



Nichifor Tănase

Tselem-Kabod-Panim – hesychastic reading of 2 Corinthians 3:18–4:6

Abstract

The Gospel of Matthew applies the symbolism of luminous *panim*/face to Jesus. In this text the luminous image, could stand behind the symbolism of Jesus' luminous face in the transfiguration accounts in close connection with pauline text about "Christ as the image of the invisible God" (Colossians 1:15) and the theophanic paradigm of *Kavod* (Hebrews 12:18-29). Firstly, the symbolism of Jesus' Luminous Face is connected with the notion of image or *iqonin*. But, the reference to his glorious *tselem* or *iqonin*, has an important feature - indicating that



Rev. Assist. Professor Dr. Nichifor Tănase, Faculty of Letters, History and Theology, West University Timișoara, Education Counsellor, Archdiocese of Timișoara, Romania

Jesus' face relates not to Moses' but to God's countenance. "Vested" with glory, Moses, as he descended Mt Sinai, he "wore" the light on his face, instead Christ is the Light. The verb μεταμορφώω, employed by Mark and Matthew, also occurs in several Pauline passages, including 2 Cor 3:18, where Paul anticipates the believer's metamorphosis. According to many scholars was steeped in hellenistic terminology and experience: transfiguration by vision. There is no other Pauline text which so clearly reveals his deepest experience and - according to some - his non-Jewish mode of thinking. But, here, Paul has suffused a Greco-Roman motif of metamorphosis with a midrashic development of the Moses story of Exodus 34 and with an allusion to Genesis 1. This metamorphosis is, thus, achieved through the *doxa kyriou*. This rare terminology of transformation coincides, instead, here with the *Kavod* imagery. If people convert to Christ, the second Adam, and reflect his glory (2 Cor 3:16, 18; 4:4), they experience a transformation ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, "from one degree of glory to another" (2 Cor 3:18). But, Paul moves beyond the Jewish terminology of the image or likeness of God and the glory of (the second) Adam. In the course of 2 Cor 3-4, the language of image (εἰκόν) is supplemented with the notion of the ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, the inner man: man's transformation into the εἰκόν of the second Adam, the heavenly ἄνθρωπος (1 Cor 15:47-49), results directly in a gradual and progressive renewal of the inner ἄνθρωπος (2 Cor 4:16). Eternal and increasing glory results from man's metamorphosis into the εἰκόν of the second Adam. In this way, says van Kooten, "*Paul recasts the Jewish terminology of the image of God in terms of a Platonic anthropology*". Thus, we learn from 2 Cor. that this "*bearing of the image of the second Adam*" is not only an eschatological event, but rather involves a transformational process in the present, based on transformation into the image of Christ in his

capacity as the heavenly man (2 Cor 3:18-4:4). Scholars also note connections with Phil 2:6-11 where once again the transformation of believers is surrounded by *Kavod* symbolism. So, in Phil 2:6-7 “form” or μορφή equates with both an εἰκών and an οὐσία. Paul, as we shall see, in describing Christ as being ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ, means to ascribe to him not only the status possessed by the prelapsarian Adam that of being κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ (Gen 1:27). Paul juxtaposes two cognates of μορφή, as such σύμμορφος and μεταμορφόμαι, with εἰκών in Rom 8:29 (ὅτι οὗς προέγνω καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνας τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς) and 2 Cor 3:18 (ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένοι προσώπων τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου Πνεύματος) in such a way as to suggest that he considers μορφή and εἰκών synonymous. The word εἰκών refers to something substantial, a μορφή to which one can be σύμμορφος or into which one can μεταμορφοῦται: *“We are transformed (μεταμορφούμεθα) into the same image” (2 Cor. 3:18) “Until Christ be formed (μορφωθῆ) in you” (Gal. 4:19)*. The form (μορφή) or visible appearance of God has, also, a theological basis in δόξα concept of the Greek Bible, according to which the glory of God is visibly in the radiance of heavenly light. So, if the sign of the humanity of Jesus is the μορφή δούλου, the μορφή θεοῦ is equivalent to the δόξα Κυρίου. Paul means to identify Christ as a visible manifestation of divine glory. Christ must refer in John 17:5 (*“Now, Father, glorify me together with yourself, with the glory which I had with you before the world was”*) to uncreated glory, that is, the essential glory of the deity. Phil 2:6-7 indicates that Christ exists both in the “form of a God” and in the “form of a servant”. Christ as equal to the Father, refer to the “form of God Μορφή itself (Mark 16:12) and μόρφωσις (2 Tim 3:5), for instance, appear in the NT in the

sense of “external appearance,” while μεταμορφόω in Matt 17:2 and Mark 9:2 refers to the transfiguration precisely of Christ’s appearance (*panim*). Thus, Philippians 2:6–7 refer to the “form of a servant,” i.e. Christ’s human nature (μορφή in the related sense of “bearing”), and the “form of God,” is the second remarks, which portray Christ as equal to the Father.

Keywords

luminous *panim*/face, Personhood, glory (δοξάζω, doxazō), form of God (μορφῆ θεοῦ), image (εἰκόν)

1 Image of God (*tselem*) reflected in the radiance of Adam’s face (*panim*)

The human *person* represents the Christianity’s contribution to anthropology.¹ The modern turn toward subjectivity means that “*the principal object of all philosophical thought is man, his conscience, his conduct. At heart, all philosophy is anthropology*”.² On this level the “person” begins to find expression as

¹ W. Pannenberg, “Person,” in: *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, edited by K. Galling, 3rd ed., vol. 5 (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1961), pp. 230–235; J. D. Zizioulas, “Personhood and Being,” in: John Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1997), pp. 27–65. Among philosophical works, see F. A. Stentrup, “Zum Begriff der Hypostase,” *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 1 (1877), pp. 57–84, pp. 361–93; 2 (1878), pp. 225–58; P. Ricoeur, “Meurt le personnalisme, revient la personne,” in *Lectures 2: La contree des philosophes* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1992), pp. 195–202, p. 198f.

² Lucien Goldmann, *Le Dieu caché: Étude sur la vision tragique dans les Pensées de Pascal et dans le théâtre de Racine*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Gallimard, 1955), p. 16. Translated into English as *The Hidden God: A*

“personality” by following the question of the relationship between Christian faith and modern anthropology. On this basis, many modern authors, like Plato and Aristotle before them, attempt to offer an “ontological” demonstration of the existence of God, starting with human subjectivity and they tend to postulate the direct presence of “God” within human consciousness.³ With Descartes, says Karl Löwith laconically, “the Christian world was secularized”.⁴ This is the true “Copernican revolution” of anthropology, because “neither the earth, nor God, nor Christ, is any longer the center, as they were for pagans, Greeks, Jews, and Christians, as the case may be; now humanity itself is at the center of all things”.⁵

According to Christian Anthropology, it is Christ that “fully reveals man to himself”. This point is shown by the Theophilus of Antioch expression “If you say to me: ‘Show me your God,’ I will respond: ‘Show me your man’ (*Ad Autolyicum* I, 2,7)”. Trying to understand anthropology on the basis of christology, several attempts have been made throughout the modern period to ensure that anthropology is Christologically mediated, not the other way around. The eschatological approach to anthropology

Study of Tragic Vision in the Pensées of Pascal and the Tragedies of Racine (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964).

³ C. Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989), pp. 211-302.

⁴ K. Löwith, *Nietzsches Philosophie der ewigen Wiederkunft des Gleichen* (Berlin: Verlag die Runde, 1935), p. 99.

⁵ Paul O’Callaghan, *Children of God in the World. An Introduction to Theological Anthropology* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2016), p. 55. This is the expression of Descartes’ doctrine of the *cogito*, the self-thinking: “I,” Cogito, ergo sum: “I exist, I am, because I think.” With Descartes, says Heidegger, “man becomes the measure and center of being. Man is at the foundation of the whole of being.” H. Heidegger, *Nietzsche* (Pfullingen: Neske, 1961), 2:61; translated into English as *Nietzsche*, edited by D. F. Krell (San Francisco: Harper, 1991).

according to Pannenberg⁶ develops the idea of the Son of God which is seen in connection with the Jewish concept of pre-existent divine wisdom and expresses it in terms of the concept of the Logos. Scripture does not have a developed and systematic anthropology. Yet both Testaments speak of the human being in a wide variety of ways.⁷ It is fair to say that the idea of the “image of God”⁸ offers a point of departure and the fundamental structure for any anthropology inspired in Biblical and Christian faith.⁹ Crowned with glory, but disfigured by sin and death,

⁶ W. Pannenberg, “The Christological Foundation of Christian Anthropology”, *Concilium* 6 (1973), pp. 86-102.

