

Qedushah and Prayer to Helios: A New Hebrew Version of an Apocryphal Prayer of Jacob¹

REIMUND LEICHT

In one of the previous volumes of this journal, I had the opportunity to discuss a newly discovered Hebrew version of the apocryphal "Prayer of Manasseh" from the Cairo Genizah which was presumably translated from a Syriac and/or Greek source.² Now, further investigation on the same manuscript has yielded the identification of another apocryphal text, Jacob's prayer comprised in the so-called "Ladder of Jacob".³ This text belongs to what one might call the fringes of apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature since up to now it was attested only in a medieval Old Slavonic translation (presumably 10th century) and transmitted in manuscripts dating back to the 15th century.

The discovery of a Hebrew version in an eleventh-century manuscript is a first-rate piece of evidence for the history of this apocryphon but (as

¹ It took a long time for this article to come into being. I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Peter Schäfer (Berlin/Princeton), Prof. Shaul Shaked (Jerusalem), Dr. Klaus Herrmann (Berlin), Gerold Necker (Berlin) and Andreas Lenhardt (Tübingen) for their constant encouragement, their careful reading of the draft and their critical comments and the stimulating discussions with them. They were an immeasurable help to me in clarifying and sharpening my arguments even in points where I was too stubborn to follow their views. Last but not least I owe my gratitude to Kiesa Malen and Johanna Hoornweg for polishing the English.

² R. Leicht, "A Newly Discovered Hebrew Version of the Apocryphal 'Prayer of Manasseh'", in *JSQ* 3 (1996), pp. 359–373.

³ This text must not be confused with the Prayer of Jacob in K. Preisendanz/D. Henrichs (ed.), *Papyri Graecae Magicae, Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*, 2nd ed. Stuttgart 1973–74, vol. 2, pp. 148 f. (henceforth PGM); cf. for an English translation of this text J. H. Charlesworth, "Prayer of Jacob", in id. (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2, Garden City (New York) 1985, pp. 715–723, and H. D. Betz, *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation Including the Demotic Spells*, 2nd edition 1992, p. 261 (henceforth GMPT; if not indicated otherwise, all English translations are taken from this work). The possibility of a remote relationship between the two texts will be discussed later.

will be seen) also raises an enormous number of related questions. Mainly the problem whether or not the Hebrew text represents the "original" version of the text poses serious difficulties. Moreover, there is undoubtedly room for diverging hypotheses about the historical, religious and intellectual background of the prayer.

As a first step, I will compare the Hebrew and Old Church Slavonic versions mainly from a textual criticism point of view. It will be shown that neither of the two versions provides a wholly reliable text. Both deliberate changes and involuntary corruption of the text have caused a number of differences. For any research on the Prayer of Jacob one has to rely on both sources.

The theological outlook of the Prayer of Jacob within the Ladder of Jacob has not gained much scholarly interest in OT pseudepigrapha research. Therefore it was largely ignored that the prayer is based on a most peculiar adaptation of the liturgical pattern of the *Qedushah* in Jewish or *Sanctus* in Christian worship. The most baffling observation, however, is that elements of a prayer to Helios have been inserted into the liturgical pattern of the *Qedushah/Sanctus*. In a second and third paragraph, I will deal with this intermingling of one of the most prominent Jewish and Christian liturgical traditions with elements of pagan solar piety of late antiquity.

The close connection of pagan and biblical motifs in the Prayer of Jacob reveals a peculiar theological concept which is possibly directed against Gnostic speculations. The Prayer of Jacob underwent serious changes as a result of the different purposes for which it came to be used, but a comparison with a number of other texts of religious practice in late antiquity will reveal a certain closeness to what is generally called theurgy.

The following analysis will show that the Prayer of Jacob may well become an important source for such difficult and much debated topics as the history of liturgy, Merkavah mysticism, apocryphal literature, medieval midrash and the beginnings of dualist and mystical movements in medieval Europe. Therefore, one has to be careful not to draw premature conclusions from such a complex, ambiguous text like the Prayer of Jacob. The present article is an attempt to point out some possible sources for a comparative analysis of our text.

I. Textual Comparison

The Hebrew version of the "Prayer of Jacob" was published for the first time in the second volume of the *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer Geniza* (MTKG II, Nr. 22).⁴ It is part of a fragment consisting of six folios from a fine eleventh-century parchment codex (T.-S. K 1.144, T.-S. K 21.95.T, T.-S. K 21.95.P). This is the same manuscript which contains the above-mentioned Hebrew version of the "Prayer of Manasseh" (fol. 2a/18–3a/2), two magico-mystical prayers attributed to the prophet Elijah (fol. 3a/3–6b/19), the last part of a magical prayer attributed to Rabbi Hanina ben Dosa (fol. 1a/1–1b/9)⁵ and a prayer of the patriarch Abraham (fol. 1b/10–18). The "Prayer of Jacob our Father" is found on fol. 2a/1–17.⁶

This manuscript is the first and only evidence for a Hebrew version of Jacob's prayer, hitherto known only as part of a larger composition called "The Ladder of Jacob".⁷ H. G. Lunt dealt with this text at length and argues convincingly that the Old Church Slavonic translation found in the *Tolkovaja paleja* (Explanatory Palaia), an exegetical retelling of the Hebrew Bible, was produced not later than the tenth century, even though the manuscripts all belong to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.⁸ As textual source for this Old Slavonic translation he suggests a Greek version. The Slavonic Ladder of Jacob is known in three different recensions of which only one contains the Prayer of Jacob in its entirety.⁹ Of this recension, Lunt had three manuscripts at his disposal.¹⁰ From a

⁴ P. Schäfer/Sh. Shaked (ed.), Tübingen 1997, pp. 27–78 (henceforth MTKG II). The fragment JTSL ENA 2672.20 to be published in MTKG III, Nr. 58 (forthcoming), probably belongs to the same codex.

⁵ The title and the assumed author of this prayer are missing in the Genizah manuscript, but a parallel version (MS Vatican 216, fol. 4b–6b) attributes this Aramaic text to Hanina ben Dosa; cf. F. M. Tocci, "Note e documenti di letteratura religiosa e parareligiosa giudaica", in *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale Napoli* 46 (1986), pp. 101–108.

⁶ The Hebrew text and a translation are given at the end of this article.

⁷ For the most recent analysis cf. H. G. Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob", in J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *ibid.*, pp. 401–411. Since not all scholars interested in apocryphal literature are familiar with Old Church Slavonic, I will base my textual comparison upon Lunt's translation of the Ladder of Jacob and refer to the Slavonic text only where necessary.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 402f.

⁹ The complete text of the prayer is found in Recension A of the "Ladder of Jacob" only. Recension B reduces the prayer to a few lines; cf. H. G. Lunt, *ibid.*, p. 407, n. 2a. They seem to be a summary of the longer text.

¹⁰ For this article I have consulted two of the three Slavonic sources. Siglum S refers to *Tolkovaja Paleja 1477 Goda, Obshchestvo ljubitelej drevnerusskoj pismennosti*, vol. 93, St. Petersburg 1893, fol. 99f.; siglum R refers to "Ljestvica", in G. Kushelev-Bjzborodko (ed.), *Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoi Literaturi*, vol. 3, St. Petersburg 1862, pp. 27ff.

textual point of view, these manuscripts provide a rather good text although Lunt could not fully restore the Slavonic in some corrupt passages (e. g. 2:7; 2:9; 2:16).¹¹

At first glance, the text of the Hebrew manuscript seems to be in a rather good state. Only minor parts, mainly in the first two lines, are lost due to lacunae. A closer reading, however, quickly reveals the text to be at times barely understandable and logically incoherent. The supposition I would like to put forward for consideration is that – irrespective of whether the Hebrew text may be the original version or not and of what may be the relation between the Hebrew and the Slavonic version – the Hebrew text was copied from a fragmentary source and therefore represents a rather defective source for our prayer.

In comparison to the Old Slavonic version we find some major gaps in the Hebrew text which can be explained as the result of major lacunae in the underlying textual source. They cause what I would like to call “hidden lacunae”. Two passages which make this point clear shall be quoted here together with Lunt’s English translation of the Old Slavonic text.¹²

The fragmentary state of the textual source underlying our manuscript can be shown best in the passage beginning with the word בחלומי on fol. 2a/4 ending with תפארתו on fol. 2a/5 (2:7–10):

[בחלומי האוחז בארבע פ'ינות]

in my dream, holding the four-f[aced cherubim, bearing the many-eyed seraphim, carrying]

[העולם כולו בזרועו]

the whole world under your arm [yet not being borne by anyone:]

[המכין את השמים בהוד כבוד]פארתו

you who have made the skies firm for the glory [of your name]¹³

One can easily see that the first three words of both texts match perfectly. Only instead of the fourth word פ'ינות, we would expect the graphically similar פנים. Subsequently, the Slavonic text contains a description of the seraphim which would consist of about six Hebrew words but is totally missing there. Nevertheless, the Hebrew text resumes literally

¹¹ In the following text, quotations according to chapter and verse (e. g. 2:16) always refer to the Old Slavonic text such as translated by Lunt. Quotations with folio and line (e. g. fol. 2a/12) always refer to the Hebrew text such as given in the appendix.

¹² The brackets in the Hebrew text indicate passages where I believe that the manuscript which preceded our version had lacunae. Likewise, I use brackets to indicate those passages of the English translation of the Slavonic version which have been omitted from the Hebrew text because of those lacunae.

¹³ For the different wording of the Hebrew text see below.

only a few words later with ... העולם כולו, but again, the second part of the sentence is missing ("yet not being borne by anyone") until the parallels with the Slavonic text resume a few words later.

The observation that the gaps in the Hebrew text compared to the Slavonic version recur regularly after about four words and stretch over a passage of about the same length make it likely that they are caused by lacunae in the underlying textual source and not due to scribal negligence or deliberate censoring.

Skipping one line (fol. 2a/6) where the discrepancies between the two texts are too big for a word-to-word comparison, we find the very same phenomenon on fol. 2a/7–9 (והוא ניסתר ... מכסים; 2:12–15). One can discern two major gaps in the Hebrew text, thus precluding a fully satisfactory reading:

והוא (ני)סתר בלילה שלא יחשב אלים והיכנתה בהם דרך לירח. ולכוכבים []
and conceal it during the night so that it might not seem a god; (you) who made on them a way for the moon and the stars; [and you make the moon wax and wane,]

עוד קורא להם והולכים שלא יחשבו אלים מפניך שרפים רועדים שש כנפים בשתים מכסים []
and destine the stars to pass on so that they might not seem gods. Before the face of your glory the six-winged seraphim are afraid, and they cover [their feet and faces with their wings, while flying with their other wings and they sing]

ואינם נדממים

unceasingly [a hymn]

In order to cope with his deficient source, the scribe seems to have made some attempts to restore it. This can explain the word פינות on fol. 2a/4. As I believe, based on the Old Slavonic text, the "original" Hebrew text was approximately האוחז בארבע פנים כרובים והנושא את השרפים מלאים. ¹⁴ This is admittedly poor Hebrew, but it would fit the style of the text and therefore be a reasonable restoration for the suggested lacuna. ¹⁵ In any case, the scribe tried his best

¹⁴ The motif of God holding the world yet not being held by anyone will be discussed below.

¹⁵ There are two reasons for the suggestion to reconstitute the verb as נושא in the formulation הנושא את העולם בורעו. First, the Old Slavonic text has two different verbs, which probably go back to two different verbs in the underlying source. Secondly, the whole formulation strongly reminds us of a passage from *Sefer ha-Razim*, IV/33 (ed. M. Margalioth, Jerusalem 1966): ונושא הכל בורעו; see also below the further discussion of this sentence. In Ez 10, the *cherubim* are described as "four faced", but there is no biblical basis for the attribute "many-eyed" to the *seraphim*, since in Ez 10 the *ofannim* are "full of eyes".

to cope with his fragmentary text. He put together what he could read and thereby created a totally new sentence: האוחז בארבע פינות העולם.¹⁶ It seems rather difficult to explain how the Slavonic version could have evolved from this Hebrew text.

