am]" in response to the question.) Jesus here quotes from Daniel 7.13, implying that his future role will be as ruler, seated at the right hand of God. John's Gospel uses "Son of Man" twice in sayings of Jesus to refer to the preexistent Christ: see Jn 3.13: "No one has ascended into heaven except the one who descended from heaven, the Son of Man." Eventually, in Christian usage, the title "son of man" for Jesus was replaced by the title "son of God."

Later Jewish rabbinic and mystical literature continued to develop earlier concepts about angels and lesser divine beings, ranging from the midrashic idea that God consulted the ministering angels when deciding whether to create human beings, to the portrayal in early mystical texts of a vast host of angels, organized in a hierarchy, who are responsible for all aspects of the world. Postbiblical Christian writers also continued to elaborate ideas about angels. In the early sixth century CE, a Christian writer known as Pseudo-Dionysius wrote *The Celestial Hierarchy*, which presented the angels in a threefold hierarchy, using terms known both from Tanakh and the New Testament. The highest order included seraphim, cherubim, and thrones; the second order consisted of dominions, authorities, and powers; the third order encompassed principalities, archangels, and angels. In the Middle Ages, the Jewish philosopher Maimonides also organized the angels into a hierarchy containing ten levels.

LOGOS, A JEWISH WORD
JOHN'S PROLOGUE AS MIDRASH

Daniel Boyarin

In the first centuries of the Christian era, the idea of the Word (Gk *Logos*) was known in some Greek philosophical circles as a link connecting the Transcendent/the Divine with humanity/the terrestrial. For Jews, the idea of this link between heaven and earth, whether called by the Greek *Logos* or *Sophia* ("wisdom") or by the Aramaic *Memra* ("word"), permeated first- and second-century thought. Although monotheistic, Jews nevertheless recognized other supernatural beings who communicated the divine will. The use of the *Logos* in John's Gospel ("In the Beginning was the Word/*Logos*, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" [Jn 1.1]) is thus a thoroughly Jewish usage. It is even possible that the beginning of the idea of the Trinity occurred precisely in pre-Christian Jewish accounts of the second and visible God that we find in many early Jewish writings.

Philo, writing in first-century CE Alexandria for an audience of Jews devoted to the Bible, uses the idea of the *Logos* as if it were a commonplace. His writings make apparent that at least for some pre-Christian Judaism, there was nothing strange about a doctrine of a manifestation of God, even as a "second God"; the *Logos* did not conflict with Philo's idea of monotheism.

Philo and his Alexandrian Jewish community would have found the "Word of God" frequently in the Septuagint (LXX), where it creates, reveals, and redeems. For example, speaking of the exodus, Philo writes:

> whereas the voice of mortals is judged by hearing, the sacred oracles intimate that the *words of God* (*logoi*, the plural) are seen as light is seen, for we are told that *all of the people saw the Voice* [Ex 20.18], not that they heard it; for what was happening was not an impact of air made by the organs of mouth and tongue, but the radiating splendor of virtue indistinguishable from a fountain of reason. . . . But the voice of God which is not that of verbs and names yet seen by the eye of the soul, he [Moses] rightly introduces as "visible." (*Migr.* 47–48)

This text draws a close connection between the *Logos* and light, as in John 1.4–5: "In him was life, and the life was the light of all people. The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it."

Further, for Philo as for the Gospel of John, the *Logos* is both a part of God and also a separate being:

> To His Word (*Logos*), His chief messenger (*archangelos*), highest in age and honor, the Father (*Pater*) of all has given the special prerogative, to stand on the border and separate the creature from the Creator. This same [i.e., the Word] both pleads with the immortal as suppliant for afflicted mortality and acts as ambassador of the ruler to the subject. He glories in this prerogative and proudly proclaims, "and I stood between the LORD and you" [Deut 5.5], that is neither uncreated by God, nor created as you, but midway between the two extremes, a surety to both sides. (*Heir* 205–6)

Philo oscillates on the point of the ambiguity between separate existence of the *Logos*, God's Son, and its total

incorporation within the godhead. Philo's *Logos* is neither just the Wisdom (Gk *sophia*; Heb *ḥokhmah*) of the Bible, nor is it quite the Platonic *logos*, nor the divine Word (Heb *davar*), but a new synthesis of all of these.