⁷ Hans Walter Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974).

⁸ The term used, *selem* (‘image’ in Aramaic), is translated in the Septuagint as *eikōn*, a term frequently used in the Old Testament to translate the term ‘idol’, or sculpted image. G. K. Beale, *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry* (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2008). Abraham Joshua Heschel, “The Concept of Man in Jewish Thought”, in *The Concept of Man*, ed. S. Radhakrishnan and P. T. Raju (London: Allen and Unwin, 1960), pp. 129, 132: According to Heschel, the obligation humans have to live a holy life is rooted in the fact that they are made in the image of God and “the body of man, and not only his soul, is endowed with divine dignity. (...) Holiness, an essential attribute of God, may become a quality of man. The human can become holy”. On the image of God in humans according to recent Jewish thought, see D. S. Shapiro, “The Doctrine of the Image of God and Imitatio Dei”, in *Contemporary Jewish Ethics*, edited by M. M. Kellner (New York: Sanhedrin Press, 1978), pp. 127–51.

⁹ See, among other studies, J. Barr, “The Image of God in the Book of Genesis: A Study in Terminology,” *Bulletin of the J. Rylands Library* 51 (1968), pp. 11–26; *Der Mensch als Bild Gottes*, edited by L. Scheffczyk (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969); J. M. Miller, “In the ‘Image’ and ‘Likeness’ of God,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972), pp. 298–304; D. Cairns, *The Image of God in Man*, 2nd ed. (London: Collins, 1973); J. F. A. Sawyer, “The Meaning of ‘In the Image of God’ in Genesis I–XI,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 25 (1974), pp. 418–26; A. G. Hamman, *L’homme image de Dieu: Essai d’une anthropologie chrétienne dans l’Eglise des cinq premiers siècles* (Paris: Desclée,

man remains “in the image of God,” in the image of the Son, but is deprived “of the glory of God,” of his “likeness”. Son himself will assume that “image” and restore it in “likeness” by giving it again its glory, the Spirit who is “the giver of life”.¹⁰ Most New Testament scholars today agree that Jesus used an enigmatic self-designation, *bar nasha* (‘the Son of Man’), translated into Greek as *ho huios tou anthropou* in the Synoptic Gospels (a christological title in connection with *Daniel* 7). In contrast, Paul, the earliest New Testament writer, nowhere mentions the

1987); G. J. Wenham, “Genesis 1–15,” in *Word Biblical Commentary*, edited by B. M. Metzger, D. A. Hubbard, and G. W. Barker (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1987–2014) [hereafter “WBC”], 1:26–31; Jonsson, *The Image of God*; C. Westermann, *Genesis* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1988), pp. 4–13. In greater detail, see Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*; W. Vogels, “The Human Person in the Image of God (Gen 1,26),” *Science et Esprit* 46 (1994), pp. 189–202; M. Welker, “Creation and the Image of God: Their Understanding in Christian Tradition and the Biblical Grounds,” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 34 (1997), pp. 436–48; F. J. Stendebach, “*šelem*,” in G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W. B. Eerdmans, 2003) [hereafter “TDOT”], 12, pp. 386–396.

¹⁰ Still, from the strictly exegetical point of view, the two terms used, *šelem*, which means sculpture, material copy, and is usually translated as “image,” and *demûth*, “likeness,” correspondence with an original, are more or less equivalent, meant to strengthen one another, following the usual Semitic usage. Perhaps it may be said that the term *demûth* in a sense attempts to attenuate the material emphasis present in *šelem*. “In the ‘Image’ and ‘Likeness’ of God” they are equivalent terms, even though *demûth* (likeness) is introduced in order to limit, clarify, and modify *šelem* (image). W. Vogels, in *The Human Person in the Image of God*, 193; see Horst, “Face to Face: The Biblical Doctrine of the Image of God,” *Interpretation* 4 (1950), pp. 259–270; P. Niskanen, “The Poetics of Adam: The Creation of אדם in the Image of אלהים,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128, no. 3 (2009), pp. 417–436, esp. pp. 421–424. W. Janzen, *Still in the Image: Essays in Biblical Theology and Anthropology* (Winnipeg: Newton, 1982); W. Vogels, *The Human Person in the Image of God*, pp. 196–198.

phrase in his letters. His Adam Christology in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15 has no real equivalent in the Synoptic Gospels.¹¹ Regarding the image of God and the constitution of man as body and soul, therefore, it is true that the number of Old Testament texts speaking of man made in the image of God is low.¹² Also, a major difficulty in assessing Jewish traditions about Adam is

-
- ¹¹ Yongbom Lee, *The Son of Man as the Last Adam: The Early Church Tradition as a Source of Paul's Adam Christology* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2012). Yongbom Lee argues that in addition to the Old Testament, contemporary Jewish exegetical traditions, and his Damascus Christophany, Paul uses the early church tradition in particular, its implicit primitive Adam-Jesus typology and the Son of Man saying traditions reflected in the Synoptic Gospels--as a source of his Adam Christology. See also, Maurice Casey, *The Solution to the 'Son of Man' Problem* (New York: T & T Clark International, 2009), pp. 56-80, and Mogens Müller, *The Expression 'Son of Man' and the Development of Christology: A History of Interpretation* (Oakville, Conn.: Equinox, 2008); P. Schwanz, *Imago Dei als christologisch-anthropologisches Problem in der Geschichte der alten Kirche von Paulus bis Klemens von Alexandrien* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1970).
- ¹² T. H. Tobin, *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1983) says that, following Philo of Alexandria (*De opificio mundi* 69) and other authors inspired by Plato, many Fathers consider that the likeness of God in man is to be found in his spiritual essence, in the soul, and specifically in the intellect (*nous*). M. T. Clark, "Image Doctrine," *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, edited by A. D. Fitzgerald and J. Cavadini (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W. B. Eerdmans, 1999), pp. 440-442, points out that, to the question: Where is the image of God situated in man? ("Ubi imago Dei?"), Augustine responds openly: "In mente, in intellectu" (In the mind, in the intellect) or "secundum solam mentem imago Dei dicitur" (*De Trin.* XV, 77, 11).. That is to say, the image of God does not reside in the human body (Augustine, *De Trin.* XII, 7, 12), because for Augustine "Imago Dei intus est, non est in corpore (...) sed est facta mens" (*Enn. in Ps.* 48, 11). But, during the twelfth through the thirteenth centuries there were important disputes on the way the human body shared in the image of God. On this discussion, see R. Javelet, *Image et ressemblance au douzième siècle de saint Anselme à Alain de Lille* (Strasbourg: Letouzey et Ané, 1967), 1:196–207, pp. 224–236.

the ambiguity of the term 'ādām.¹³ The term can denote not only Adam the person, but also humanity in general or a generic human.¹⁴ Adam's body is a mixture of divine likeness and clay of earthly material. In rabbinic literature the Aramaic transliterations generally indicate royal statues. In early Second Temple Judaism the iconic Adam is also perceived as YHWH's צלם for cultic purposes.¹⁵ The tradition interprets the concept of image of God as physical resemblance to God.¹⁶ So, in rabbinic Judaism, highlights Father Silviu Bunta, this is "*the main connotation of the concept of image of God*".¹⁷ The resemblance be-

¹³ On Hebrew anthropology, see Abraham Joshua Heschel, "The Concept of Man in Jewish Thought"; *God in Search of Man*; and *Man Is Not Alone*. See also the useful text of H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 6th ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974).

¹⁴ Silviu N. Bunta, "Adam (Person) in Judaism" in *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception 1* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York 2009) 300-306. According to one text from Qumran, the fragment 4Q504 VIII (Puech col. I), 4 (ca. mid-2nd cent. BCE), Adam was fashioned in the likeness of the Glory of God. See, also, J.R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (Sheffield Academic Press, 1988). According to one opinion, Adam was created on the site of the future temple and on the first of Tishri, when the temple would also be finished. He was of an exquisite beauty and wore garments of light. Adam resembled God morphologically to such an extent that the angels mistook the protoplast for God and wanted to venerate him as the Holy One. According to one version of the story God prevents this misguided act of veneration by making Adam fall asleep and thus showing the an-gels that Adam is a creature (Bunta, "Adam (Person) in Judaism" 304).

¹⁵ Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), p. 102.

¹⁶ A. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *Harvard Theological Review* 87.2 (1994), pp. 171-195, see esp. 173-176. For a critique of Gottstein's literal understanding of rabbinic references to Adam's body of light, see David H. Aaron, "Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam," *Harvard Theological Review* 90 (1997), pp. 299-314.