Additional support for the thesis that the copyist had to rely on a fragmentary source is provided by another difficult passage. On fol. 2a/4 the Hebrew version reads האוחז בחלומי "who holds my dream" instead of "as I saw in my dream" in the Slavonic text (2:7). The Slavonic version definitely makes more sense even if the whole passage is somewhat corrupt there, too. Therefore I assume that the scribe once again tried to reconstruct a fragmentary source. He may have read בחלומי and connected it with the syntactical structure of the following passage (האוחז ב-). Thereby he created an image of God "holding dreams" which I cannot remember having read in any other text.

In other instances it is far more difficult to come to clear conclusions. In line fol. 2a/1 we find a long addition of the whole genealogy from Adam to Noah which corresponds to the Slavonic "your creature" (2:6). It may be interpreted as a secondary addition, but this remains hypothetical. The sentence on fol. 2a/3 f. is too fragmentary in the Genizah manuscript to allow any definite conclusions. The following lines which describe the heaven and stars are probably corrupt in the Slavonic version (2:11–14) and the Hebrew text equally reveals what I called "hidden lacunae".¹⁷

¹⁶ To my knowledge, the cosmological vocabulary of the early midrashim does not know the notion of "four corners of the world". It appears only in later works like *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, ch. 6, 10, 17, 18 (ed. Higger, *Horeb* 8 [1944], pp. 82–119, 9 [1946], pp. 94–166, 10 [1948], pp. 185–294), *Alpha Beta de Rabbi Aqiva* A (ed. A. Wertheimer, *Bate Midrashot*, vol. 2, Jerusalem 1956, p. 371), *Midrash Temurah*, ch. 1 and 2 (ed. A. Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash*, vol. 2, Jerusalem 1967 [reprint], pp. 106 ff.), *Midrash Konen* (ibid., p. 28) etc. The reason why this formulation sounds so familiar to us is its similarity to the motif of the "four wings of the earth" (e.g. Jes 11:12: מארבע כנפות הארץ; Ez 7:2: על ארבע כנפות הארץ; Job 37:3: על כנפות הארץ; and foremost Job 38:13: לאחוז בכנפות הארץ, "to hold the wings of the earth"). It has to be noted, however, that in midrashic literature the notion of "the four corners of the world" is never combined with the motif of "God holding the world"!

¹⁷ A hypothetical reconstruction could be: לשמש והוא הפותח ממעל לשמים חלונים. The notion of different gates for the sun is very common in ancient and medieval cosmology, Jewish and non-Jewish alike; cf. e.g. 2 (Slavonic) Enoch 12 ff. The existence of "marble" (שיש) in heaven is likewise well attested, and this is probably what the scribe had in mind when writing his text. I am convinced, however, that the "sun" is strikingly missing in this description of the gates in heaven whereas "marble" is not. For this reason שמש could be a reasonable emendation for שיש. Nevertheless, this phrase is a good example of the impossibility of deciding a priori whether the Hebrew or the totally different Slavonic version of 2:11 is more reliable.

In the whole text, only on fol. 2a/9ff. is the Hebrew version longer than the Slavonic text. Unfortunately both testimonies are too corrupt to permit clear conclusions, but some striking aspects should be pointed out. The Hebrew words **וַאִינָם נִדְמָמִים** correspond to “unceasingly” in the Slavonic text. Then, instead of a somehow corrupt relative clause in the Slavonic version (“whom I now in sanctifying ...”), the Genizah text formulates a clearly understandable introduction to the following invocation of the divine names (... **וְגַם אֲנִי מְקַדֵּשׁ וְקוֹרֵא**).

The two first divine attributes on 2:17/fol. 2a/10f. match each other perfectly in both versions (“twelve-topped, twelve-faced”), but then the Hebrew text suddenly breaks off in the middle of the word “faces” (**פָּנִי**),¹⁸ introduces an obscure **שְׁבָטִים**, and switches to a sequence of words which are partly reminiscent of biblical expressions from Cant 5:2 (**טָל נִמְלָא**), Hab 1:13 (**טְהוֹר עֵינַיִם**), Job 17:9 (**טְהוֹר־יָדַיִם**), Dan 10:6 (**וְעֵינָיו כְּלִפְיֵי אֵשׁ**) or Ez 1,13 (**כְּמִרְאָה הַלְפִידִים**) and perhaps of Nah 2:5 (**מִרְאִיהֶן כְּלִפְיֵידִים כְּבָרְקִים יִרְוּצֻן**). The meaning of **מֵהֶם מְשֻׁנִּיָּהִם** remains obscure. The Hebrew version leads us pretty far away from the Slavonic text, but the text as it is preserved is barely understandable so that there can be little doubt that here again “hidden lacunae” have mutilated the text. Nevertheless, common words like **אֵשׁ** and “fiery one” (*ogno*; lit: fire!) or **בָּרְקִים מְבַהִיק** and “lightening-eyed” (*mlioz-rachnje*) can be identified (fol. 2a/12; 2:17).

It is striking that in the following passage both versions are again rather close, even when it comes to the transcribed Hebrew words and *nomina barbara* in the Slavonic version. Let us first turn to the name of God. He is called *Yaô Yaôva Yaôil Yaô*¹⁹ in the Slavonic version. This is better structured than the confused Hebrew version **אֵל יָאוּ אוּ אַב בְּאִיָּה אוּ עוֹלָם**, although both undoubtedly go back to the same source. If we try to parallelize the elements of the two versions, the final **יָאוּ** corresponds to *Yaô*. In order to reconstruct *Yaôil* we have to delete **עוֹלָם**²⁰ and disconnect **בְּאִיָּה** from **יָהּ**, but then **אֵל (עוֹלָם) יָהּ אוּ** is clearly discernible as *Yaôil*. If we take the initial **אוּ** as what has remained again of *Yaô*, we have to identify **אַב בְּאִיָּה** as remnants of *Yaôva*.

Although this parallelization looks a bit like a kabbalistic device on my part, there can be little doubt that *Yaôva* stands for the fully written form of the tetragrammaton written in Greek (and Old Slavonic) pho-

¹⁸ This I interpret as an additional argument for the hypothesis that the textual source of the Genizah manuscript was fragmentary.

¹⁹ This is the reading of S; R reads: *Yao Yaova Yaail*.

²⁰ The insertion of the word **עוֹלָם** could be caused by a slip of the eye to the following **עוֹלָם מֶלֶךְ** (fol. 2a/13).

netically with a *Beta*. Therefore, the fact that the name of God in the Hebrew manuscript has a *Bet* and a *Aleph* too (and not a *Waw* and *Heh*) can be taken as a clue that this sequel of *nomina* was not composed originally in Hebrew but in Greek. This assumption is even reinforced by the gross misunderstanding of the vocalization of the tetragrammaton as *Yehova* that we encounter here.²¹

Furthermore, it is striking that in spite of some missing words both versions are fairly congruent in terms of the transcribed Hebrew words in the Slavonic version, which might be taken as a clue that it ultimately goes back to a Hebrew source (*kados chavod, savaoth omlelech ilavir amismis varich*; עולם מלך אביר אמיץ ברוך).²² Three words are omitted in the Hebrew text, but it is very surprising that *omlelech* (translated correctly into Slavonic as “eternal king”) is found there in the very same inverted word order as עולם מלך. *Il* is omitted and two adjectives in the Slavonic translation have no parallel either in the transcription or in the Hebrew text (*prjevelik*, “most great”; *terpjelive*, “patient”). The next passage, which is basically identical in both versions²³ and strongly reminiscent of Is 6:3, will be discussed later.

In the Genizah manuscript the Prayer of Jacob was transmitted as a separate entity whereas in the Slavonic version it was embedded in a broader narrative embellishment. This redactional difference obviously influenced the formulation of the last verses of the prayer. To start with the Slavonic version, we find as the ultimate intent of the prayer a request for an interpretation (or an interpreter) of a bewildering dream he experienced the night before (2:22): “tell me the interpretation of my dream”. Therefore, the scene we spontaneously imagine is that Jacob, when he awoke after his dream, felt the need for an explanation. This is provided in the subsequent chapters of the Ladder of Jacob when Sariel as *angelus interpres* reveals to Jacob the apocalyptic meaning of his nightly vision.

In contrast, the Genizah version turns the whole prayer into a request for a dream, not for its interpretation. “Tell me in my dream a message”

²¹ We will have to discuss this phenomenon of a non-Hebrew spelling of words of Hebrew origin later, but it should be noted here that such spellings of *nomina barbara* were taken by G. Scholem as proof that “the influence worked both ways” between the Hekhalot texts and the Greek Magical Papyri. Cf. G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*, New York 1965, p. 76; on the name Yaol also p. 41 ff.

²² Three transcribed Hebrew words in the Slavonic text are missing in the Hebrew version (*kados, chavod, varich*), perhaps another case of “hidden lacunae”. R reads: *savakdos, cha vod* (!), *savaoth, omlelech, ilavir, amismi, varich*.

²³ There is no equivalent for “the sea” in the Hebrew text.

(והגד לי בחלומי בשרה; fol. 2a/16) is what Jacob desires. The only appropriate moment for such a request would be before going to sleep, not after having had the dream. Therefore, the Hebrew version of the prayer does not fit the narrative context of the Ladder of Jacob.

There is, however, a clue that the purpose formulated in the Hebrew version may not be the original one. In verse 2:7 we read: "just as I saw in my dream". Admittedly, this passage is not well preserved in the Genizah text, but, as I explained above, we may assume that the Slavonic text is more or less reliable here. If this is true, it makes no sense for Jacob to mention a vision he had not yet had in a request for a dream. Therefore, we would have to assume that the separate transmission represented by the Genizah manuscript is secondary to the version found in the Ladder of Jacob and we could conclude that the final passage, which follows the pattern of a traditional Jewish *berakhah*, belongs to this late development as well.

It is noteworthy, however, that Jacob obviously refers to a different dream than the one explained in the subsequent chapters of the Ladder of Jacob. Not a single detail of the vision of the divine throne described in the Prayer of Jacob (2:7 ff.: fiery throne, cherubim, seraphim etc.) is found in Gen 28 and the explanation given by the *angelus interpretes* in the Ladder of Jacob. I would therefore contend that the sentence "just as I saw in my dream" is an alien element and very likely to be a rather maladroit attempt to polish up this prayer in order to make it fit the needs of a narrative about Gen 28. If this proves to be correct, we may infer that the Prayer of Jacob was not composed for the Ladder of Jacob as found in the Old Slavonic translation but existed before being inserted and adapted superficially for this purpose.²⁴

To sum up, side by side with surprisingly identical passages, the textual comparison of the two versions has revealed verses with substantial differences. The difficulties become more complex, however, if we try to determine the relationship between the Hebrew and the Slavonic versions. Did there ever exist a Greek version mediating between the two versions? Nothing is known about a Greek version of the Prayer of Jacob, but since most – though by far not all – of the earlier translations into Old Church Slavonic were done from Greek texts, this is not improbable. If so, was this Greek version the source for or a translation of our Hebrew text? As pointed out above, there seems to be evidence for divergent interpreta-

²⁴ I believe that the abbreviated version (Lunt: "condensation"; *ibid.*, p. 407, note 2a) of the prayer found in the Slavonic recension B reflects a redactor's observation that the prayer in fact does not fit the narrative context of the Ladder of Jacob.

tions. Nevertheless, it could be shown that although neither of the texts is wholly reliable, each of them can at times help us to reconstruct the other. This has led us to the tentative explanation of certain textual features in the Hebrew version as caused by "hidden lacunae". In those cases where both versions differ more substantially, however, we lack clues which would enable us to decide which reading to prefer.

Thus neither of the two versions provides an *a priori* better text. As far as the redactional transmission is concerned, the text underwent three discernible stages: First it probably existed separately from the narrative context of the Ladder of Jacob with a purpose to be discussed later. At a certain time, it was inserted into a narrative retelling of Gen 28 (Ladder of Jacob). Since the redactional additions which were necessitated by the insertion into the narrative are still found in the Hebrew text, it must have preceded the Genizah text. Here the prayer was disconnected from the narrative and transformed into a request for a mantic dream with a concluding *berakhah*.

2. *Qedushah* or *Sanctus* as an underlying pattern of the Prayer of Jacob?

The Prayer of Jacob is a carefully composed prayer which consists of a number of clearly definable sections. After an initial invocation (2:6; fol. 2a/3), God is depicted as sitting on his celestial throne (2:7-9; fol. 2a/3-5), and Jacob praises him as the creator of the universe (2:10-14; fol. 2a/5-8). In the following section, the heavenly praise of the seraphim in front of the glory of God is described (2:15; 2a/8-9). Jacob joins them and addresses God directly by his names and the "Holy, Holy Holy" from Is 6:3 (2:16-20; fol. 2a/10-14). The prayer concludes with the pronouncement of Jacob's request and a final praise of God and benediction (2:21-22; fol. 2a/14-17).