Although this particular synthesis is as far as we know original to Philo, he develops it, as is his wont, by biblical allegories:

> The Divine Word (*Theios Logos*) descends from the fountain of wisdom (*Sophia*) like a river to lave and water the olympian and celestial shoots and plants of virtue-loving souls which are as a garden. And this Holy Word (*Hieros Logos*) is separated into four heads, which means that it is split up into the four virtues. . . . It is this Word (*Logos*) which one of Moses' company compared to a river, when he said in the Psalms: "the river of God is full of water" (Ps 65.10); where surely it were absurd to use that word literally with reference to rivers of the earth. Instead, as it seems, he represents the Divine Word (*Theios Logos*) as full of the stream of wisdom (*Sophia*), with no part empty or devoid of itself . . . inundated through and through and lifted up on high by the continuity and unbroken sequence from that ever-flowing fountain. (*Dreams* 2.242–45)

Other versions of *Logos* theology, namely notions of the second god as personified Word or Wisdom of God, were present among Aramaic-, Hebrew-, and Syriac-speaking Jews as well. Hints of this idea appear in Jewish texts that are part of the Bible such as Proverbs 8.22–31, Job 28.12–28, as well as those not in the Hebrew Bible (but included in the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical books): Sirach 24.1–34, Wisdom of Solomon 7.22–10.21, and Baruch 3.9–4.4. Especially common is the Aramaic word *Memra* ("Word") of God, appearing in the Targumim, the early Aramaic translations and paraphrases of the Bible (e.g., *Targum Onqelos*, *Targum Neofiti*), where it is used in contexts that are frequently identical to ones where the *Logos* has its home among Greek-speaking Jews.

Although official rabbinic theology sought to suppress all talk of the *Memra* or *Logos* by naming it the heresy of "Two Powers in Heaven" (*b. Hag.* 15a), before the rabbis, contemporaneously with them, and even among them, there were many Jews in both Palestine and the Diaspora who held on to a version of monotheistic theology that could accommodate this divine figure linking heaven and earth. Whereas Maimonides and his followers until today understood the *Memra,* along with the *Shekhinah* ("Presence"), as a means of avoiding anthropomorphisms in speaking of God, historical investigation suggests that in the first two centuries CE, the *Memra* was not a mere name, but an actual divine entity functioning as a mediator.

The following examples from the Targumim suggest that the *Memra* has many of the same roles as the *Logos*:

> *Creating:* Gen 1.3: "And the *Memra* of H' (a form of abbreviation for the Divine Name, the Tetragrammaton) said 'Let there be light' and there was light by his *Memra*." In each of the following verses, it is the *Memra*—intimated by the expression "and he said"—that performs all of the creative actions.
>
> *Speaking to humans*: Gen 3.8ff.: "And they heard the voice of the *Memra* of H'. . . . And the *Memra* of H' called out to the Man."
>
> *Revealing the Divine Self*: Gen 18.1: "And was revealed to him the *Memra* of H'."
>
> *Punishing the wicked*: Gen 19.24: "And the *Memra* of H' rained down on Sodom and Gomorrah."
>
> *Saving*: Ex 17.21: "And the *Memra* of H' was leading them during the day in a pillar of cloud."
>
> *Redeeming*: Deut 32.39: "When the *Memra* of H' shall be revealed to redeem his people."

These examples show that the *Memra* performs many, if not all, of the functions of the *Logos* of Christian theology (as well as of Wisdom).

In the Targumic tradition, the translation of Exodus 3.12–14, the theophany of the burning bush, offers an instructive illustration of the essence of the *Memra*. The Hebrew text reads, "God said to Moses: 'I am that I am,' and he said: 'Thus shall you say unto them, I am has sent me to you.'" "I am" is here a name of God. The *Palestinian Targum* translates: "And the *Memra* of H' said to Moses: He who said to the world from the beginning, Be there, and it was there, and who is to say [to it Be there, and it will be there]; and he said, Thus shall you say to the Israelites, He has sent me to you." In other words, the name "I am" is glossed in the Targumim by a reference to Genesis 1.3, "And God said: Let there be": the Word by which God brought the universe into being is the *Memra*.

In the next verse in the *Palestinian Targum*, this name for God, "He who said to the world 'Be there,'" becomes transformed into a divine being in its own right: "I, My *Memra*, will be with you: I, My *Memra*, will be a support for you."