¹⁷ Silviu N. Bunta, "The Likeness of the Image: Adamic motifs and צלם (tselem) anthropology in Rabbinic Traditions about Jacob's image en-

tween Adam and God confounds the angels. Unable to differentiate between the image and the prototype, the angels unwittingly direct their worship to Adam. The tradition associates the angelic worship of Adam with the protoplast's identity as the image of God. As John R. Levison emphasizes, "the image consists of physical similarity to God"¹⁸ and this physical resemblance enables Adam to function as a cultic statue of God.¹⁹ In the ancient Near East the presence of the god in the statue is an indwelling. The image is distinct from its prototype in its sub-

throned in heaven", *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, XXXVII, 1 (Brill NV, Leiden, 2006), pp. 55-84. According to father Bunta the "throne of glory" or "of God," on which Jacob's image is engraved, is reminiscent of the throne of the (כְבוֹד) of Ezek 1:26-28. This connection implies that Jacob is identified with the divine glory (כְבוֹד) of Ezek 1:26-28. This association of Jacob with the כְבוֹד of Ezekiel 1 introduces the possibility of a connection between the Jacob texts and traditions about Adam, who is a prominent identity of the (כְבוֹד) in Second Temple literature (Bunta, "The Likeness of the Image: Adamic motifs and תְּסֵלֶם (*tselem*) anthropoly", 61). All the rabbinic texts designate the image of Jacob with אֵיִקוֹנִין, a Palestinian Aramaic transliteration of εἰκόνας. The anonymous humanlike figure on a heavenly throne is reminiscent of the throne of the כְבוֹד, 'glory' in Ezek 1:26-28; the use of the term φῶς for the enthroned humanlike being is an allusion to Adam, defined by the wordplay φῶς- φῶς in Hellenistic Jewish circles. For the Priestly Source and the author of Ezekiel Adam functions as God's representation. The angels beheld the likeness and image of God in Adam and they fell down and worshipped him and gave him glory as *the likeness of God*. The connection between Adam's physical resemblance to God and the angelic worship of Adam is evident in Michael's command to Satan: *adorete imaginem domini dei* in Latin (*Astowac* is the Armenian version uses for Adam's iconic function). Adam possesses the image of God through the insufflation of divine breath. The imagery is the result of a juxtaposition of Gen 1:26 with Gen 2:7.

¹⁸ John R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism* (JSPSS1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), p. 178.

¹⁹ Dmitrij F. Bumazhnov, *Der Mensch als Gottes Bild im christlichen Ägypten* [Man as image of God in Christian Egypt]: Studien zu Gen 1,26 in zwei koptischen Quellen des 4.-5. Jahrhunderts (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

stance. Concerning the transmission of the likeness to God (bodily luminosity - *shechinah*, שכינה) from Adam to other humans or the whole humanity, the beauty of Adam the first was like the beauty of the *Divine Shekinah* (דייוקנא meaning “dwelling” or “one who dwells”). The Lord created mankind “in a facsimile of his own face”.²⁰ The concept of the emperor’s presence in his images (based on the common likeness) is widely attested in rabbinic thought, but also during the controversy regarding the *Antropomorphites* in the Egyptian Desert. This is what Bumaznov refers to as the *Kaiserbildargument* – the analogy of

²⁰ F. I. Andersen, ‘2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch’, in J.H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985), pp. 92-221, here 171: “*The Lord with his own two hands created mankind; and in a facsimile of his own face. Small and great the Lord created. Whoever insults a person’s face insults the face of the Lord; whoever treats a person’s face with repugnance treats the face of the Lord with repugnance. Whoever treats with contempt the face of any person treats the face of the Lord with contempt. (2 En. 44:1-2 shorter recension)*”. In 2 Enoch the motif of the luminous face of the seer was transferred for the first time to the seventh antediluvian patriarch. The text tells that the vision of the divine Face had dramatic consequences for Enoch’s appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. The Enoch’s radiant metamorphosis before the divine Countenance links Enoch’s transformation with Moses’ account in the Book of Exodus. The metaphor of “engraving” on the *Kavod* might signify here that the seer’s identity became reflected in the divine Face, as in a mirror. Moses become “an anthropomorphic hypostasis of God himself.” Apud, Andrei Orlov, “In the Mirror of the Divine Face: The Enochic Features of the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian”, George J. Brooke, Hindy Najman and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (eds.), *The Significance of Sinai Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 183-200, here p. 199, n. 51 and pp. 193-194, n. 36; W. A. Meeks, “Moses as God and King,” in J. Neusner (ed.) *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), pp. 354-371, here pp. 367-368; Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (SNT 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967), p. 208; A. Orlov, “Ex 33 on God’s Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition,” *SBLSP* 39 (2000), pp. 130-147.

the emperor and his image.²¹ According to the *Ecclesiastical History 852* of Socrates Scholasticus the Egyptian ascetics (the so-called “Anthropomorphites”²²) from the desert of Nitria led

²¹ Dmitrij F. Bumazhnov, „Zur Interpretatin der Vita des seligen Aphu von Pemdje”, *Origeniana Octava: Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition* (Leuven University Press, 2003), pp. 987-993, here p. 989; Etienne Drioton, “La Discussion d’un moine Anthropomorphite Audien avec le patriarche Theophile d’Alexandrie en l’annee 399” *Revue de l’Orient Chretien* 10 (1915-1917), pp. 93-100, pp. 113-28. Appa Aphou makes an analogy between Christ’s presence in the Eucharist and God’s image in humans, as pointed out by Paul Andrew Patterson, *Visions of Christ: The Anthropomorphite Controversy of 399 CE*, (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 2012), p. 55; see, also, Hugo Lundhaug, “The Body of God and the Corpus of Historiography. The Life of Aphou of Pemdje and the Anthropomorphite Controversy” în Anne Hege Grung, Marianne Bjelland Kartzow și Anna Rebecca Solevåg (editori), *Bodies, Borders, Believers. Ancient Texts and Present Conversations* (Wipf and Stock, 2015).

²² See Bishop Alexander (Golitzin), “The Vision of God & the Form of Glory: More Reflections on the Anthropomorphite Controversy of AD 399” in John Behr, Andrew Louth, Dimitri Conomos (eds.), *Abba – The Tradition of Orthodoxy in the West: Festschrift for Bishop Kallistos Ware*, ed. (Crestwood, NY: SVS, 2003), p. 295; A. Golitzin, “The Form of God and Vision of the Glory: Some Thoughts on the Anthropomorphite Controversy of 399 AD”, published in Romanian translation by I. Ica Jr., in *Mistagogia: Experientia lui Dumnezeu in Ortodoxie* (Sibiu: Deisis, 1998) 184-267; Elizabeth Clarke, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton:1992), pp. 43-84; G. Gould, “The Image of God and the Anthropomorphite Controversy in Fourth Century Monasticism”, in *Origeniana Quinta*, ed. B. Daley (Louvain:1992), pp. 549-557; G. Florovsky, “The Anthropomorphites in the Egyptian Desert”, in his *Collected Works*, Vol.IV (Belmont, MA:1975) pp. 89-96; G. Stroumsa, “The Incorporeality of God: Context and Implications of Origen's Position”, *Religion* (1983), pp. 345-358; C. Stewart, “Working the Earth of the Heart”. *The Messalian Controversy in History, Texts, and Language to AD 431* (Oxford:1991), esp. pp. 169-203; Tim Vivian, *Four Desert Fathers: Pambo, Evagrius, Macarius of Egypt & Macarius of Alexandria* (Crestwood, NY: Saint Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2004), p. 45; Tim Vivian, *Becoming fire: through the year with the Desert Fathers and mothers* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2008), p. 314, pp. 390-394; Derek Krueger, “The Old Testament

by the so-called Tall Brothers, left their monasteries and came to Alexandria. Theophilus the bishop of Alexandria becoming aware of his danger, going to the monks, he in a conciliatory tone thus addressed them: “*In seeing you I behold the face of God!*”.²³ The utterance of this saying moderated the fury of these men and they replied: If you really admit that God’s countenance is such as ours, anathematize Origen’s book (the idea that the *imago Dei* of Genesis 1:26 must thus be understood ‘spiritually’ [spiritualiter]).²⁴

According to Jewish sources, the image of God (*tselem*) was especially reflected in the radiance of Adam’s face (*panim*).²⁵ Moses’ glory is associated with being created in the image of God, stating that God created man in his own image. The understanding of Moses’ face restoring the original luminous *tselem*

in Monasticism” in *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, edited by Paul Magdalino and Robert Nelson (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 2010) pp. 199-221.

²³ Sozomen, *HE VIII.11-12*, PG LXVII:1544A-9A; ET: *NPNF* 2nd series, II:406-7; Socrates, *HE VI.7*, PG LXVII: 684A-8C [Socrates (684BC) and Sozomen (1545A) both: *hos theou prosopon*].

²⁴ Massey Hamilton Shepherd Jr., “The Anthropomorphic Controversy in the Time of Theophilus of Alexandria” *Church History* Vol. 7, No. 3 (Sep., 1938), pp. 263-273; Norman Russell, *Theophilus of Alexandria* (New York: Routledge, 2007), pp. 139-143; Young R Kim, *Epiphanius of Cyprus: Imagining an Orthodox World* (University of Michigan Press, 2015), pp. 222-224; Elizabeth A. Clark, “New Perspectives on the Origenist Controversy: Human Embodiment and Ascetic Strategies” *Church History* 59:2 (1990), pp. 145-162.

²⁵ Jarl Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord. Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985), p. 94; Jarl Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), pp. 14-39, for here 16 (“Light Adam” or “Light-Man”) and 20, n. 30 (the word for ‘light’ in the LXX is *phōs*, which significantly also means ‘man’: τὸ φῶς, ‘light’ and ὁ φῶς, ‘man’).

(Gen 1:27), that Adam had prior to the fall²⁶, is also expressed in parallel with the radiant *panim* of the prophet.²⁷ The glory of Adam's body and the glory of Moses' face were creatively juxtaposed in 4Q504. The luminous face of the prophet serves in this text as an alternative to the lost luminosity of Adam and as a new symbol of God's glory once again manifested in the human body.²⁸ Thus, as Andrei A. Orlov demonstrated, in early Mosaic, Enochic, and Jacobite traditions *tselem* is often used interchangeably with *panim*. Also, in Matthew's and Luke's transfiguration²⁹ account, Jesus' luminous face was indeed understood as his *iqonin*. Although scholars have attempted to interpret the symbolism of Jesus' luminous face through the biblical imagery of Moses' incandescent visage (Exod 34:29-30), says Orlov, "another important theophanic trend, which speaks about the deity's *Panim*, remains neglected".³⁰ This tradition, in which the

²⁶ God deprived Adam of his splendor and expelled him from the Garden of Eden, as it is written, "Thou changest his countenance, and sendest him away" (Job 14:20).

²⁷ Linda Belleville, *Reflections of Glory: Paul's Polemical Use of the Moses-Doxa Tradition in 2 Corinthians 3.1–18* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), p. 65; A. Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HTR* 87 (1994), p. 183.

²⁸ A. A. Orlov, "Vested with Adam's Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Macarian Homilies," *Christian Orient* 4.10 (2006), pp. 498-513.

²⁹ The verb μεταμορφώω ("transformation" or "change in form") employed by Mark and Matthew to describe the "transfiguration" of Jesus, refers to an external transformation outwardly visible rather than an internal transformation invisible to the physical eye. The aorist passive form (μετεμορφώθη) indicates, according to the Holy Fathers, that this external transformation of the physical appearance of Jesus was effected in terms of a "revelation," or "disclosure," or "unveiling" of an inner, permanent glory of Jesus.

³⁰ Andrei A. Orlov, *The Glory of the Invisible God. Two Powers in Heaven Traditions and Early Christology* (New York: T&T Clark, Bloomsbury Publishing, 2019), p. 124. The tradition of the *panim* as a designation

deity's *Panim* becomes a technical term for the Glory of God, is rooted in the biblical theophanic accounts, where, in response to Moses' request to behold the deity's *Glory*, God tells the seer it is impossible for him to see his *Face*. The correlation between *panim*/face and *tselem* is discernible noticeable in the *Ladder of Jacob*³¹, where the conceptual bridge between the notions of image and face are openly expressed in the symbolism of Jacob's *iqonin*. In *2 Enoch 22* a similar motif appears during the patriarch's encounter with the deity's glorious form, labeled there as God's "face".³² This creative interchange between *panim* and *tselem* symbolism will develop a very important influence on Christian theophany. The application of "image" terminology to Moses' story here has profound anthropological significance, since Moses' luminosity³³ becomes envisioned as a

for the luminous divine body receives further development in the Enochic literature. The symbolism of God's Face receives further elaboration in *2 Enoch* where God's *Panim* is understood not as a part of God's body, but as his entire extent. Moreover, the *panim* became a terminological correlative for another concept prominent in many early Jewish two powers accounts, namely, the image of God or his *iqonin*.

³¹ Horace Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob" in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983-1985), pp. 2.401-2.411, p. 2.407.

³² Francis Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983-1985), pp. 1.136-1.138: "I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent... and I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord. And the Lord, with his own mouth, said to me, 'Be brave, Enoch! Don't be frightened! Stand up, and stand in front of my face forever.'"

³³ According to Exodus 34:35 'the sons of Israel would see the face of Moses, that the skin of Moses' face shone' (יָרָק verb denom. to radiate, to emit beams, to shine). The verb here is *qaran/qeren*, יָרָק - as 'to shine' or 'rays of light' (also to shine as rays of light or beam of light or radiation) or *qal* יָרָק / greek equivalent δοξάζω (to send out rays). Scholars are well aware of the interpretive difficulties in Exod 34:29-

restoration of Adam's original *tselem*. The splendor of the *iqonin* of his face shone because of the splendor of the Glory of the Shekinah of the Lord.

Cornelis den Hertog made a brilliant analysis of “the prophetic core of the Divine Name” on Exodus 3.14a, by analyzing its context and syntax. In 14a God said to Moses: “*’ehye ’asher ’ehye*, and in 14b he said: “Thus shall you say to the Children of Israel: Ehyeh (*’ehye*) has sent me to you’.” To understand this text, he goes back to Genesis 32 where Jacob struggles with a mysterious ‘man’ during the night. At the end of the struggle Jacob asks this person to bless him (v. 27). The question, ‘Why do you ask for my name?’ is followed by the statement: ‘It [is] *pe’el’i*’ (v. 18). The last word is best taken as a description of something transcending human power and knowledge and as such astonishing (‘wonderful’; see esp. Ps. 139.6; also Judg. 13.19). In all proba-

35 relating to the phrase קָרַן עוֹר פָּנָיו “the skin of his face shone”). Moses’ “shining face” and “veil” and how they operate within the context of the entire Sinai episode (Exod 19–40). The episode of Moses’ shining face is the conclusion to the whole Sinai event. The common or standard interpretation is that Moses’ face is “shining” (קָרַן). The meaning of the verb קָרַן has sparked a lively debate among scholars and should be translated “to shine” instead of “to display horns”. First, the subject of קָרַן is “the skin of his face,” not Moses’ head. The LXX has δεδόξασται ἡ τοῦ χρώματος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ (“the appearance of the color of his face was glorified”), with the choice of δοξάζω as a reference to the “glory” (δόξα) that Moses requested from Yahweh in 33:18 and which passed before Moses in 34:6. The idea is clearly radiant glory. question regarding why the author chose קָרַן instead of the usual אָוֶר to communicate a “display of light”. The author used קָרַן as a subtle indictment on the idolatrous acts of the people. The closest anthropological parallel is the Mesopotamian concept of *melammu*, having the meaning of “radiant light,” which came from the heads of the gods. See the discussion in Menahem Haran, “The Shining of Moses’ Face: A Case Study in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography,” in *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature, in Honor of G. W. Ahlström* (ed. W. Barrick and John R. Spencer; JSOTSup 31; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), pp. 167–168.

bility this word does not qualify the name (in Hebrew: *šēm*) in question, but the person involved: ‘I have seen God face to face and my life was saved’ (v. 31; the use of *’elohîm* without object marker and without article may suggest some uncertainty about the identity of the other person but this seems to be cleared away by the phrase *pānîm ’el pānîm*, ‘face to face’).³⁴ The combination in Exod. 3.14b of the verb form *’ehye* – literally, ‘I shall be’ or ‘I am’ – with a verb form in the third person (*š’elah*, ‘has sent’) suggests that the former functions as a subject and is used as a proper name (‘Ehyeh has sent me to you’ closely resembles it: ‘Yhwh has sent me to you’).³⁵ In both ways of pronouncing Yhwh, Ehyeh can be connected with the first-person verb form, Yhwh with some indication of the third per-

³⁴ Cornelis den Hertog, *The Other Face of God. ‘I Am that I Am’ Reconsidered* (Hebrew Bible Monographs, 32, Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012), pp. 34–35. In the ancestral narratives there are many particular divine designations, also. *El Elyon* (*’ēl ’ēlyôn*, ‘God Most High’, Gen. 14.18, 19, 20, 22), *El Olam* (*’ēl ’ōlām*, ‘[the] Everlasting God’, 21.33) and *El Ro-i* (*’ēl ro’î / rō’î*, 16.13) are found in the Abraham cycle. On the other hand, [the] Frightful [One] of Isaac (*paḥad yiṣḥāq*, Gen. 31.42, 53), [the] Strong One of Jacob (*’abîr ya’aqōb*) and [the] Shepherd, [the] Stone of Israel (*rō’e ’eben yiśrā’ēl*, 49.24) occur in relation to the patriarch Jacob. The designation *El Shadday* (the word *šaddāy*, traditionally rendered ‘Almighty’) stands apart from these designations in a different way. First of all, it is somehow related to all the patriarchs and also to Joseph, as its use in the book of Job also. Finally, the designation Yhwh clearly concerns a ‘proper name’ too; see John M. Anderson, *Grammar of Names* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 298–302 and Terrance R. Wardlaw, *Conceptualizing Words for ‘God’ within the Pentateuch: A Cognitive-Semantic Investigation in Literary Context* (LHBOTS 495; New York: T & T Clark, 2008).

³⁵ *The Other Face of God*, pp. 50–51: Yhwh was *Yah-weh* (in letters of the International Phonetic Alphabet: *ja:wæ*). Following Ehyeh, the name Yhwh may be heard simply as an (archaic) third-person form of the verb *hyh-hwh*, therefore, as ‘he will be’ / ‘he is’. *Yahwa* is based on the (syllabic) rendering of the theophoric element *ia-a-wa* in personal names in some late Babylonian texts. Yhwh with a peculiar third-person preformative form of *hwh: yehû’* is attested in Eccl. 11.3.

son. Ehyeh, 'I am', serves to make a transition between 'I am who I am' of v. 14a and 'Yhwh' of v. 15a. First of all it should be noted that Ehyeh does function as a name. Ehyeh refers to the inaccessibility of God's essence to knowledge. The grammaticalization of the relationship between the names Ehyeh and Yhwh. 'God of the Fathers' originally did not have a proper name. This is supported by texts in Genesis that do not use the name Yhwh but that of *'elōhîm*.³⁶ The authorities link came from the words of Jeremiah decidedly to the name of Yhwh: '[It is] in the name of Yhwh, our god, [that] he has spoken to us' (v. 16). According to Genesis, God appeared to the ancestors and other persons in dreams, as a voice or incarnate, but only to address the persons in question, not others.³⁷ Let us first of all look at how *'ehye* and *'āšer* function in relation to each other within the statement *'ehye 'āšer 'ehye*. This is the place where YHWH showed Himself: say to them "Ehyeh" and its explanation is *'šr 'hyh* – it means the present one, who is present to you when you seek me. 'I am the one who is' – the first *'ehye* is often said to be identifying; the second would have an 'existential' sense. The verb in question is *hyh* ('be'), divine presence, the solidarity of God with Moses and his people. Ehyeh would then have associations with the

³⁶ Ladislaus M. v. Pákozdy, '*'ehye 'āšer 'ehye*—Die Deutung des *Jhwh*-Namens in Exodus 3:14: Ein Votum für die Übersetzung "Ich werde sein, der ich sein werde," *Judaica* 11 (1955), pp. 193-208; Christopher Seitz, 'The Call of Moses and the "Revelation" of the Divine Name: Source-Critical Logic and its Legacy', in Seitz, *Words without End: The Old Testament as Abiding Theological Witness* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 229-47.

³⁷ We have the expression about the Moses and his sending in Exod. 4.13: 'For my part (*bî*), Lord, send, please (*šelaḥ-nā*), by the hand (*be-yad*) you may send (*tišlāḥ*).' With the modal particle *nā*' speakers mark an imperative clause as only a proposal. The phrase serves to indicate that the sending concerns a person (and not a message). See Bent Christiansen, 'A Linguistic Analysis of the Biblical Hebrew particle *nā*': A Test Case', *VT* 59 (2009), pp. 379-393.

future ('I shall be'), but the accompanying verb form (*šelah*-, 'has sent') refers to the past. The dialogue from 33.12-23 makes clear that this is certainly a matter of *kabod*-*panim*'s presence of God. After Yhwh has indicated his willingness, Moses asks him to show his 'glory' (*kābôd*, 33.18). According to the way this term is used in Exodus, 'the glory is what can be seen of God's presence', such as a cloud or a devouring fire.³⁸ Within the particular context, Moses' request can be understood more precisely as one for an intimate encounter, something that would confirm Yhwh's willingness to restore his covenant with Israel (cf. 24.9-18). God answers first of all (33.19): '*I will make all my goodness pass before your face and I will call out the name Yhwh before your face,*' and in this way God redirects Moses' question before replying to it in the next verses (vv. 20-23). All this prepares the actual realization of the theophany inasmuch as the abundance of God's grace is emphasized there. Regarding the nature of the answer to be expected to the request for the name of the other in a theophany narrative according to Genesis 32:27-30, Judges 13:17-18 and Exod. 3.14a, is quite evident the relation with a presence that manifests itself and is affirmed accordingly. Prophets are persons who speak the truth. "In the Exod. 3:13-15, another face of God is introduced, one that mediates between Yhwh- '*elôhîm* as the god of the ancestral narratives, a god of direct revelation, and Yhwh as the god of the exodus of Israel from Egypt (cf. 3.7-8; also Exod. 20.2; Ezek. 20.5;

³⁸ Donald E. Gowan, *Theology in Exodus* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), pp. 232-33. The title '*elôhîm* (with his function as sovereign creator in Gen. 1.1-2.3) appears to function there first of all as the *not-yet* counterpart of Yhwh. See further Paul Ricoeur, 'Exodus 3:14 – From Interpretation to Translation', in P. Ricoeur and A. LaCocque, *Thinking Biblically: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies* (trans. D. Pellauer; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 331-361; den Hertog, *The Other Face of God*, p. 110.

Hos. 12.10). The sending of Moses to the Israelites and with it his prophetic office are connected with a new name, Ehyeh, which is put forward as the very heart of the divine name. It is within this perspective that the priority of its human counterpart, 'Yhwh', over all other divine names is founded".³⁹ Therefore, the divine name by means of personal pronouns its rendering as 'the Present One' and, seen in this way, says der Hertog, 'Yhwh is not equated with Being', as often seems to be supposed, but he rather claims this for himself.⁴⁰

Therefore, according to den Hertog, the I-morpheme, the initial '(e) of 'ehye, or, in other words, the I-form of the verb, whereas the predicate – what is said about the subject – is represented by the relative particle 'asher (thus 'who' / 'what'). If we focus, says der Hertog, on what this says about the subject, we can quote the general remark of Lacan that the I-shifter (pronominal form) 'designates the subject of the enunciation but does not signify him'⁴¹ and *this* is a mode of revelation of the Real. Thus, certain concepts of Lacan, especially those related to the category of the Real, 'the metaphor of the subject' (*la métaphore*

³⁹ den Hertog, *The Other Face of God*, p. 130.

⁴⁰ Ibidem, p. 291: "what in the Bible is called Yhwh is called by the Greek philosophers, by Plato, the Be-ing'. (...) This applies even to Philo of Alexandria". Related to both variants is the rendering of the divine name as 'the Self-Being' or 'Self-Existent'.