This survey of the general structure of the prayer reveals that the crucial elements of the *Qedushah* or *Sanctus*, i.e. a hymnical *praefatio* and the recitation of Is 6:3, are the underlying pattern of the Prayer of Jacob.

The climax of every *Qedushah/Sanctus* is the solemn pronouncement of the *Trishagion*, a point we reach in 2:18 (fol. 2a/12). Although this praise of God was enhanced by additional names and attributes (to be analyzed later), the quotation of Is 6:3 is still clearly discernible. After the triple "holy" and some additional names and attributes, the rest of the biblical verse is quoted (2:20; fol. 2a/13). This is, of course, not a

direct quotation, but it is close enough as to uncover Is 6:3 as the underlying model: "Holy, holy, holy [Yao] Yaova [Yaoil, Yao, Kados, Chavod,] Savaoth [Olemelech il avir amismi varich, eternal king, mighty, powerful, most great, patient, blessed one!] You who fill [heaven and] earth, [the sea and abysses and all the ages] with your glory".²⁵

The second important element of the *Qedushah*/*Sanctus* is the introduction preceding the pronouncement of Is 6:3. It contains a praise of God as the creator of the universe. The most prominent example in Jewish liturgy for this pattern – one combining the praise of the creator with the celestial *Qedushah* – is the *Yozer* benediction preceding the recitation of the *Shema* during the morning service.

In Christian liturgy, these *praefationes* were a field of prolific literary activity.²⁶ The explanation of the *Sanctus* given by Cyrill of Jerusalem in the fifth of his *Mystagogicae Catecheses*, provides an important generic description of their content: "Then, we remember the heavens, the earth and the sea, the sun and the moon, the stars, the whole rational and non-rational creation, the visible and the invisible, the angels, archangels, powers, dominions, powers, authorities, thrones, the many-faced cherubim which say powerfully that of David: 'Praise the Lord with me'. We also remember the seraphim which Isaiah viewed in the Holy Spirit staying in a circle around the throne of God and with two wings covering the face, with two the feet and with two flying and saying: 'Holy, holy, holy is Lord Sabaoth'. We pronounce the doxology given to us by the seraphim in order to become participants of the hymnody of the hosts of the upper world".²⁷

This is not the place to discuss all the questions about the origin of the *Sanctus* and its relations to the Jewish *Qedushah*, which have occupied many scholars since A. Baumstark, I. Elbogen, A. Marmorstein and others formulated their first hypotheses more than half a century ago, but the comparison of the *Qedushah* in the Hebrew version of the

²⁵ In the Slavonic version of 2:18–20 the structure of Is 6:3 is preserved more or less in its entirety if the additions (here put into brackets) are removed. In the Hebrew version the *Trishagion* is incomplete (only a single *qadosh*), but I assume that this is due to the corrupt state of this text.

²⁶ For collections of the abundant sources cf. e.g. E. Renaudot, *Liturgiarum orientalium collectio*, 2 vols., Frankfurt 1847; F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford 1896, and the classical study by H. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie*, Berlin 1955. For a most comprehensive bibliographical list cf. G. Kretschmar, Art. "Abendmahlsfeier I", in *TRE*, vol. 1, Berlin 1977, pp. 272–278.

²⁷ My own English translation according to the Greek text in Cyrill von Jerusalem, *Mystagogicae Catecheses. Mystagogische Katechesen*, ed. G. Röwekamp, Freiburg 1992, p. 150.

Prayer of Jacob with Christian sources on the one hand and the *Qedushot* in the Synagogue service on the other reveals some noticeable peculiarities. Whereas in *all* cases where the *Qedushah* is used in Jewish liturgy, it quotes Is 6:3 in its masoretic form, the Hebrew version of the Prayer of Jacob does not do so. Even if we do not take into account the words which were added, the differences are evident. Instead of the masoretic *והארץ ותהומות וכל העולמים מלא כל הארץ כבודו* we read: *והארץ ותהומות וכל העולמים מלא כל השמים לכבודך*. In this wording not only *כל* is missing before *השמים* (as in Greek liturgies), but most strikingly the 3. pers. sing. suffix of *כבודו* was replaced by the 2. pers. sing. suffix for *לכבודך*. Both variants not only match the Slavonic version of the Prayer of Jacob, but they also seem to reflect the wording of the *Trishagion* in Christian liturgies rather than the masoretic text. In the Greek liturgy the *choros* replies to the priest: *Hagios, hagios, hagios, Kyrios Sabaoth, plêrês ho ouranos kai hê gê tês doxês sou* ("your glory"), and the same loose rendering of the biblical text of Is 6:3 can be observed in the Latin liturgy: *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Sabaoth. Pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua*. It is noteworthy that we are speaking of the liturgical use of this phrase only, since the Septuagint and the Vulgate versions both have a reading closer to the masoretic text. Furthermore, the bewildering construction *לכבודך* with the preposition *-ל* has no basis in the text of the Hebrew Bible and there is no obvious reason why a scribe who was familiar with the Hebrew Bible and liturgy should use such a grammatical construction. For this reason we will have to consider the possibility that this is an attempt to imitate the genitive clause *tês doxês sou*.

Compared to the obvious conservatism of Hebrew liturgies in the wording of the *Qedushah*, a great variety of formulations is attested in Greek Christian sources, beginning with Apoc 4:8 (*Hagios, hagios, hagios Kyrios ho theos ho pantokratôr, ho ên kai ho ôn kai ho erchomenos*) and Clement of Rome in I Cor 34:6 (*Hagios, hagios, hagios Kyrios Sabaoth, plêrês pasa hê ktisis tês doxês autou*) to the Apostolic Constitutions 7.35.3 (*Hagios, Hagios, Hagios Kyrios Sabaoth, plêrês ho ouranos kai hê gê tês doxês sou*) and 8.12.27 (*Hagios, hagios, hagios Kyrios Sabaoth, plêrês ho ouranos kai hê gê tês doxês autou*). Even if we cannot be sure that some of the Greek versions ultimately go back to Hellenistic Jewish sources, we can say that the reformulation of Is 6:3 in the Hebrew version of the Prayer of Jacob is not the one we normally would expect in a Hebrew liturgical text.²⁸

²⁸ Ch. Böttrich, "Das 'Sanctus' in der Liturgie der hellenistischen Synagoge", in *JLH* 35 (1994/95), pp. 10–36, regards all the *Qedushot* he could collect from OT apoc-

This assumption is reinforced by another similarity to Greek liturgies. According to the Slavonic text of the following words "they sing unceasingly" we may assume that the Hebrew text would have been [שרים] ואינם נדממים. The idea that the angels sing "unceasingly" is again widely spread in Greek liturgies but unknown in Hebrew *Qedushot*. One of the earliest examples for this motif is again Apoc 4,8: *kai anapausin ouk echousin hēmeras kai nyktos legontes* ("and they do not pause and say day and night"). Similarly, in the Apostolic Constitutions 7.35.3 the angels sing "with never-ceasing voices" (*asigētois phōnais*). Numerous other liturgical texts adopt this idea. If we sum up, many elements in the Hebrew version of the Prayer of Jacob are strongly reminiscent of the Greek form of the *Sanctus* rather than of Hebrew *Qedushot*.

In the Prayer of Jacob the liturgical pattern of the *Qedushah/Sanctus* is subordinated and adapted into the form of a prayer. For this purpose two further elements have been added in the Prayer of Jacob. At the beginning of the text, Jacob uses the common invocation of God as "God of Abraham ...", and after the climax of the *Trishagion* he expresses his desire in a direct address to God which ends with a final praise and benediction.²⁹ This elucidates the Prayer of Jacob as a combination of *Qedushah/Sanctus*³⁰ and elements of common prayers. I believe that we do not force the interpretation in assuming that the underlying idea is that a person uttering this prayer approaches God and imitates the heavenly service. This enables him to address God directly by his name and to express his personal request.³¹

rypha and pseudepigrapha as belonging to the traditions of the Hellenistic Synagoge. Although in many cases this may prove to be essentially correct, I believe that in many others the complicated textual developments of these documents require further investigation with respect to possible Christian influences.

²⁹ As pointed out above, the final passage is rather different in both versions and there are some reasons to assume that the concluding benediction is a later attempt to adapt the prayer to Orthodox Jewish standards. It is noteworthy, however, that the Hebrew prayer adds a concluding *Amen* after the benediction although in bBer 45b it states that a person should not say *Amen* when he himself said the benediction. This rule is obviously not observed in the Prayer of Jacob which could be a trace of the Christian habit to conclude every prayer with *Amen*, although the Slavonic version omits it.

³⁰ In the following sections I will call this pattern *Sanctus* only since I believe that the formulation is so much closer to Greek liturgies than to any *Qedushah* version known to me.

³¹ The *unio liturgica* between human beings and angels which has been pinpointed by P. Schäfer as the ultimate aim of many texts of Merkavah mysticism; P. Schäfer, "The Aim and Purpose of Early Jewish Mysticism", in *Hekhalot-Studien*, Tübingen

3. Elements of a prayer to Helios

The general pattern of the Prayer of Jacob has been adopted from the liturgical use of Is 6:3. But another dominant element in the Prayer of Jacob deserves our attention. Even a superficial reading of the text uncovers a number of surprising formulations. Most prominent is the conflation of the *Trishagion* from Is 6,3 with attributes like "twelve-topped", "twelve-faced", "many-named" and "fiery one" (2:15–17; fol. 2a/10–12). One must readily admit that these adjectives are rather unusual attributes for the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. In the following passage I argue that they fit Helios perfectly, the god who was identified with the *pantokratôr* and *demiourgos* in late antiquity.

First we may cast an eye on the attributes "twelve-topped" and "twelve-faced".³² In a number of prayers addressed to Helios from the important collection of the *Papyri Graecae Magicae* (PGM), the idea that Helios appears in twelve different forms is widely attested. The most elaborate version is found in PGM IV 1596–1716 (*pros Hêlion logos*) where Helios is invoked according to his twelve forms (*morphai*). These *morphai* are animals, and Helios appears in their forms during the different hours of the day. This is an Egyptian tradition of a system of twelve daily hours (*dodekaoros*) which tried to compete with the more widespread system of the twelve signs of the zodiac. A very similar prayer is found in PGM III 494–609. The theurgical invocations of Helios described in the so-called Eighth Book of Moses mention as well that this deity changes his forms (PGM XIII 70: *ho metamorphoumenos eis pantas*).

The idea that the appearance of Helios in different forms is essential for theurgical and divinatory purposes is confirmed by a passage from Porphyry's *Letter to Anebo*. Porphyry is rather skeptical about theurgy and divinatory practices and rejects what he believes to be a clear overestimation of its practical and theoretical value. With special reference to Helios he remarks (*Ep.ad.An.* 2,9; § 32): "Those prayers, which sense do they have when they speak (about Helios) as he emerges from the sea,

1988, pp. 277 ff. The same idea of a common worship of angels and men was expressed by Cyrill of Jerusalem in the passage quoted above.

³² The Hebrew version introduces the שבתים (sevivim) after "twelve topped". This could be a simple attempt to restore the text by an allusion to what one might associate with the number twelve. For mystical speculations on the number twelve cf., e.g., A. Wertheimer (ed.), *Alpha Beta de Rabbi Aqiva A*, *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 363, note 54*, and *Seder Rabba diBereshit*, *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 23. However, they do not contribute anything to a better understanding of our text.

is sitting on a lotus flower, sails on a ship, changes his forms every hour (*kath' hōran tas morphas ameibonta*) and alters his appearance according to the sign of the zodiac (*kata zōdion metaschēmatiszomenon*)?"³³

Departing from this imagery of Helios, we have little difficulty in finding explanations for some other expressions connected with this deity. The Slavonic version calls God "many-named" (*mnogoimenje*) which is equivalent to the Greek *polyonymos*,³⁴ an attribute widely used for Apollo, who himself was frequently identified with Helios, but also attested for Helios himself in PGM II 107f.: "You have the form of a young child sitting on a lotus, rising, many-named" (*echeis ... morphēn nepiou paidos epi lotō kathēmenos, antoleu, polyonyme*).³⁵ Additionally, nothing is more self-evident than the description of Helios as "fiery one". The adjective "lightning-eyed" finds a beautiful parallel in the theophany of Helios in PGM IV 703: "Then you will see lightning bolts leaping from his eyes" (*epeita opsē autou ek tōn ommatōn astrapas*).³⁶

As pointed out above, the wording of the passage with the divine attributes is largely different in both versions, and it has to be admitted that the attributes in the Slavonic version are more obviously connected with Helios than those in Hebrew. An attribute like "many-named" – so characteristic for pagan syncretism – is missing in the Hebrew text. Instead it employs words which remind the reader of biblical texts. On the other hand, this could be due to a translator who tried to find more or less appropriate vocabulary from a spiritual world more familiar to him. In any case both versions contain enough evidence for the thesis that in the whole prayer biblical elements (in this case Is 6:3, and Ez 1 and 10) were contaminated with ideas originally connected with Helios.

This can be observed at the beginning of the Prayer of Jacob as well. At first glance, the description of the godhead on his throne seems to be what we know from biblical revelations such as Is 6 or Ez 1 and 10, but a closer textual analysis reveals some surprising details. God is described as sitting on a throne while holding the four-faced cherubim and seraphim and bearing the world in his arm. The two classes of angels belong to the standard equipment of the celestial palace, but neither in Ezekiel

³³ Translated according to the edition of the Greek text by A. R. Sodano (ed.), *Porfirio. Lettera Ad Anebo*, Napoli 1958, p. 21; cf. Jamblichus, *De Mysteriis* 7,2 and 7,4.

³⁴ For all following references to the vocabulary of Greek-Old Slavonic translations I rely on the dictionaries of R. I. Avanesov, *Slovar drevnerusskogo jazyka (XI–XIV vv.)*, Moscow 1988ff., and R. M. Cejtin et al., *Staroslavjanskij Slovar (po rukopisjam X–XI vjekov)*, Moscow 1994.

³⁵ Different translation in GMPT, p. 16.

³⁶ GMPT, p. 52.

nor in Isaiah is there any mention made of God holding *them*. Quite on the contrary, it is the cherubim who carry the throne of God and *he* is "sitting on the cherubim" (יֹשֵׁב הַכְּרוּבִים).³⁷

Some clarity about this can be obtained from archeological evidence on Helios. One of the most widespread motifs in the iconography of Helios is the depiction of this god holding the four horses which pull his chariot.³⁸ If we cast an eye on the actual wording of the passage, the verb האוחז and the Slavonic *derzha* (which corresponds to the Greek *kratein*) may well designate exactly this action of holding fast the four horses of the chariot. If this is the original meaning, the image of Helios as a charioteer has been conflated with biblical traditions and identified in our prayer with the cherubim.³⁹

A similar conflation of the biblical description of God sitting on his throne and Helios as a charioteer can be found in some Coptic magical texts. In the manuscript Leiden, Anastasi no. 9, we encounter an invocation of the "great shining cherubim who are rising with the sun". In a text of ritual power (which in its use of the *Sanctus* and also in some other respects resembles the Prayer of Jacob), we find the invocation: "You are holy, (3 times), who sits upon the seventh chariot of the light cherubim. 4 great creatures draw it, each one of [them having six wings]" (London Oriental manuscript 6796). Here we have plunged deeply into a world of highly syncretistic beliefs.

The second important element in this image is that God holds the world in his hand.⁴⁰ This motif is strongly reminiscent of a passage in *Sefer ha-Razim* IV/33 where God is described as the one who "holds everything (v.l. "the world"; עולם) in his arm" (נושא הכל בזרועו), and in VII/19 he "holds *me'onah* in his arm" (תולה בזרועו מעונה). Similar formulations stating that the whole world hangs under (תחת) God's arm

³⁷ Cf. also I Sam 4,4; II Sam 6,2 etc. and verse 2:7 of our text.

³⁸ Cf. F. Cumont, Art. Sol, in M. E. Saglio (ed.), *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Greques et Romaines*, vol. 4, Paris 1911, pp. 1373–1386.

³⁹ Cf. M. Meyer/R. Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic. Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*, New York 1994, pp. 318 and 284. It is noteworthy that *Sefer ha-Razim* uses terms like *merkavah* (IV/25) and a phrase like ותראה כברק יוצא (which is reminiscent of Ez 1:13) for describing the sun as well.

⁴⁰ The Slavonic version employs two different verbs for God holding the cherubim (*derzha*) and holding the world (*nosja*). Whereas *derzhati* corresponds to the Greek *kratein*, the verb *nosati* equals *pherein*, *hairein*, *bastazein*. According to what I explained above, the actual wording of the Hebrew text in this passage is corrupt and the Slavonic text seems more reliable. As a tentative reconstruction of a possible Hebrew text I would suggest that האוחז in fact refers to the cherubim, not to the world. For the next sentence, an appropriate Hebrew equivalent for *hairein* or *bastazein* could be נושא. This would lead to a reading like הנושא את העולם כלו בזרועו.

can be found in Hekhalot literature (mainly *Seder Rabba diBereshit*).⁴¹ The language employed here is exegetically derived from Dt 33,27 (מַעֲנֶה) ^{אלהי קדם ומתחת זרעת עולם}⁴², but the motif itself seems to depend on the iconography of Helios who frequently appears as *kosmokratôr*, the one who literally holds (*kratein*) the cosmos. One of the most beautiful examples of a pictorial representation of this idea is the famous mosaic of the Synagogue in Hammat Tiberias with Helios holding a globe in his left arm.⁴³ Other examples can be taken from Roman coins of the late imperial period⁴⁴ or an illumination of an astrological manuscript from Byzantium depicting the zodiac with Helios in its center.⁴⁵

The description of God as Helios in the Prayer of Jacob is therefore to be interpreted as an additional example of the identification of Helios with the biblical God. Unfortunately there is no clear evidence that midrashic concepts such as those found in *Seder Rabba diBereshit* did actually influence the Prayer of Jacob. If any midrashic elements could be unveiled with certainty, it would be a decisive argument for solving the riddle of where our prayer and/or its Hebrew version originated. Here again we have to be cautious about drawing hasty conclusions: Although it is beyond any doubt that the language of the Hebrew version is closely linked to the vocabulary of the cosmological speculations in Hekhalot literature, this is not necessarily the background for the Helios motifs in the prayer. We will have to come back to this problem.

The iconography of Helios holding the world in his arm reflects the identification of this God with the *pantokratôr*, *kosmokratôr*, the *theos hypsistos* and the *dēmiourgos* which not only became important in the

⁴¹ Cf. P. Schäfer et al. (ed.), *Synopse der Hekhalot Literatur*, Tübingen 1981 (henceforth SHL) §§ 467, 701, 727, 784, 804, 840, 967; id. (ed.), *Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, Tübingen 1984, p. 133 (T.-S. K 21.95.J = G11, fol. 2a/18–2b/2); *Midrash Kohen*, in A. Jellinek (ed.), *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 33, and *Alpha Beta de Rabbi Aqiva A*, *ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 37; cf. also K. Herrmann, *Massekhet Hekhalot. Traktat von den Himmlischen Palästen*, Tübingen 1994, pp. 132 and 217f. As to this motif, the Slavonic version is paradoxically closer to the biblical tradition than the Hebrew version: Whereas the Genizah fragment reads בְּזְרָעוֹ ("in his arm"), the Slavonic version employs the preposition *pod* ("under") which would have preserved a possible exegetical link to מַתַּחַת זְרַעַת (Dt 33,27).

⁴² Cf. SHL § 701; cf. also Job 26:6: תּוֹלֵה אֶרֶץ עַל בְּלִימָה. I am convinced that all these formulations are examples of a subtle process of the contamination of biblical exegesis with motifs of solar piety which apparently left deep imprints on the vocabulary of cosmological and Hekhalot literature.

⁴³ Cf. M. Dothan, *Hammath Tiberias. Early Synagogues and the Hellenistic Roman Remains*, Jerusalem 1983, p. 39ff. and plate 29.

⁴⁴ Cf. F. Cumont, *ibid.*, p. 1384.

⁴⁵ Cod. Vat. gr. 1291, fol. 9r (9th century); cf. H. G. Gundel, *Zodiakos. Tierkreisbilder im Altertum*, Mainz 1992, Tafel 6.

philosophical teachings of Middle- and Neoplatonism but influenced much wider circles of Roman society as well.⁴⁶ In his important article on solar theology, F. Cumont explains how astronomical centrality was transformed slowly into a real superiority of the sun's power in the whole universe.⁴⁷ An early identification of Helios with the demiurge in his central position between the heaven and the earth can be found in the *Corpus Hermeticum* XVI, 5: "In this way the craftsman (I mean the Sun) binds heaven to earth, sending essence below and raising matter above".⁴⁸

It has to be noted that from the Middle- and Neoplatonic point of view the visible sun is not the only *hêlios*. Therefore, the visible, physical sun must not be confused with the real god Helios. A fine example of this theory can be found in the fourth oration of the Emperor Julian Apostata. In his "Hymn to King Helios" he "conceives of the sun in three ways; first as transcendental, in which form he is indistinguishable from the Good in the intelligible world, secondly as Helios-Mithras, ruler of the intellectual gods, thirdly as the visible sun".⁴⁹ Much earlier, this idea is implicitly expressed in the tripartite cosmological concept (god, demiurge, world) of Numenius: "Before capturing the discussion, let us hear (i.e., make) an unequivocal agreement, that the first god abstains from every work and is the king, and that the demiurgical god governs by walking through the heaven."⁵⁰

The implicit identification of the creator of the world with Helios is not unparalleled in apocryphal literature either. The theophany described in the Apocalypse of Abraham in chapters 16 to 19 is akin to our text in many respects. Abraham is led by an *angelus interpretis*⁵¹ to

⁴⁶ Cf. F. Cumont, *ibid.*, p. 1376.

⁴⁷ F. Cumont, "La Théologie Solaire du Paganisme Romain", in *Mémoires présentés à l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1. Sér. 12/2 (1908), pp. 447–479.

⁴⁸ Cf. B. P. Copenhaver (ed. and tr.), *Hermetica*, Cambridge 1992, p. 59, and A. D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière (ed. and tr.), *Corpus Hermeticum*, vol. 1, Paris 1945, p. 233.

⁴⁹ W. C. Wright (ed.), *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, vol. 1, London 1980 (Loeb Classical Library), p. 361, note to or. IV, 133a; R. Smith, *Julian's Gods. Religion and Philosophy in the Thought and Action of Julian the Apostate*, London 1995, pp. 143ff., denies any closer relationship between Julian's thought and the cult of Mithras. He argues that all the main ideas about Helios being the "middle" (*mesotês*) and the demiurge are evoked mainly through Neoplatonic influence.

⁵⁰ Translated according to Fragment 12 from E. DesPlaces (ed.), *Numénios. Fragments*, Paris 1973, p. 54.

⁵¹ In most parts of the Apocalypse of Abraham, this angel is called Yaoel. However, it is striking that in Abraham's hymnic prayer which precedes the theophany, not the angel but God himself is named Yaoel (17:13). It has been pointed out correctly that this indicates a different origin of the hymn and the narrative passages of the text. On the other hand it points to a common origin of this hymn and the Prayer of Jacob in which God is called *Yaoel* as well (2:18).

heaven where he pronounces a hymnic prayer containing divine attributes no less appropriate for Helios than those we read in the Prayer of Jacob: "light-giving, thunder-voiced, lightning-visioned, many-eyed" (17:15).⁵² Finally, Abraham's hymn culminates in a sentence which expresses both the latent identification of the creator with Helios and his clear-cut separation from the visible sun that we observed in the Prayer of Jacob as well: "You are the light that shines before sunrise on your creation" (17:18).⁵³ The following appearance of the fiery godhead on his chariot leaves little doubt about a strong influence of pagan imagery pertaining to Helios on the description of the divine throne from Is 6:2 (18:1-6).

One final point deserves our attention. In the Slavonic version God is called "*Yaô Yaôva, Yaôil, Yaô*" (2:18). As I explained above, this is probably a more reliable version than the corrupt Hebrew text, and one name identified in both versions is of special interest: *Yaôil*. An angel bearing this name plays a crucial role in the Apocalypse of Abraham as *angelus interpres* who leads the patriarch into heaven and teaches him the song he has to sing during the theophany (ApocAbr 17). It is most striking, however, that within this song, God himself is called *Yaôil* as well (ApocAbr 17:13), which makes it very probable that Abraham's song originates from a source different from that of the Apocalypse as a whole.⁵⁴

Be this as it may, both texts are outstanding examples of the identification of *Yaôil* with the Helios-like creator of the universe. This association of the biblical God with *Yaôil* and Helios seems to have been a rather widespread tradition.⁵⁵ Although the name *Yaôil* is not attested in PGM, *Yaô* is repeatedly invoked as creator.⁵⁶ In other instances, other solar attributes such as "light-bearer *Yao*" (*phôsphôr Iaô*; PGM V 176,

⁵² It is noteworthy that scholars of the Apocalypse of Abraham agree that at least parts of the hymn 17:8 ff. must have been written originally in Greek; cf. B. Philonenko-Sayar/M. Philonenko, "Die Apokalypse Abrahams", in *JSHRZ*, vol. 5, Gütersloh 1982, p. 417. For the English translation cf. R. Rubinkiewicz, "Apocalypse of Abraham", in J. Charlesworth (ed.), *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 697.

⁵³ English translation according to B. Philonenko-Sayar/M. Philonenko, *ibid.*

⁵⁴ The whole theophany of ApocAbr 17-18 is modeled like a magnificent sunrise. The strong similarities between this text and the Prayer of Jacob (attributes linked to Helios) lead to the assumption that both texts originate in the same intellectual milieu. It is striking that even in their textual transmission they shared a common fate since both have been preserved in Old Slavonic translations only.

⁵⁵ E. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, vol. 2, New York 1953, pp. 194-200; 258-261, quotes texts which identify Helios and *Yaô*. It is well-known that many of Goodenough's theories have been sharply criticized, but in many cases his work remains a good collection of sources.

⁵⁶ PGM IV 1040; VII 760.

209) and "fiery" (*pyrithymos*; 593) are bestowed on him. In the PGM Prayer of Jacob *Yaô* "sits upon the sun" (*kathêmenos epi Hêliou*; PGM XXIIb 13)⁵⁷, so that we possess sufficient evidence that the association of *Yao/Yaôil* with Helios was an invention neither of the Prayer of Jacob nor of the Apocalypse of Abraham but a common heritage of antique syncretism.⁵⁸

It is a well-known fact in religious history that the image of Christ in late antiquity was largely modeled as the new Helios.⁵⁹ This poses the question whether the identification of Helios as *the* God is influenced by Christian thinking. I shall deal with this later, but for the moment suffice it to say that I do not find any definite proof that the Helios attributes found in the Prayer of Jacob underwent any Christian influence. "Twelve-topped" and "twelve-faced" would be as unusual for Christ as they are for the Jewish God. Although the Prayer of Jacob is based on a liturgical pattern close to Christian texts, solar piety seems to be a still vivid source for the religious imagery of the prayer.

4. The theological concept of the Prayer of Jacob

The association of God with attributes common to Helios in pagan religiosity poses many questions about the underlying theological concept. Certain similarities with Middle- and Neoplatonic thinking and Hermeticism have been pointed out. The most dominant aspect of the

⁵⁷ In view of this evidence (including the Prayer of Jacob and the Apocalypse of Abraham), I think that there are good reasons to assume that the name *semesilam* identified with *Yaô* in PGM (e. g. PGM XIII 935; VII 646) indeed has to be interpreted as שמש עולם rather than שמי שלם, as Scholem suggests in the revised second edition of *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*, p. 76 and note on p. 134. This interpretation is reinforced by interpretative Greek misreadings like *semesilamps* (e. g. PGM XIII 490).

⁵⁸ In the above-mentioned fragment from the Cairo Genizah (JTSL ENA 2672.20; to be published in MTKG III, Nr. 58, forthcoming), which probably belongs to the same codex like our text, we find in an invocation on fol. 20b/14 the sentence: "And I call first *Elim*, secondly the moon, thirdly the stars of heaven" (קראתי בראשון לאלים) (ב' ללבנה ג' לכוכבים של שמים שם האלים המושל בכל העולם אלים המזבח). The structure leaves no doubt that *Elim* stands for the sun. Therefore in the following formulation שם האלים המזבח is probably a misreading for המזרח, and is a reference to the sun rising in the east ("the name of God who governs in the whole world, God of the East who moves among the angels [i. e., the stars ?]"); המזבח makes no sense in this context. This is another interesting Jewish source for an identification of God with the sun.

⁵⁹ Cf. F. J. Dölger, *Die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit*, Münster 1918; id., *Sol Salutis*, Münster 1925.

godhead, however, is his being the creator and governor of the whole world. He "made the skies firm" with the sun and the stars (2:10 ff.; fol. 2a/5 ff.), and he "is holding/carrying the world" (2:9; fol. 2a/5), i. e. governs it, and he has dominion over the stars and all the celestial beings. In this respect the reading of the Slavonic version in 2:6 ("Lord, God of Adam your *creature*") seems to fit the general outlook much better than the genealogy in the Hebrew text (fol. 2a/2), since it would once again stress God's creative powers. Even if neither of the two terms is mentioned directly, God is described as creator/demiurge and *kosmokratôr*.

A key term associated with God in the Prayer of Jacob is "glory" (*slava*, כבוד, *doxa*).⁶⁰ The first instance where this word is used is the description of God sitting on the Throne of Glory (2:7; fol. 2a/3). In the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (1. Enoch), the motif of the elected one sitting on the Throne of Glory has a clear messianic connotation: Enoch, transformed into the Son of Man, is seated on the Throne of Glory in his function as eschatological judge.⁶¹ The same idea is found in the New Testament in Mat 19:28 and 25:31 about the Messiah. In the Hebrew Book of Enoch (3. Enoch) the Shekhinah is sitting on the Throne of Glory.⁶² Some *Shi'ur Qomah* passages reveal a similar motif concerning the creator,⁶³ and in the Babylonian Talmud we find the much debated passage where Rabbi Yishmael sees Akhtariel sitting on the throne (bBer7a).

The reason why I elaborate on this aspect is that describing somebody sitting on the Throne of Glory reflects the concept of a second divine "personality" – be it the Messiah, the demiurge or the *kosmokrator* – or at least of a second, visible aspect of the godhead. If we were to interpret these theophanies in Neoplatonic terms, the god addressed in the Prayer of Jacob is neither the wholly transcendental One nor the visible sun, but he is very similar to the intermediary God between those two extremes.⁶⁴ Such a triple concept of the "sun"/Helios can explain how

⁶⁰ Cf. 2:7; fol. 2a/3 ("throne of glory"). 2:10; fol. 2a/5. 2:15; missing in Hebrew. 2:20; fol. 2a/14.

⁶¹ Cf. 1 Enoch 45:3; 51:3; 55:4; 61:8; 62:2; 69:27. The non-eschatological use of the throne of glory is found there as well in 71:7; cf. 14:18.

⁶² Cf. SHL § 7; cf. also § 389 and 959.

⁶³ SHL § 376, 960.

⁶⁴ In this sense the remark that god is "carrying the whole world ... yet not being borne by anyone" (2:9) denotes an ontological hierarchisation. The underlying idea is that the encompassing being has ontological priority over the encompassed beings. This idea possibly goes back to Philo of Alexandria; cf. W. R. Schoedel, "Enclosing, not enclosed: The early Christian doctrine of God", in *Early Christian Literature and*

attributes borrowed from the sun god are bestowed upon God who is described at the same time as the creator of the world, including the sun itself. As long as we know that a second, transcendental sun exists, there is no contradiction between the description of God in terms of Helios on the one hand and the clear-cut statement that the physical sun, the moon and the stars move and change so that they shall not seem gods (2:12; fol. 2a/7). On the contrary, the description of the creator in terms of solar theology makes this juxtaposition even more necessary.⁶⁵

Whereas in this first passage the word "glory" functions as an attribute of the throne or its occupant, in the other cases it seems to represent the creative and governing power of God. He "made the skies firm for the glory of his name" (2:10)⁶⁶ or, according to the Hebrew version "who made the skies firm with the magnificence of the glory of his splendor" (fol. 2a/5). The angels are afraid "before the face of your glory" (2:15),⁶⁷ and finally one of God's names in the Prayer of Jacob is "Chavod" (2:18).⁶⁸

The most interesting passage for the theology of the "glory", however, is the adaptation of Is 6:3: "You who fill heaven and earth, the sea and abysses and all the ages with your glory" (2:18–20; fol. 2a/10–14). The interpolations are more than a stylistic variation of the text and have to be interpreted as a tendentious adaptation of the biblical verse for the sake of theological speculation.

In this respect, the cosmological system in this verse deserves closer attention. The first words ("heavens, earth, abysses") could simply extend the realm of the power of God's glory to the different spheres of the physical world,⁶⁹ but the expression וכל העולמים (fol. 2a/14) needs further explanation. The Slavonic version employs the word *vjek* which is the common Slavonic translation for the Greek *aiôn*. If this is the

the Classical Intellectual Tradition, in Honour of Robert M. Grant, Paris 1979, pp. 73–86; id., "Topological theology and some monistic tendencies in Gnosticism, in *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts, in Honour of A. Böhlig*, Leiden 1972, pp. 88–108; B. Nasedmann, *Theurgie und Philosophie in Jamblichs De Mysteriis*, Stuttgart 1991, pp. 59–67.

⁶⁵ The Prayer of Jacob stresses the similarity between the sun and the appearance of God by stating in a passage which obviously refers to the sun (fol. 2a/6) that it is "like the God of heavens" (כאלהי השמים).

⁶⁶ If this is the better reading, we would expect in Hebrew לכבוד שמו with a clear stress on "glory" rather than on "name" as the active principle in the act of creation.

⁶⁷ In Hebrew the word כבוד is missing.

⁶⁸ In the Coptic magical texts, the names *Kabaoth* and *Chobaoth* are used; cf. M. Meyer/R. Smith, *ibid.*, 131 and 283 ff. A. Kropp, *Koptische Zaubertexte*, vol. 2, Brussels 1931, p. 156, explained these names as "Spielform zu Kyrios Sabaoth", but they could equally be a conflation of *kavod* and Sabaoth.

⁶⁹ The word "sea" is missing in the Hebrew version.

underlying concept here, the meaning of this passage is that God's glory emanates into all the *aiōnes*. This choice of words is reminiscent of Gnostic terminology for the realm of the cosmic powers,⁷⁰ so that it is appropriate to seek the root of such theological speculation about the extent of the power of God's glory.

Even if one has to be careful not to overinterpret this phrase, I would contend that a possible explanation for the explicit mentioning of the different parts of the cosmos is the implicit refutation of the opposite assumption, namely that parts of the world are dominated by powers other than the glory of God. His glory is conceived of as a cosmic power which pervades all the various sections of the universe. Otherwise the specifications would be absolutely pointless.

The term *kavod* in the Prayer of Jacob does not refer to an object in the mystical vision of the basileomorphic godhead such as found in Hekhalot literature. It is difficult to determine whether other rabbinic terms like "inquiring into the glory of his father" (לדרוש בכבוד אביו שבשמים)⁷¹ or the statement in the Babylonian Talmud that Rabbi Aqiva "used the glory" (להשתמש בכבוד)⁷² could refer to such cosmological speculations. Both quotations were taken by Scholem as prooftexts for the existence of Merkavah mysticism in rabbinic Judaism,⁷³ but in fact the meaning of these dicta remains enigmatic. In a passage from *Shi'ur Qomah* (SHL § 952) R. Yishmael says: "After I had expounded this in front of R. Aqiva, he told me: 'Everyone who knows this measure of our creator and the glory of the Holy, be he praised, which is hidden from the creatures, surely has the life of the world to come.'" The Hebrew text uses the word שבה for "glory" which – according to Scholem – represents the Greek *doxa*,⁷⁴ but the term *kavod* is missing here.

Somewhat closer to the imagery of God's emanative power in creation is the famous aggadah dealing with the role of light in the creation⁷⁵. But although the concept of a divine light as first substance in the universe and the concept of the glory may well be related to each other, there is no hint that this light was ever identified with the *kavod*.

⁷⁰ Cf. H. Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion*, Boston 1963, pp. 51–54.

⁷¹ tHag 2,1.

⁷² bHag 15b.

⁷³ G. Scholem, *Major Trends Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, London 1955, S.46.