Targum Neofiti (Ms. 1) confirms this connection between the divine being and the word. In Exodus 3.13, in answer to Moses' apprehension that he will not be up to the task of going to Pharaoh and persuading or forcing him to allow Moses to bring out the Israelites, God answers: "I will be with you." *Neofiti* reads: "I, My *Memra*, will be with you." The other Targumim maintain

this interpretation but add the element of the *Memra* as supporter, thus: "And he said: Because my *Memra* will be for your support." From here we see how this *Memra*, revealed to Moses in the declaration "I am," supports him, redeems the Israelites, and all the rest of the saving activities. In the Targum, as in the *Logos* theology, this Word has been hypostasized, turned into an actual divine being.

The conclusive evidence for the connection of the Targumic *Memra* and the *Logos* of John appears in the Palestinian Targumic poetic homily on the "Four Nights," probably a liturgical text in which four special nights in sacred history are delineated:

> Four nights are written in the Book of Memories: The first night: when the Lord was revealed above the world to create it. The world was unformed and void and darkness was spread over the surface of the deep; *and through his* Memra *there was light and illumination* [italics added], and he called it the first night.

This text matches the first verses of John's Prologue, with its association of *Logos*, the Word, and light. The midrash of the "four nights" culminates in the coming of the Messiah, drawing even closer the connections between the Targum heard in the synagogue and John's Gospel. Moreover, the midrash of the "four nights" is most likely a fragment of Paschal liturgy, suggesting even more palpably its appropriateness as a text for comparison with John's Gospel, where Jesus is compared to the Paschal offering. In order to see this, however, we must pay attention to the formal characteristics of Midrash as a mode of reading Scripture (see "Midrash and Parables in the New Testament," p. 565). One of the most characteristic forms of Midrash is a homily on a scriptural passage or extract from the Pentateuch that invokes, explicitly or implicitly, texts from either the Prophets or the Hagiographa (Gk "holy writings": specifically, very frequently Psalms, Song of Songs, or Wisdom literature) as the framework of ideas and language that is used to interpret and expand the Pentateuchal text being preached. This interpretive practice is founded on a theological notion of the oneness of Scripture as a self-interpreting text, especially on the notion that the latter books are a form of interpretation of the Five Books of Moses. Gaps are not filled with philosophical ideas but with allusions to or citations of other texts.

The first five verses of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel fit this form nearly perfectly. The verses being preached are the opening verses of Genesis, and the text that lies in the background as interpretive framework is Proverbs 8.22–31. The primacy of Genesis as text being interpreted explains why we have here *Logos* and not "Wisdom." In an intertextual interpretive practice such as a midrash, imagery and language may be drawn from a text other than the one under interpretation, but the controlling language of the discourse is naturally the text that is being interpreted and preached. The preacher of the Prologue to John had to speak of *Logos* here, because his homiletical effort is directed at the opening verses of Genesis, with their majestic: "And God said: Let there be light, and there was light." It is the "saying" of God that produces the light, and indeed through this saying, everything was made that was made.

Philo, like others, identifies Sophia and the *Logos* as a single entity. Consequently, nothing could be more natural than for a preacher, such as the composer of John 1, to draw from the book of Proverbs the figure, epithets, and qualities of the second God (second person), the companion of God and agent of God in creation; for the purposes of interpreting Genesis, however, the preacher would need to focus on the linguistic side of the coin, the *Logos*, which is alone mentioned explicitly in that text. In other words, the text being interpreted is Genesis, therefore the Word; the text from which the interpretive material is drawn is Proverbs, hence the characteristics of Wisdom:

1. In the beginning was the Word,
   And the Word was with God,
2. And the Word was God.
   He was in the beginning with God.
3. All things were made through him,
   and without him was not anything made that was made.
4. In him was life, and the life was the light of men.
5. The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not receive it.

The assertion that the Word was with God is easily related to Proverbs 8.30, "Then I [wisdom] was beside him," and even to Wisdom of Solomon 9.9, "With thee is wisdom." As is frequently the case in rabbinic midrash, the gloss on the verse being interpreted is dependent on a later biblical text that is alluded to but not explicitly cited. The Wisdom texts, especially Proverbs 8, had become commonplaces in the Jewish interpretive tradition of Genesis 1. Although, paradoxically, John 1.1–5 is our earliest example of this, the form is so abundant in late antique Jewish writing that it can best be read as the product of a common tradition shared by (some) messianic Jews and (some) non-messianic Jews. Thus the operation of John 1.1 can be compared with the Palestinian Targum to this very verse, which translates "In the

beginning" by "With Wisdom God created," clearly also alluding to the Proverbs passage. "Beginning" is read in the Targumim sometimes as Wisdom, and sometimes as the *Logos*, *Memra*: By a Beginning—Wisdom—God created.