⁴¹ Jacques Lacan, *Écrits* (Paris: Seuil, 1966), *The First Complete Edition in English* (trans. B. Fink et al.; New York: Norton, 2006) p. 800; den Hertog, *The Other Face of God*, pp. 301-302: "The divine statement refers to the one who is speaking but does not say something definite about him. As for Exod. 3.14a, Lacan himself has hinted in this direction. He can paraphrase the divine statement as 'I am what I is', or even as: 'I am what is the I' (S 16: 11 December 1968). From the context ('the truth speaks "I" [je]') it is clear that this I is not the ego, the I of common self-understanding. Many years earlier in his seminar he had already pointed to the fleeting, elusive nature of the I of Exod. 3.14 (S 3: 20 June 1956 / 1993, pp. 324-25 [F])".

du sujet), or the Lacan's description of the gaze (*le regard*), can narrow the interpretive gap between the notions of subject and the Other as a place at Exod. 3.14a. The divine name establishes itself at the place of a gap, a symbolic lack and indicates the irreducibility of what is at stake. Moses has barred his gaze by concealing his face, the voice of God goes on and strikingly starts by telling what he has *seen*.⁴² The notion of lack (*manque*) plays a crucial role in the theory of Lacan. The notion 'lack' makes clear that the subject is of a different order than that of things. Being inspired by that of *manque d'être* of Sartre as characteristic of human being, something connected with the reality of desire, Lacan himself proposed the neologism 'want-to-be'. This is the possible absence as a fundamental loss to the Other, the subject makes itself a complement to the lack of the Other and thus irreplaceable.⁴³ In conclusion, says den Hertog, Lacan as well as others suggest that there is a big difference between the original meaning of the divine statement of Exod. 3.14a (an unexpected, surprising event, the irruption of another I) and its later metaphysical interpretation (eternal being). The introduction of the divine name involves a change in the nature of the Real: "*By the introduction of the subject metaphor, the*

⁴² den Hertog, *The Other Face of God*, p. 304, pp. 318-319. In this connection the statement of Lacan is noteworthy that 'the gods are a mode of revelation of the Real' ('*Les dieux, c'est un mode de révélation du réel*'; S 8: 30 November 1959), or in other terms: 'the gods belong to the Real' ('*les dieux sont du réel*'; S 8: 21 December 1960). If, the Real is a limit-concept (*Grenzbegriff*), thus on the border of what can be expressed, by contrast, the term 'reality' is reserved by Lacanians for what has been embedded in the Symbolic.

⁴³ See Anthony Wilden, *The Language of the Self: The Function of Language in Psychoanalysis by Jacques Lacan, Translated with Notes and Commentary* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1968), p. 131. In that case the context indicates which lacks are meant: the lack that the disappearance of the subject would entail and the lack of the Other (that is, the fact that the Other cannot found itself).

Real also acquires, as it were, a human face” (the personal and anthropomorphic character of God, his ‘incarnation’). This is the reinterpretation of the divine name Yhwh, by deriving it from *’Ehye*, a first-person verb form.⁴⁴

Bogdan Bucur argues that “scholars have generally failed to adequately distinguish the christological exegesis of the burning bush episode – the equation of Christ with the Ὁ ὢν of Exodus 3:14”.⁴⁵ Under the sign of the phrase “*Jesus on Sinai, Moses on Tabor*” Bucur rests on an identification of the theophanic subject of Sinai/Horeb with that of Tabor.⁴⁶ Recognizing the invocation of Ὁ ὢν at Exod 3:14 to justify the use of the non-biblical term οὐσία, he goes on ascribing the Ὁ ὢν to the Son, thus following to the patristic theology. Indeed, to the Ps-Clementine Homilies and Clement of Alexandria and for Irenaeus or Tertullian, the Face of God is the Son. Withal, in the same time, he delimits himself of both McGuckin’s typological interpretation of Sinai’s theophany and Orlov’s prophetic Christology. Bucur’s choice for the interpretation of the Transfiguration as a “vision of a vision” (a vision granted to Moses and Elijah,

⁴⁴ den Hertog, *The Other Face of God*, p. 321. Moses will go and represent Yhwh (Exod 3:7-12), but Yhwh attaches Aaron to Moses (4:14). The relationship between Moses and Aaron in terms of the relationship between God and prophet. In the text, ‘he shall be for you as (a) mouth’ is in line with ‘he shall speak for you to the people’ (Exod. 4.16a); and ‘you, you shall be for him as (a) god’ with ‘you shall speak to him and put the words in his mouth’ (4.15a). In this context the word ‘god’ indicates that Moses should be understood as a substitute for God, in a sense his embodiment. The signifier substituted remains present through a metonymic connection (Yhwh as a Subject Metaphor).

⁴⁵ Bogdan Gabriel Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned. Christophanic Exegesis and the Making of a Christian Bible* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2019), p. 71.

⁴⁶ Michel van Parys, “De l’Horeb au Thabor: Le Christ transfiguré dans les homélies byzantines” *Irénikon* 80 (2007), pp. 235-266.

witnessed by the disciples⁴⁷) is the Matthean text⁴⁸, which he says “is justified by its being the only account among the Synoptics which explicitly links the Transfiguration to the burning bush scene, by calling it a “vision” (ὄραμα, Matt 17:9; cf. Exod 3:3, τὸ ὄραμα τὸ μέγα)”.⁴⁹ Using a large number of patristic testimonies, father Bucur emphasizes that “it is quite obvious that we are not dealing with a marginal strand of interpretation”, and early Christians appropriated the Scriptures of Israel as “Old Testament” and, therefore, “Tabor is not ‘foreshadowed’ by Sinai, and Christ is not signified typologically, but straightforwardly ‘identified’ with the ‘Lord’ in the Old Testament narrative” and “Moses experienced a real encounter with the Logos-to-be-incarnate, not as somehow ‘prefigured’ or ‘foreshadowed’, but as present in the bush”.⁵⁰ Along with “typological interpretation of Sinai’s theophany” there is also the problem of “prophetic Christology”. Here, Mark is the one who is correcting an older prophetic Christology, which presented Jesus as a new Moses and a new Elisha. According to Goulder “Mark himself rejected any prophet-like-Moses Christology” by removing the *‘radiant face motif’* but, doing so, says McGuckin, he “has effectively removed the last lingering vestiges of prophetic Christology from the story and pointed us quite clearly in the Christological di-

⁴⁷ Andreas Andreopoulos, *Metamorphosis: The Transfiguration in Byzantine Theology and Iconography* (Crestwood, NY: Saint Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2005), p. 73, notes the “mutual recognition” between the Prophets and the Apostles and he sees “the Transfiguration as a dynamic field of recognition”.

⁴⁸ Bogdan Gabriel Bucur, “Matt 17:1-9 as a vision of a vision: A neglected strand in the patristic reception of the transfiguration account” *Neotestamentica* 44 (2010), pp. 15-30 and “Sinai, Zion, and Tabor: An Entry into the Christian Bible,” *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 4 (2010), pp. 33-52.

⁴⁹ Bogdan Gabriel Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned. Christophanic Exegesis*, p. 120.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 136-137, 120.

rection subsequently explicated by the patristic church”.⁵¹ For our purpose into this study, it is exactly the radiant face motif that we are looking for it. Also noteworthy, according to Bogdan Bucur, is that in Exod 33 dialogue, the terms of “glory” and “face” seem to be used interchangeably: “Show me your glory! You cannot see my face!”⁵² Here, Father Bogdan disputes Orlov’s statement, for which “all four accounts, Exod 33:18–23, Ps 17:15, 1 Enoch 14, and 2 Enoch 39:3-6, represent a single tradition in which the divine Face serves as the *terminus technicus* for the designation of the Lord’s anthropomorphic extent.”⁵³ Calling upon Pre-Nicene theology (for Clement, Irenaeus or Tertullian – the Face of God is the Son), he concludes correctly: “The ‘Face of God’ is undoubtedly a theme of already great prominence in the apocalyptic literature of Second Temple Judaism. With the advent of Christianity, its importance was amplified

⁵¹ Michael D. Goulder, “Elijah with Moses, or a Rift in the Pre-Markan Lute,” in *Christology, Controversy and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole*, ed. D. G. Horrell and C. M. Tuckett (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 193-208, here p. 203; and John McGuckin, *The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition* (New York: Edwin Mellen, 1986), p. 18; according to Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned. Christophanic Exegesis*, p. 121.

⁵² Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned. Christophanic Exegesis*, p. 122: A very similar juxtaposition of the two terms occurs in Ps 16 (17), p. 15, where the experience of the faithful seems to be patterned onto that of Moses: “I shall appear to your face (ὀφθῆσομαι τῷ προσώπῳ σου) in righteousness: I shall be fed when your glory appears (ἐν τῷ ὀφθῆναι τὴν δόξαν σου)”. The Hebrew (Ps 17:15) juxtaposes “your face” not with “your glory” but with “your form” (תְּצַפֵּן / תְּצַנְנֵנִי).

⁵³ Orlov, *Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 282. Orlov, “Exodus 33 on God’s Face: A Lesson From the Enochic Tradition”. Also, according to Nathaniel Deutsch (*Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity* [Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1999], p. 43), at least one Merkabah passage (pp. 396–397) “explicitly identifies Metatron as the hypostatic face of God,” so that “the title *sar hapanim*... is better understood as ‘prince who is the face [of God].’” Cf., Bogdan Gabriel Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned. Christophanic Exegesis*, pp. 123-124.

even more. Indeed, for early Christian writers the Face of God is more than 'the radiant façade of God's anthropomorphic extent,' more than a code-expression for 'a vision of the enthroned Glory,' and is even more specifically defined than the hypostatic 'Face' of some later Hekhalot traditions: it is the Logos or Son of God, Jesus Christ".⁵⁴ This represents a major contribution that clarifies much of the exegesis of the OT theophanies in the light of a Christian theology⁵⁵ framework and not only within Jewish exegetical thinking. In this way, he is linking the abiding mystery of "I am", the theology of "divine energies"⁵⁶ and "Face theophany" a theophany that both reveals and conceals.