⁷⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 66.

⁷⁵ Cf. for a discussion of this aggadic episode V. Aptowitzer, "Zur Kosmologie der Agada. Licht als Urstoff", in *MGWJ* 72 (1928), pp. 363–370; A. Altmann, "A Note on the Rabbinic Doctrine of Creation", in *JJS* 7 (1956), pp. 195–206; G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism*, pp. 56–64; P. Schäfer, "Berešit bara' Elohim. Zur Interpretation von Genesis 1,1 in der rabbinischen Literatur", in *JSJ* 2 (1971), pp. 161–166.

G. Scholem pointed out parallels for this aggadic episode in hymns dealing with the garment of God in the Hekhalot texts.⁷⁶ In general, however, Hekhalot literature reveals surprisingly little interest in a theory of the divine *kavod* within cosmological speculations.

One passage in *Seder Rabba diBereshit*, however, seems to reflect an idea very close to the one expressed in the Prayer of Jacob: "And at this hour, the Holy One, be he praised, is sitting on a throne, and his glory fills the cosmos (עולם) since it is said: 'Full is the whole earth'".⁷⁷ As in our text, the quotation of Is 6:3 is subjected to an interpretation which stresses the all-embracing power of God's glory in the cosmos. In the case of *Seder Rabba diBereshit* the whole passage would be totally tautological and even more pointless than the passage in the Prayer of Jacob if it could not be interpreted as an implicit refutation of the opposite assumption.

This cosmological concept of the divine *kavod* expressed through an interpretation of Is 6:3 seems to have exercised some influence on other texts as well. A late midrashic text called *Ma'ayan Hokhmah* describes the seraphim roaring like lions and adds an interesting interpretation of the *Qedushah*: "Holy, holy, holy YY Sabaoth, full is the whole earth of his glory! (And this is its explanation: holy in the upper part, holy in the lower parts, holy in all the 'olamim, YHWH is sanctified through the secret of Sabaoth Israel)".⁷⁸

Another example for the influence of this cosmological idea can be found in the *Musaf*-service where the words כבודו מלא עולם – "his glory fills the world" are added to the *Qedushah*. The origin of this addition is unknown, but there can be little doubt that it is somehow connected to the passage quoted from *Seder Rabba diBereshit*. This can be shown by a Genizah fragment which preserves the beginning of a Palestinian *Yotzer* for the New Year. It extends these motifs by adding: "His glory fills the world. His ministering angels ask each other: 'Where is the place of his glory?' Those standing opposite them praise and say: 'Blessed is the glory of God from his place!' And it is said: 'Arise and shine, for your light has come, and the glory of the Lord has shone upon you.'" The last words are a quotation from Is 60:1, but what interests us here is that again the metaphor of God as the light at sunrise (זרח) is combined with the cosmological speculation about the presence of the divine glory in the cosmos. If my interpretation of the words כל העולמים in the *Qedush-*

⁷⁶ Cf. G. Scholem, *ibid.*

⁷⁷ SHL § 813 (Oxford 1531): ובאותה שעה יושב הק"ב"ה" על כסא וכבודו מלא עולם; cf. parallels § 183, 533, 793.

⁷⁸ A. Jellinek (ed.), *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 59.

ah of the Prayer of Jacob is correct, this could give us a clue how to interpret the additional words of the *Musaf*-service, and it could contribute to the controversial discussion about the influence of early mysticism on the development of the *Qedushah*.⁷⁹

To my knowledge there are no Jewish sources which can sufficiently explain this cosmological speculation on the *kavod*, but the whole matter reminds me of a motif in the *Revelation of Adam*, where the "glory" functions as a "kind of spiritual element"⁸⁰ in the cosmological myth. The disappearance of the glory from mankind is part of the great cosmic tragedy which Adam reveals to his son Seth: "Next we became two aeons, and the glory that was in our hearts – your mother Eve's and mine – left us, as did the prior acquaintance that had breathed with us. And it (the glory) fled from us and entered [some other] great [aeon and some other] great [race]" (ApocAd 64:22 ff.).⁸¹ The explicit statement of the Prayer of Jacob that the glory of the good creator of the world fills "all the aeons" could thus be a refutation of the Gnostic concept that parts of the created world are devoid of God's glory.

The possibility that remnants of Gnostic speculation can be found in the Prayer of Jacob is very tempting, in spite of the possibility that Christian thinking may have exerted its influence on the text and the New Testament use of *doxa* in christological contexts could have done so as well.⁸² If, however, the Gnostic line is followed, two further passages may indicate a certain acquaintance with Gnostic concepts.

One of them is the pretty unusual invocation of the "God of Adam your creature" (2:6). If interpreted from a Gnostic background, this may not only stress God's creative power but also implicitly refer to Gnostic speculations about the primordial Adam or the creation of Adam by the demiurge.⁸³

⁷⁹ The Genizah fragment T-S. 8 H/7 was edited by R. Scheindlin in his revised English translation of I. Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy. A Comprehensive History*, New York/Jerusalem 1993, p. 60–61.

⁸⁰ Cf. B. Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures*, Garden City 1987, p. 55, note 64m.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² For the New Testament use of *doxa* cf. H. Hegermann, "Doxa", in *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 1, Stuttgart 1980, pp. 832–841; C. Spicq, "Doxa, doxazô, syndoxazô", in: *Lexique Théologique du Nouveau Testament*, Fribourg 1991, pp. 372–387. The association of Christ with the sun and its *doxa* is part of the theology of the *logos* analyzed by F. X. Dölger, "Sonne und Sonnenstrahl als Gleichnis in der Logos-theologie des Christlichen Altertums", in *Antike und Christentum* 1 (1929), pp. 271–290.

⁸³ The Slavonic version uses the word *tvar* which generally renders the Greek *poiêma*, *poiêsis* or *ktisis*. In Gnostic literature, however, *plasma* is used for the created things ("modeled form"), foremost for Adam; cf. e.g. the creation story in *On the Origin of the World* II/115 ff. (edited and translated in B. Layton, *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2–7, Lei-

The Hebrew version replaces this passage with a complete genealogy from Adam to Noah.⁸⁴ We cannot be sure whether this is the better reading, but it is reminiscent of the famous opening passage of *Sefer ha-Razim* (Introduction/23) and its chain of tradition from Adam to Noah. The first parallel which comes to our mind is, of course, the beginning of Mishnah Avot, but I would like to put forward for consideration the question whether the insertion of this genealogy, i. e., the qualification of God as the God of Adam etc., does imply a polemic against Gnostic teachings? It is well known that some Gnostic schools saw the biblical protagonists as followers of the evil demiurge. Insisting on the biblical genealogy could therefore express an anti-Gnostic impetus.

The second passage is less hypothetical and perhaps more important from several points of view. The clearly anti-astrological statement that the physical sun, the moon and the stars are not gods (2:12 ff; fol. 2a/7) could envision Gnostic leanings towards astrology and the theory of planetary powers.⁸⁵ In this respect it should be noted that the ideas expounded here are attested not only in apocryphal literature⁸⁶ but also in two medieval midrashic works generally attributed to Moses ha-Darshan who was active in Southern France during the eleventh century when dualist ideas were flourishing there. *Midrash Tadshe* states that since the stars were created, God gave the day and the night "addition or diminution" (עדיפא או מיעוטא) so that "the stars might not be deemed gods" (שלא יחשבו המאורות כאלהים).⁸⁷ The same passage is found in *Midrash Bereshit Rabbati* followed by another interpretation: "The Holy One, be he praised, made for the stars – so that they might not be deemed gods – that they walk in their spheres from west to east and every day the firmament brings them back from the east to the west."⁸⁸ It

den 1989, pp. 65 ff.). I think that this could be the meaning here. The Coptic magical text quoted above (London Oriental manuscript 6796 (2.3) recto/84, uses the formulation: "before you (i. e. God) redeemed your *plasma* Adam" (*pek-plasma*); cf. A. Kropp, *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 38. The Slavonic Book of Enoch (2. Enoch 44) emphasizes the outstanding dignity of Adam as God's own creature as well.

⁸⁴ The omission of Lamekh is probably a scribal error.

⁸⁵ It has to be noted that the Hebrew Prayer of Jacob differentiates between the *one* sun which looks like "the God of heavens" (כאלהי השמים, fol. 2a/6) and all the moving stars which are no אלים. This word could represent to the Greek *daimones*.

⁸⁶ Cf., e. g., ApocAbr 7 and 1. Enoch 80.

⁸⁷ A. Jellinek (ed.), *ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 164.

⁸⁸ Ch. Albeck (ed.), *Midraš Berešit Rabbati ex libro R. Mosis Haddaršan*, Jerusalem 1940, p. 53:

ד'א עשה הב' למאורות עדיפא ומיעוטא כדי שלא יחשבו כאלים. ד'א עשה הב' למאורות שלא יחשנו כאלים שהם הולכים בגלגליהם ממערב למזרח והרקיע מחזירן בכל יום ממזרח למערב.

is fascinating to see how the composer of the Prayer of Jacob combines both ideas expressed in *Bereshit Rabbati*: The passages on the sun, moon, and stars which "conceal during night" (2:12; fol. 2a/7) and "wax and wane" (2:13 in the Slavonic version only) correspond to the first interpretation (עדיפא ומיעוטא), whereas "you made in them a way" (2:13; fol. 2a/7) and "destine the stars to pass on" (2:14; fol. 2a/8) express the basic idea of the second one (עשה ... שהם הולכים). We will have to reconsider this evidence when we will try to tackle the problem of the origin of the Prayer of Jacob.

5. *The Purpose of the Prayer of Jacob*

The analysis of the theological concept of the Prayer of Jacob has shown that it stands at a crossroads leading in many different directions: We have discovered Neoplatonic elements combined with solar piety, and we have found parallels in apocryphal texts; some elements are strongly reminiscent of Gnostic speculations whereas others are obviously connected in some way or other with medieval midrashic traditions. But although theological statements play an important role in the Prayer of Jacob, speculative theology is not its main concern.

The textual comparison of the two extant versions of the Prayer of Jacob has shown that the purposes formulated in both of them do not fit the general structure of the text. Nevertheless, they do preserve a common characteristic, namely that Jacob invokes his God in order to receive some kind of secret knowledge. There is no reason to doubt that this is the idea originally pursued in the prayer. The attribution of such a text to the patriarch is certainly inspired by the story about the Ladder of Jacob in Gen 28 even though the biblical text did not contribute much to the actual imagery of the Prayer of Jacob.

As has been shown above, pagan and syncretistic beliefs about Helios left deep imprints on the Prayer of Jacob. For this reason it is essential to know that late antiquity brought with it a predilection for choosing Helios for theurgical invocations. The PGM contain innumerable examples of theurgical invocations of Helios and Porphyry's *Letter to Anebo*, quoted above, proves the same. To exemplify the concept of Helios possessing twelve forms I have quoted the invocation from PGM IV 1598–1716 above; other famous texts are the so-called "liturgy of Mithras" (PGM IV 475–750) and the ceremony described in the "Eighth Book of Moses" (PGM XIII). Many others could be added. A good summary of the possible effects of an invocation of Helios is found in some short

instructions included in the latter manuscript (PGM XIII 335–340): “With this spell perform the acts of thanksgiving to Helios, rites to fetch lovers, send dreams, ask for dreams, make Helios appear, attain goals, win victory, and in short, everything”.⁸⁹

The aim of the Prayer of Jacob, however, is more specific: Jacob asks for knowledge. If we consider the exegetical linkage with Jacob’s dream in Gen 28 it is very probable that the Prayer of Jacob was either conceived as a request for a dream or – if Jacob’s experience was interpreted more as theophany – as a theurgical ceremony to make *Yaôil* appear. The song sung by Jacob is, just as in many pagan theurgical rites, nothing but a device to force the godhead to appear.⁹⁰ There is a manifest theurgical tendency in the prayer.

In this point, our Prayer of Jacob is very similar to the PGM Prayer of Jacob (PGM XIIb). Although both texts largely differ, they have crucial elements in common: Both are prayers directed to *Yaô*, the creator of the world, and both adapt motifs of the celestial throne with the cherubim (PGM XXIIb 8). The two sentences “(You who) give power ov[er (the) cha]sm (to those) above and those below and those under the earth” and “[He] who is upon (the) stars abo[v]e (the) ages” remind us of the adaptation of Is 6:3 in 2:20 (fol. 2a/13f.). Finally, the request for “wisdom” (XXIIb 17) is not very far removed from our Prayer of Jacob. The instruction to “say the prayer of Jacob seven times to (the) North and East” (PGM XIIb 20) is a clear hint that it was conceived of as an invocation of Helios-*Yao*-*Yaôil* at night.⁹¹ These similarities are certainly not sufficient proof of a direct dependency, but they can be taken as hints that the two prayers may be rather remote relatives.