In light of this evidence, the Fourth Gospel is not a new departure in the history of Judaism in its use of *Logos* theology, but only, if even this, in its incarnational Christology. John 1.1–5 is not a hymn, but a midrash, that is, it is not a poem but a homily on Genesis 1.1–5. The very phrase that opens the Gospel, "In the beginning," shows that creation is the focus of the text. The rest of the Prologue shows that the midrash of the *Logos* is applied to the appearance of Jesus. Only from John 1.14, which announces that the "Word became flesh," does the Christian narrative begins to diverge from synagogue teaching. Until v. 14, the Johannine prologue is a piece of perfectly unexceptional non-Christian Jewish thought that has been seamlessly woven into the Christological narrative of the Johannine community.

AFTERLIFE AND RESURRECTION

Martha Himmelfarb

Writing toward the end of the first century CE, the Jewish historian Josephus tells us that of the three Jewish "philosophies," two, the Essenes and the Pharisees, embraced the idea of the immortality of the soul and an afterlife involving reward and punishment (*J.W.* 2.154–58,163; *Ant.* 18.14,18). Josephus does not mention a belief in resurrection, perhaps because immortality of the soul was a concept more familiar to his Roman audience, but some ancient Jews believed that the soul would be returned to its body at the time of the last judgment. Josephus's claim that the Pharisees believed in reincarnation (*J. W.* 2.163) may be an attempt to present this idea in a form more accessible to his audience.

According to Josephus, the Sadducees were the only Jewish group to reject the idea of the immortality of the soul and postmortem reward and punishment (*J. W.* 2.165; *Ant.* 18.16). Though they were in the minority, the Sadducees would have been right to remind other Jews that most of the writings that eventually became part of the Tanakh say nothing about reward and punishment after death. Rather, they envision the dead, righteous and wicked together, enduring a shadowy existence in Sheol, an inhospitable place often described as a miry pit (e.g., Isa 38.18), a widespread idea in the ancient Near East, similar to Hades in the Homeric poems. The blessings and curses that attach to Israel's covenant with God play a central role in the Torah and prophetic writings, but they are typically experienced collectively by the people of Israel as a group, and they take place in this world.

The only strand of the Tanakh to emphasize the reward and punishment of the individual is Wisdom literature, but these texts locate rewards and punishments in this life. The book of Proverbs, which may contain ancient material but probably reached its final form early in the Second Temple period, presents the optimistic side of the Wisdom tradition: "Long life is in [Wisdom's] right hand; in her left hand are riches and honor" (Prov 3.16). Human experience has always offered observers abundant evidence to the contrary, however, and other Wisdom works criticize the view that wise and righteous behavior leads to reward. The book of Job launches a frontal attack as the pious Job demands to know why God has inflicted so much suffering on him. The divine response appears in the final chapters of the book, where the LORD answers Job from a whirlwind with a poetic invocation of his awesome creative powers and rejects the message of the friends who insist that Job must have done something wrong to merit the evils that have befallen him. Ecclesiastes (Qohelet), likely written around the fourth century BCE, takes a less direct but perhaps even more subversive approach to the problem of why the righteous suffer and the wicked prosper: it juxtaposes sayings that describe the rewards of wisdom to sayings that claim that the wicked and righteous share a single fate.

Neither Job nor Ecclesiastes suggests the possibility of an afterlife as a venue for righting earthly wrongs. The first Jewish text to take that step is the *Book of the Watchers*, as scholars call the work preserved as *1 Enoch* 1–36. This work, which reached its final form by the end of the third century BCE, was extremely influential during the Second Temple period. In the last portion of the *Book of the Watchers*, the patriarch Enoch, mentioned briefly in Genesis 5.21–24, is taken on a tour of the earth in the company of the archangels. After seeing the fiery abyss in which the watchers of the title of the work, angels who descended to earth to marry women, are imprisoned (*1 En.* 21), Enoch comes to a mountain with four chambers. Three of the chambers are dark, but the fourth is light and has a fountain in its midst (*1 En.* 22). Although difficult, the passage suggests that the chambers house the souls of the dead, with the souls of the wicked

THE JEWISH ANNOTATED NEW TESTAMENT

New Revised Standard Version Bible Translation

Amy-Jill Levine and Marc Zvi Brettler

Editors

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS