Inquiry to a Zoharic Myth" [Hebrew], in *ha-Dimyon ha-parshani: Dat ve-omanut ba-tarbut ha-yehudit be-heksherehah*, ed. Ruth HaCohen-Pinczower, Galit Hasan-Rokem, Richard I. Cohen, and Ilana Pardes (Jerusalem, 2016), 54–59.

112. See Benarroch, "Metatron 'the Youth' and the Bride"; Benarroch, "Sava-Yanuka and Enoch-Metatron as James Hillman's Senex-Puer Archetype."

113. See Benarroch, "God and His Son," 41–48.