Another related text is the theophany in the Apocalypse of Abraham 15–19. Just as in the two other texts, a Helios-like deity, *Yaôil*, appears to Abraham at night. What distinguishes the two prayers of Jacob from the Apocalypse of Abraham is the motif of the ascent to heaven. Whereas the prayers of Jacob are pagan theurgy in a biblical garment, the Apocalypse of Abraham introduces the motif of the celestial voyage. Nevertheless, strong theurgical inclinations are a common denominator

⁸⁹ GMPT, p. 181.

⁹⁰ In discussing the Apocalypse of Abraham – which we pointed out as a close parallel to our text –, M. Himmelfarb correctly defines Abraham’s hymn as “part of the means of achieving ascent rather than simply a sign of having achieved angelic status after ascent”, thus revealing its theurgical character; cf. M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, New York 1993, p. 64.

⁹¹ The North is the place where the sun is at night and in the East it rises. For an invocation of Helios at night from the North cf. *Sefer ha-Razim* IV/43; for an invocation of the sun from the East cf. PGM XIII 254.

of the Prayer of Jacob, some of the PGM texts, and the Apocalypse of Abraham.

Conclusions

This article represents a first attempt towards interpreting the Prayer of Jacob. In almost every line, it became clear that the textual basis of the text remains very fragile and highly ambiguous. It could be shown, however, that a *Qedushah/Sanctus* which has much more in common with Greek liturgies than with the *Qedushot* commonly known from Jewish liturgy served as a literary pattern for the prayer. The deity adored and invoked in the prayer bears many hallmarks of Helios. If the arguments for terminological similarities with Gnostic texts and concepts are valid, the patriarch Jacob was a fierce anti-Gnostic polemicist. Cosmological and theological elements found in our prayer re-appear in ancient and medieval mystical traditions inside and outside Judaism. The purpose of the prayer is to attain some kind of knowledge from God and it can therefore be called a theurgical ritual.

The main importance of the Prayer of Jacob, now attested in Jewish and Christian sources, lies in its close connections to many different traditions. It links the pagan solar cult (Helios motifs) together with apocryphal literature (Apocalypse of Abraham), Hekhalot literature and cognate texts (*Seder Rabba diBereshit*, *Sefer ha-Razim*), medieval Midrash (*Bereshit Rabbati*), Gnostic ideas and Slavo-Byzantine, possibly Bogomil, sources. All of these are generally believed to be somehow connected, although it is always hard to prove whether, where and how they came into direct contact.

In face of this situation we have to raise the question whether it is possible to determine into which direction traditions were flowing in the case of the Prayer of Jacob. This, of course, leads us to directly ask the question as to where the Prayer of Jacob originated. The most far-reaching hypothesis would be to assume that the Hebrew text represents indeed the original version of this prayer. There are strong arguments in favor of this assumption, namely the close similarities in language and motifs with Hekhalot literature and medieval midrashic texts, and the obvious Hebraisms in the Slavonic version. If we follow these arguments, the prayer would have been translated either directly from the Hebrew into Slavonic,⁹² or mediated through a lost Greek version thus

⁹² It is undisputed that some direct translations from Hebrew into Slavonic exist, although their number and extent are still a matter for discussion; cf. G.

being an important evidence for Jewish influence on Slavo-Byzantine culture.

This conclusion, however, is not the only possible one. The strongest argument in favor of the opposite assumption, namely that the Prayer of Jacob goes back to a Greek origin is the wording of Is 6:3. The rewording of the biblical text has been attested up to now only by Greek (Christian) liturgical texts and there is absolutely no reason to assume that a Jew familiar with the biblical text and Jewish liturgy should have employed לַכְבוֹד instead of the biblical form. Moreover, the whole literary composition of the prayer resembles Greek rather than Hebrew sources.

For this reason, we should also consider the possibility that the Hebrew version itself is a translation, presumably from a Greek source, as well. The existence of Hebrew words in the Slavonic version alone is not a very strong argument against the second hypothesis. They can either be part of the syncretistic Hebrew and pseudo-Hebrew jargon attested in Greek and Coptic magical manuscripts, or they could have been retained in a direct Slavonic translation from a Hebrew source.⁹³

In fact, some of the Hebrew names could even prove the opposite assumption. It has been pointed out that the spelling of *Yaôva* (to be reconstructed from: אֵו אבּ בּא; fol. 2a/12) with a *Bet* and the erroneous vocalization of *Adonai* points at a non-Jewish origin.⁹⁴ *Varich* (בּרִיךְ) is not used as a name of God in Hekhalot literature and Jewish magical texts, whereas in the PGM and in the Coptic Spells this name and its

Podskalsky, *Christentum und Theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus'*, München 1982, pp. 78–82.

⁹³ The discussion whether the Hebrew version goes back to a non-Hebrew source and whether the Slavonic version goes back to a Hebrew one are two different subjects which must not be confused. It is perfectly imaginable that a Greek text could have been translated into Hebrew and found its way from there into Slavonic sources such as happened to the *Sefer Yosippon*. I do not feel competent to determine whether or not the Slavonic version of the Prayer of Jacob might go back directly to a Hebrew source. We have to bear in mind, however, that many scholars did find Hebraisms in the apocryphal work closest to the Prayer of Jacob, namely the Slavonic Apocalypse of Abraham; cf. A. Rubinstein, "Hebraisms in the Slavonic 'Apocalypse of Abraham'", in *JJS* 4 (1953), pp. 108–135; R. Rubinkiewicz, "Les Sémitismes dans l'Apocalypse d'Abraham", in *Folia Orientalia* 21 (1980), pp. 141–148. On the other hand, it has to be noted that within this text the passage which is most reminiscent of the Prayer of Jacob (ch. 17) is probably of Greek origin!

⁹⁴ Cf. for Greek transcriptions of the tetragrammaton with *Beta* cf. e.g. PGM IV 1186 (*Iabe*), V 103 (*Iabas*), IV 3020, XII 4 (*Iabai*), V 304 (*Iabou*).

derivatives are widely attested,⁹⁵ and *amismi* (אל אמיץ) appears as *elemas* in many Coptic texts as well.⁹⁶

The same can be observed for the name *Yaôil*, which we know from the Slavonic Apocalypse of Abraham but which hardly occurs in Hekhalot texts⁹⁷ and only in very insignificant places in Jewish magical texts.⁹⁸ Even *Yaô* written with an *Aleph* (יאו), which could have easily slipped into some of the endless sequences of permutations found in Hekhalot literature and the magical texts, plays – unlike יהו spelled with a *Heh* – no important role in these sources.⁹⁹ The only Jewish work to use the last two names in a greater density is *Harba de-Mosheh*,¹⁰⁰ and it is no accident that out of the whole corpus of texts this is one of the works most heavily influenced by Greek sources.¹⁰¹ In any case, the divine names do not necessarily prove any closer linkage to Hebrew sources.¹⁰²

The similarities in language, motifs and content of the Hebrew version with midrash and Hekhalot sources is a very weighty, though not totally unambiguous argument. The language of the translator could have been inspired by Hekhalot literature, and as far as I can see, nothing in our text needs to be qualified as midrashic in method. The literary motifs and theological concepts do not compel us to assume a Jewish background either.

⁹⁵ Cf. PGM V/480 and M. Meyer/R. Smith, *ibid.*, pp. 92; 132f.; 196; 213; 321.

⁹⁶ M. Meyer/R. Smith, *ibid.*, pp. 122, 221, 269, 314ff., 318; however, in a few (pp. 139, 156, 336) cases where *elemalelemas* seems to be derived from *eli eli lama sabakhthani* (Mc 15,34).

⁹⁷ SHL §§ 76, 277, 340, 387, 493f., 577, 628 as יהואל.

⁹⁸ MTKG II, Nr. 22, fol. 4a/5 and the parallels (the same manuscript like our text!), and no. 25, fol. 1b/7, as יהואל.

⁹⁹ Cf. SHL §§ 341, 395, 564, 639, 655ff.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. for יאו SHL §§ 640, 642, 644, 645; for יאואל § 640.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Cl. Rohrbacher-Sticker, "From Sense to Nonsense, From Incantation Prayer to Magical Spell", in *JSQ* 3 (1996), pp. 24–46. In Syriac magical texts יאו is attested as well; cf. M. Geller, "Two Incantation Bowls Inscribed in Syriac and Aramaic", in *BSOAS* 39 (1976), p. 423, and M. Baillet, "Un Livre Magique en Christo-Palestinien à l'Université de Louvain", in *Le Muséon* 76 (1963), p. 382f.

¹⁰² G. Scholem dealt more than once with the identity of Yaoil. In *Major Trends of Jewish Mysticism*, pp. 67–70, he argues that parts of the Metatron tradition originally refer to Yaoil. According to his opinion, Yaoil is an "older" angel which underwent a metamorphosis into Metatron. Therefore, a reference to Yaoil by the Hasside Ashkenaz represents for him a revival of an old, hidden tradition. The present analysis comes to the opposite assumption. The Hebrew names יאו and יאואל־יהואל occur in texts which reveal strong Greek influence. Therefore, they are likely to be additional examples of the phenomenon of Hebrew readaptions of *nomina barbara* from (syncretistic) Greek sources rather than dispersed remnants of older traditions; cf. *id.*, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*, pp. 41f.; *id.*, *Kabbalah*, Jerusalem 1974, pp. 377ff.

The great number of apocryphal texts discovered in the Cairo Genizah and at Qumran have encouraged us to assume that Genizah texts can indeed preserve authentic old Hebrew traditions. Nevertheless, one has to be careful not to draw premature conclusions. Every single text has its own story. The textual analysis of the Prayer of Manasseh¹⁰³ contained in the same codex, has shown that the Hebrew version represents a text which is close to a seventh-century manuscript and probably does not represent the oldest form of the text. In addition, it could be observed that biblical quotations were frequently used in exactly those places where the Hebrew text diverges from the other versions to a large degree. This was interpreted as a technical device of the translator in order to render the text in a biblical style. One passage was even reformulated according to rabbinic traditions on Manasseh's fate in the world to come. These observations and the tremendous difficulties arising from any attempt to construct a *stemma* with the Hebrew version at its beginning have led me to assume that the Hebrew Prayer of Manasseh is a translation.

In the case of the Prayer of Jacob the textual basis is much weaker. Therefore, the decision whether or not the Hebrew version is a translation becomes a question of taste rather than a matter of ultimately decisive arguments and firm convictions. No doubt, Greek concepts heavily influenced our prayer, but it might seem futile ask whether it goes back to a Greek source for which we have no evidence that it ever existed. Furthermore, a thoroughly Hellenized Jew could have written a Hellenistic prayer in Hellenistic Hebrew without directly making use of a Greek source. This could have happened sometime from the third/fourth century onwards. During this period motifs of solar religion were a common phenomenon in Judaism (e. g. synagogue mosaics),¹⁰⁴ Gnos-

¹⁰³ Cf. R. Leicht, *ibid.*

¹⁰⁴ The allusions to Helios could render the prayer into an additional source for the much debated problem of the role of the sun in ancient Judaism. In his highly controversial work on *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, New York 1953, E. Goodenough collected much material which – according to his opinion – proves Judaism's close links with pagan religion and mystery cults in late antiquity; for the ongoing discussion about his theories cf. G. Lease, "Jewish Mystery Cults since Goodenough", in *ANRW* II 20.2 (Berlin 1987), pp. 858–880. Literature on the Helios mosaics in synagogues is abundant. I quote a small selection of more recent articles: G. Stemberger, "Die Bedeutung des Tierkreises auf Mosaikfußböden Spätantiker Synagogen", in *Kairos* 17 (1975), pp. 23–56; R. Hachlili, "The Zodiac in Ancient Jewish Art: Representation and Significance", in *BSOAR* 228 (1977), pp. 61–77; J. Maier, "Die Sonne im religiösen Denken des antiken Judentums", in *ANRW* 19.1 (Berlin 1979), pp. 346–412; G. Foerster, "The Zodiac in Ancient Synagogues and its Place in Jewish Thought and Literature" (hebr.), in *Eretz Israel* 19 (1987), pp. 225–234.

ticism reached one of its peaks, and theurgical practices and Neoplatonic thinking were fashionable. The latest date would be that of the manuscript itself (eleventh century).