Gospel of Matthew applies the symbolism of luminous *panim*/face to Jesus. In this text the luminous image, could stand behind the symbolism of Jesus' luminous face in the transfiguration accounts in close connection with pauline text about "Christ as the image of the invisible God" (Colossians 1:15) and the theophanic paradigm of *Kavod* (Hebrews 12:18-29). Firstly, the symbolism of Jesus' Luminous Face is connected with the notion of image or *iqonin*. But, the reference to his glorious

⁵⁴ Ibidem, p. 123.

⁵⁵ For theophanies as christophanies, see: Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1965), pp. 14-23; Brian E. Daley, "Divine Transcendence and Human Transformation" *Studia Patristica* 32 (1997), pp. 87-95, p. 89: "the Incarnation of the Word as the culmination of the theophanies of sacred history - all acts of self-revelation by a single divine Son"; Matthew Thiessen, "'The Rock Was Christ': The Fluidity of Christ's Body in 1 Corinthians 10.4" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 36 (2013), pp. 103-126; Dragoş Andrei Giulea, *Pre-Nicene Christology in Paschal Contexts: The Case of the Noetic Divine Anthropos* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 23-24: "This hermeneutical strategy is part of an early Christian exegetical method which may be called 'Bible re-written through Christological lens,' since Melito identifies Yahweh with Christ and interprets all the Old Testament narratives about Yahweh in Christological terms."

⁵⁶ See David Bradshaw, "The Divine Glory and the Divine Energies" *Faith and Philosophy* 23 (2006), pp. 279-298.

tselem or *iqonin*, has an important feature - indicating that Jesus' face relates not to Moses' but to God's countenance. "Vested" with glory, Moses, as he descended Mt Sinai, he "wore" the light on his face, instead Christ is the Light. The verb μεταμορφώω, employed by Mark and Matthew, also occurs in several Pauline passages, including 2 Cor 3:18, where Paul anticipates the believer's metamorphosis: "*all of us, with unveiled faces, seeing the glory of the Lord as though reflected in a mirror, are being transformed (μεταμορφούμεθα) into the same image from one degree of glory to another (ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν); for this comes from the Lord, the Spirit.*" According to many scholars was steeped in hellenistic terminology and experience: transfiguration by vision. There is no other Pauline text which so clearly reveals his deepest experience and - according to some - his non-Jewish mode of thinking.⁵⁷ But, here, Paul has suffused a Greco-Roman motif of metamorphosis with a midrashic development of the Moses story of Exodus 34 and with an allusion to Genesis 1.⁵⁸ This metamorphosis is thus achieved through

⁵⁷ W. C. van Unnik, "With Unveiled Face': An Exegesis of 2 Corinthians iii 12-18," *NovT* 6 (1963-64), pp. 153-169, reprinted, *Sparsa collecta: The Collected Essays of W. C. van Unnik: Part One* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), pp. 194-210, for here p. 195; Duane A. Garrett, "Veiled Hearts: The Translation and Interpretation of 2 Corinthians 3," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 53/4 (December 2010), pp. 729-772.

⁵⁸ A. Fitzmyer, SJ. "Glory Reflected on the Face of Christ (2 Cor 3:7-4:6) and a Palestinian Jewish Motif" *Theological Studies* 42.4 (1981), pp. 630-644, here p. 639. With a sort of *Qal va-homer* (קל וחומר, literally 'light and heavy' principle of exegesis - *a minori ad maius*) argument, according to Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Paul begins to contrast the "splendor" or "glory" (*doxa*) which attended the giving of the law to Moses with the glory attending the giving of the Spirit: "*The veil is lifted or removed only through Christ (3:14). (b) Playing on the idea of Moses' removal of the veil whenever he would turn to 'the Lord' (viz., Yahweh, Exod 34:34-35), Paul bluntly says, 'But when one turns to the Lord, the veil is removed' (3:17).*" Paul affirms that as a result of the Christ-event the per-

son who puts faith in Christ Jesus is gradually “transformed” (*metamorphoumetha*) by degrees of glory reflected on and from the face of Christ. This effect of the Christ-event has been associated with the “new creation” in Pauline theology. This sublime theology of the glory of the creator-God reflected on the face of Christ makes him declare that “Paul’s mode of argumentation has sometimes been called ‘rabbinic logic’, and has been compared loosely to the principle of *gězērāh šāwāh* or ‘inference by analogy.’” (Fitzmyer, “Glory Reflected on the Face of Christ”, pp. 634, 638). Paul alludes to Gen 1:3, as he paraphrases, “Let light shine out of darkness,” and refers to the creator as the source of the *doxa* that shines on the face of Christ is thus the *eikōn*, the “likeness” of the creator, and in turn reflects the same *doxa* on the faces of those who turn to him, with unveiled faces. As one ray of glory after another is thus reflected first on the face of Christ and then on the face of the Christian. All this comes from the glory of the Father, who first brought forth light from darkness. The intermediary is now Christ, the image of the Father, the creator-God (Fitzmyer, “Glory Reflected on the Face of Christ”, p. 643). See, also, William R. Baker, “Did the Glory of Moses’ face Fade? A Reexamination of *καρταργέω* in 2 Corinthians 3:7-18” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 10.1 (2000), pp. 1-15. On various aspects of Talmudic logic and methodology see: Yoram Hazony, *The Philosophy of Hebrew Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), especially “Truth and Being in the Hebrew Bible” 193-218; Louis Jacobs, “The ‘qal va-ḥomer’ Argument in the Old Testament” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* Vol. 35, No. 2 (1972), pp. 221-227; Adolf Schwarz, *Der Hermeneutische Syllogismus in Der Talmudischen Litteratur: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Logik im Morgenlande* (Vienna: Nabu Press, 2012); Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine Studies in the Literary Transmission Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I Century B.C.E.— IV Century C.E.* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1952), pp. 47-68, reprinted as *Greek in Jewish Palestine/Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: J TSA PRESS, 1994); David Daube, “Alexandrian Methods of Interpretation and the Rabbis,” in Fischel, H.(ed.), *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature* (New York: Ktav, 1979), pp. 239-264; D. Daube, “Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 22 (1949), pp. 239-264; A. Baumgarten, “Korban and the Pharisaic Paradosis,” *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 16 (1984), pp. 5-17; Adina Moshavi, “Two Types of Argumentation Involving Rhetorical Questions in Biblical Hebrew Dialogue,” *Bib* 90 (2009), pp. 32-46; Samuel A. Meier,

the *doxa kyriou*. This rare terminology of transformation coincides, instead, here with the *Kavod* imagery.⁵⁹ If people convert to Christ, the second Adam, and reflect his glory (2 Cor 3:16, 18; 4:4), they experience a transformation ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, “from one degree of glory to another” (2 Cor 3:18). But, Paul moves beyond the Jewish terminology of the image or likeness of God and the glory of (the second) Adam. In the course of 2 Cor 3-4, the language of image (εἰκῶν) is supplemented with the notion of the ἕσω ἄνθρωπος, the inner man⁶⁰: man’s transformation into the εἰκῶν of the second Adam, the heavenly ἄνθρωπος (1 Cor 15:47-49), results directly in a gradual and

Speaking of Speaking: Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible (VTSup, 46; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), pp. 141-61.

⁵⁹ John McGuckin, *Transfiguration*, pp. 11, 17; Andreas Andreopoulos, *Metamorphosis. The Transfiguration in Byzantine Theology and Iconography* (Crestwood, New York, St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2005), p. 98; Simon Lee, *Jesus’ Transfiguration and the Believers’ Transformation: A Study of the Transfiguration and Its Development in Early Christian Writings* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), p. 95; John Paul Heil, *The Transfiguration of Jesus: Narrative Meaning and Function of Mark 9:2-8, Matt 17:1-8 and Luke 9:28-36* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000), pp. 76-78; Michael Ramsey, *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ*, (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1949), pp. 114-115.