For several reasons, however, I am inclined to believe that there is room for an interpretation of the Hebrew version as a translation. The cornerstone of this assumption is the formulation of the *Qedushah* and the spelling of *Yaova* and *Yao* (with *Aleph* and *Bet* instead of *Heh* and *Waw* and the peculiar vocalization), which I find difficult to imagine as originating in a Hebrew source. The transmission of the Prayer of Jacob in a manuscript which contains material closely related to Hekhalot literature provides a certain clue as to which circles could have been interested in such texts. The magical adaptations of the Seven- and Eighteen-Benediction-Prayer attributed to Elijah, the Prayer of Abraham and the Prayer of Hanina ben Dosa all belong to the magical margins of Hekhalot literature. In language and motifs, common traits of the Prayer of Jacob and *Sefer ha-Razim*¹⁰⁵ and *Seder Rabba diBereshit* could be shown. All these traditions contributed much to both the midrashic activities in the eleventh century (*Midrash Rabbati*) and the rise of mystical movements in Europe. Since it is well known that both of these movements reveal an unprecedented knowledge of apocryphal traditions, the Hebrew Prayer of Jacob can be seen as a rare example for this process of (re-)adaptation of cosmological and mystical ideas within Judaism.¹⁰⁶ This could explain the characteristic vocabulary of the Hebrew version, the addition of a concluding benediction (fol. 2a/16f.)¹⁰⁷ and the partial replacement of pagan words by biblical expressions (fol. 2a/

¹⁰⁵ It should be added that the Prayer of Jacob concludes with a phrase (fol. 2a/16: *מהולל בפי כל הנשמות*) similar to *Sefer ha-Razim* VII/39: *ברוך שמו מפי כל נשמה*, which is more evidence for a common historical background. In spite of many linguistic similarities with *Sefer ha-Razim*, *Seder Rabba diBereshit* and other texts, some wordings of the Prayer of Jacob are unique; cf., e.g., *שמע תהילתי שהללתי* ("hear my song which I have sung you", fol. 2a/14) which is obviously re-adopted in the concluding benediction. The verb *הלל* is not used in Hekhalot literature as denoting "song" or "praise". It could stand for the Greek *hymnein*!

¹⁰⁶ Our manuscript was probably written in Byzantium or Southern Italy since it seems to belong to the same codex as JTSL ENA 2672.20 (Nr. 58, MTKG III; cf. commentary there). It should be noted that the Hebrew *Sefer Yosippon* (later translated into Slavonic as well) was redacted there. Furthermore, traditions from Southern Italy played a crucial though never fully clarified role in the transmission of esoteric lore to Western Europe; cf. G. Scholem, *Kabbalah*, p. 33.

¹⁰⁷ In rabbinic literature, the benediction *האל המושיע* is attested in connection with the reading of the Book of Esther only; bMeg 21b; PesR 13 (53a). I have no explanation why this benediction was chosen for the Prayer of Jacob except for the very general assumption that the knowledge asked for in the prayer would be most helpful in some kind of dangerous situations.

10ff.). They could be attempts to adapt the text to traditional Jewish standards. Furthermore, this hypothesis could explain how some of the difficult phenomena like the *Qedushah* and a few of the divine names came into being.

The main relevance of the Prayer of Jacob, however, should not be confined to a sophisticated discussion on whether or not the Hebrew version is the original one. It is a text with a strikingly peculiar theological outlook and a source of prime relevance for the relationship between apocryphal and pseudepigraphal literature, Hekhalot literature, magical texts and liturgy. It links together motifs stemming from and re-appearing in different places and different periods. Therefore we should hope that new light from other sources will yield a more comprehensive understanding of the Prayer of Jacob.

Text

Fol. 2

	תפלת יע??? אבינו +	1
(6)	י יי אלהים אד] רד חנוך מתושלח נח.	2
(7)	י יי אלהי ?] [הצדיקים אל נאדר על כסא כבוד	3
(8/9)	נאה ??? תיך] [. האוחז בחלומי . האוחז בארבע פינות	4
(10)	העולם כולו בזרועו המכין את השמים בהוד כבוד תפארתו	5
(12/11)	הפותח ממעל לשמים חלונים כשיש ובהם כאלהי השמים	6
(13)	והוא נ]סתר כלילה שלא יחשב אליהם . והיכנתה בהם דרך לירח..	7
(15/14)	ולכוכבים עוד קורא להם והולכים שלא יחשבו אליהם מפניך . +	8
	שרפים רועדים שש כנפים בשמים מכסים ואינם נדממים	9
(17/16)	וגם אני מקדש וקורא שנים עשר ראשים שנים עשר פני	10
	שבטים ראשו נמלא טל מהם שמשניהם טהור עינים וידים	11
(18)	שנים ולפיד אש ברכים מבהיק קדוש או אב באיה או עולם	12
(20/19)	אל יאו עולם . מלך אביר . אמיץ ברוך מלא השמים והארץ	13
(21)	ותהומות וכל העולמים לכבודך עניני ושם? ??? ילתי שהללתי	14
	וחין בקשתי מה שאני מבקש ועשה ותביא שאלתי לפניך	15
(22)	והגד לי בחלמי בשרה כי יי מהולל בפי כל הנשמות . ברוך אתה	16
	יי האל המושיע אמן .	17

Translation

The textual analysis has shown that the Hebrew version of the Prayer of Jacob is rather fragmentary and corrupt. It is therefore a difficult task to produce an adequate translation of it. For the reader's convenience, I

quote Lunt's translation of the Ladder of Jacob 2:6–22 on the left side together with an English translation of the Genizah text. In my translation, I have tried to remain as faithful as possible to the wording of Lunt's translation in order to enable the reader who is not familiar with Hebrew to understand of the main differences between the two versions discussed in section 1 of this article.

Ladder of Jacob 2:6–22

MTKG II, Nr. 22, fol. 2a/1–17

Prayer of Ja[cob] our father.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>6 Lord God of Adam your creature
and Lords God of Abraham and
Isaac my fathers and all who have
walked before you in justice!</p> <p>7 You who sit firmly on the cheru-
bim and the fiery throne of glory
... and the many-eyed (ones) just
as I saw in my dream,</p> <p>8 holding the four-faced cherubim.
bearing also the many-eyed sera-
phim,</p> <p>9 carrying the whole world under
his arm, yet not being borne by
anyone;</p> <p>10 you who have made the skies firm
for the glory of your name,</p> <p>11 stretching out on two heavenly
clouds the heaven which gleams
under you,</p> | <p>Lord, God (of)¹⁰⁸ Ad[am] Shet,
Enosh, Qenan, Mehalel, Ja[red],
Enoch Metushelach, Noah.¹⁰⁹
Lord, God of [Abraham and
Isaac] the just!</p> <p>God, firm on¹¹⁰ a beautiful¹¹¹
throne of glory ??? your ??? [...],
who holds my dream,</p> <p>who holds the four corners of</p> <p>the whole world in his arm;</p> <p>who made firm the skies with the
magnificence of the glory of his
splendor,</p> <p>who opens above the skies win-
dows like marble,</p> |
|---|---|

¹⁰⁸ The text does not employ the *status constructus* here.

¹⁰⁹ Genealogy according to Gen 5.

¹¹⁰ The expression נָאֵדֵר עַל כִּסֵּא כְבוֹד is difficult. נָאֵדֵר ("firm") is a common attribute of God, but it never describes an action such as "sitting firmly on" (to my knowledge, עַל נָאֵדֵר is not attested at all). This is, however, how the Slavonic version translates this passage.

¹¹¹ The word נָאֵה is translated here as an attribute to "throne" thus meaning "beautiful". It has to be noted, however, that this word is used twice in the same manuscript, once in the Prayer of Abraham (fol. 1b/14: כִּי לֶךְ נָאֵה שִׁיר) and once in the Prayer of Manasseh (fol. 3a/2: וְלֶךְ נָאֵה לְהַלֵּךְ), and in both cases it obviously means "you deserve"; cf. MTKG II, pp. 31 f.

- 12 that beneath it you may cause the sun to course and conceal it during the night so that it might not seem a god;
- 13 (you) who made on them a way for the moon and the stars;
- 14 and you make the moon wax and wane, and destine the stars to pass on so that they too might not seem gods.
- 15 Before the face of your glory the six-winged seraphim are afraid, and they cover their feet and faces with their wings, while flying with their other (wings), and they sing unceasingly a hymn:
- 16 '... whom I now in sanctifying a new (song) ...
- 17 Twelve-topped, twelve-faced, many-named, fiery one! Lightning-eyed holy one!
- 18 Holy, Holy, Holy, Yao, Yaova, Yaoil, Yao, Kados, Chavod, Savaoth,
- 19 Omlemlech il avir amismi varich, eternal king, mighty, powerful, most great, patient, blessed one!
- 20 You who fill heaven and earth, the sea and abysses and all the ages with your glory,
- 21 hear my song with which I have sung you, and grant me the request I ask of you,
- and within them is (one) like the God of the heavens, and it is concealed during the night so that it might not be deemed a god;
- and you made firm in them a way for the moon and the stars
- and you give them order, too, and they pass on so that they might not be deemed gods.
- Before you the seraphim shiver, six wings, with two they cover and they (never) keep silent
- and also I sanctify and shout:
- Twelve-topped, twelve-fa(ced), tribes,
his head is full of dew,
from them for from these two,
pure-eyed and two hands,
and fiery torch,
lightning shining!
- Holy, O Av Bayah O Olam El Yao,
- Olam Melekh (eternal king),
Avir (mighty), Amiz (powerful),
Barukh (blessed)!
- Full are the heavens and the earth and the abysses and all the ages of your glory,
- answer me and hea[r] my [so]ng¹¹² which I have sung to you, and grant¹¹³ me my request I ask, and do (it) and bring my question before you

¹¹² Hebrew text: שמ[ע] תה[י]לתי.

¹¹³ Read: תן.

22 and tell me the interpretation of my dream, for you are a god who is mighty, powerful and glorious, a god who is holy; my Lord and Lord of my fathers.

and tell me in my dream a message, for (you are) the Lord, praised through the mouth of all souls.

Blessed are you, Lord, the God who gives rescue. Amen.

Martin Buber: Drei Reden und eine Diskussion 1926–1929

MANFRED VOIGTS

Summary

The culture of the Weimar Republic Period in Germany can be described as a "Streitkultur", which means that intense discussions, debates and controversies were a strong feature of its cultural life. This collection of documents and lecture notes pertaining to three of Martin Buber's talks as well as a report on a public discussion with him was originally put together by opponents of Buber in the "Philosophical Group" of Oskar Goldberg (1885–1953) and intended to form part of a public campaign against him which, however, they were not able to realize. Two of the talks documented here have never been published before. As a valuable addition to our knowledge of Buber in that decisive periode of his life devoted to translating the Bible together with Franz Rosenzweig until the latter's death in 1929, they provide a vivid picture of the conflicting viewpoints of those tumultuous years.

Als der Pädagoge Hermann Gerson durch einem Brief vom 25. 11. 1926 mit Martin Buber in Kontakt trat, da berichtete er:

Ich durfte Sie am Montag in Berlin zum ersten Male sehen und hören. Da fühlte ich mich so ganz anders, so viel persönlicher, schicksalhafter angesprochen als bei einem nur 'guten' Vortrage. Und so faßte ich den Mut, mich an Sie zu wenden ...¹

Die ungeheure Wirkung der Reden Bubers – vor allem der ersten Prager Reden 1909/10 – wurde oft bezeugt. Dieser Vortrag hatte den Titel *Judentum* und war in der Aula der (jetzigen) Cäcilien-Schule am Nikolsburger Platz in Berlin-Wilmersdorf am 22.11.1926 gehalten worden. Eine zusammenfassende Mitschrift dieses Vortrages – und zwei anderer – hat sich erhalten, aber Buber hat von dieser Mitschrift nichts gewußt

¹ Martin Buber: Briefwechsel aus sieben Jahrzehnten, Bd. II: 1918–1938, Heidelberg 1973, S. 271.