⁶⁰ Hans D. Betz, “The Concept of the ‘Inner Human Being’ (ὁ ἕσω ἄνθρωπος) in the Anthropology of Paul,” *New Testament Studies* 46.3 (2000), pp. 315–341. See also: Geurt Hendrik van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 92-220; Susan Grove Eastman, *Paul and the Person: Reframing Paul’s Anthropology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2017), pp. 85-108; Joel Green, *Body, Soul, and Human Life: The Nature of Humanity in the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008); Craig S. Keener, *The Mind of the Spirit: Paul’s Approach to Transformed Thinking* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016); Kevin J. Vanhoozer, Constantine R. Campbell, and Michael J. Thate, eds. “In Christ” in *Paul: Explorations in Paul’s Theology of Union and Participation* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), pp. 3-37.

progressive renewal of the inner ἄνθρωπος (2 Cor 4:16). Eternal and increasing glory results from man's metamorphosis into the εἰκών of the second Adam.⁶¹ In this way, says van Kooten, "Paul recasts the Jewish terminology of the image of God in terms of a Platonic anthropology".⁶² Thus, we learn from 2 Cor. that this "bearing of the image of the second Adam is not only an eschatological event, but rather involves a transformational process in the present, based on transformation into the image of Christ in his capacity as the heavenly man (2 Cor 3:18-4:4).

Scholars also note connections with Phil 2:6-11 where once again the transformation of believers is surrounded by *Kavod* symbolism.⁶³ So, in Phil 2:6-7 "form" or μορφή equates with

⁶¹ Already in 1 Cor, Paul has designated man as being the "image (εἰκών) and glory (δόξα) of God": εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων (1 Cor 11:7), and has explained that "Just as we have borne the image (εἰκὼν) of the man of dust, we will also bear the image (εἰκὼν) of the man of heaven" (1 Cor 15:49). The outward man is wasting away, whereas only the inner man is being progressively renewed: "Even though our outer man is wasting away, our inner man is being renewed day by day" - εἰ καὶ ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται, ἀλλ' ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν ἀνακαινοῦται ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ (2 Cor 4:16). This progressive renewal of the inner man is synonymous with man's transformation into God's εἰκών, Christ. Christ is portrayed here as Adam, the second Adam that is. The glory of this Christ (2 Cor 3:18, 4:4), thus, is the glory of the second Adam, just as the first Adam was God's image and glory (1 Cor 11:7).

⁶² George H. van Kooten, "Why did Paul include an Exegesis of Moses' Shining Face (Exod 34) in 2 Cor 3? Moses' Strength, Well-being and (Transitory) Glory, according to Philo, Josephus, Paul, and the Corinthian Sophists" in G.J. Brooke, H. Najman and L.T. Stuckenbruck (eds.), *The Significance of Sinai Traditions*, 149-181, here 180. Van Kooten says that Josephus depicts Korah as a sophist rival to Moses and represents him in terms also used in the Corinthian rivalry in which Paul is engaged. For an analysis of 2 Cor 3 in its anti-sophistic setting, see Bruce W. Winter, *Philo and Paul among the Sophists: Alexandrian and Corinthian Responses to a Julio-Claudian Movement* (2nd edition; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2002).

⁶³ L. L. Belleville, *Reflections of Glory: Paul's Polemical Use of the Moses-Doxa Tradition in 2 Corinthians 3:1-18* (JSNTSS 52; Sheffield: Sheffield

both an εἰκών and an οὐσία.⁶⁴ Paul, as we shall see, in describing Christ as being ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ, means to ascribe to him not only the status possessed by the prelapsarian Adam that of being κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ (Gen 1:27).⁶⁵ Paul juxtaposes two cognates of μορφή, as such σύμμορφος and μεταμορφόομαι, with εἰκών in Rom 8:29 (ὅτι οὐς προέγνω καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς) and 2 Cor 3:18 (ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένω προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου Πνεύματος) in such a way as to

Academic Press, 1991), pp. 49-50. Jesus is the divine *Kavod* and, during the time that he emptied himself (Phil 2:7), He continued to retain his divinity entire concealed under the veil of the flesh.

⁶⁴ Plato (*Phaed.* 103e; *Resp.* 381c) and Aristotle (*Met.* 11.1060b; *Phys.* 2.1.193b) employ the term μορφή to denote a principle of being, invisible and immaterial of itself, that corresponds closely to οὐσία. Similarly, Ulrich Wilckens, *Das Neue Testament, übersetzt und kommentiert von Ulrich Wilckens* (7th ed.; Zürich, Einsiedeln, and Köln: Benziger, 1983), p. 704, n. 2, elucidates the phrase ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ in Phil 2:6 by explaining that “for Hellenistic thought, the essence lies in the form”.

⁶⁵ James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (2d ed.; London: SCM, 1989), pp. 114-121 and *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 282-288. The LXX employs μορφή in Dan 3:19 to translate the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew תְּצַלֵּם tselem ‘image’ (and this provide a link between εἰκών and μορφή). The LXX renders “likeness” דְּמוּתָא (*demuth*), however, as ὁμοίωμα, not μορφή. Peter T. O’Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), pp. 263-264, observes that “Adam is nowhere in the LXX or the NT referred to as μορφή θεοῦ”. For the μορφή-εἰκών hypothesis and the anthropological approach to Phil 2:6-7 see, also, Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd, *Where Christology Began: Essays on Philippians 2* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998) and C. A. Wanamaker, “Philippians 2.6–11: Son of God or Adamic Christology,” *NTS* 33 (1987), pp. 187-188.

suggest that he considers μορφή and εἰκών synonymous.⁶⁶ The word εἰκών refers to something substantial, a μορφή to which one can be σύμμορφος or into which one can μεταμορφοῦται: “We are transformed (μεταμορφούμεθα) into the same image” (2 Cor. 3:18) “Until Christ be formed (μορφωθῆ) in you” (Gal. 4:19). The form (μορφή) or visible appearance of God has, also, a theological basis in δόξα concept of the Greek Bible, according to which the glory of God is visibly in the radiance of heavenly light. So, if the sign of the humanity of Jesus is the μορφή δούλου, the the μορφή θεοῦ is equivalent to the δόξα Κυρίου. Paul means to indentify Christ as a visible manifestation of divine glory. Christ must refer in John 17:5 (“Now, Father, glorify me together with yourself, with the glory which I had with you before the world was”) to uncreated glory, that is, the essential glory of the deity. Phil 2:6-7 indicates that Christ exists both in the “form of a God” and in the “form of a servant”. Christ as equal to the Father, refer to the “form of God Μορφή itself (Mark 16:12) and μόρφωσις (2 Tim 3:5), for instance, appear in the NT in the sense of “external appearance,”⁶⁷ while μεταμορφώω in Matt 17:2 and Mark 9:2 refers to the transfiguration precisely of Christ’s appearance (*panim*). Thus, Philipians 2:6–7 refer to the “form of a servant,” i.e. Christ’s human nature (μορφή in the related sense of “bearing”), and the “form of God,” is the second remarks, which portray Christ as equal to the Father. Dennis W. Jowers says that the μορφή = οὐσία hy-

⁶⁶ This position is criticized by Dave Steenburg, “The Case against the Synonymy of *Morphē* and *Eikōn*,” *JSNT* 34 (1988), pp. 77-86.

⁶⁷ Joseph Fitzmeyer, *Tobit. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2003), p. 114: “The word μορφή denotes ‘outward form, appearance,’ and describes the way that Tobit was seen and regarded by others”. It seems, accordingly, that Tob 1:13 does supply a precedent for the employment of μορφή in the sense of external form, appearance.

pothesis thus “appears to enjoy substantial support among scholars of quite diverse ideological stripes” and, this μορφή = οὐσία construal is “the only thoroughgoing antidoceticist interpretation”.⁶⁸

Adam’s luminosity in the Garden and Christ’s luminosity at Mount Tabor serve for Macarian “glory” christology. Adam and Eve before the Fall were clothed (ἐνδεδυμένοι) with God’s glory in place on clothing (II.12.8).⁶⁹ The Second Adam put on the body of the first Adam in order to restore the lost clothes of the divine light, which it is acquired at the eschatological resurrection, manifested in the bodies of saints. In Macarian writings the Adam-Christ dichotomy includes a third important element, the glorious face of Moses as a prototype (τὸν τύπον: II.5.10-11) for the future glory (ἀληθινῆς δόξης, II.47.1) of Christ at the Transfiguration.⁷⁰ Moses’ glorious *face* is the glorious *garment* of Adam.⁷¹ The description of Moses’ face shining (ἰῆε – *qeren*, ‘to

⁶⁸ Dennis W. Jowers, “The Meaning of ΜΟΡΦΗ in Philippians 2:6-7”, *JETS* 49/4 (2006), pp. 739-766, here pp. 763, 765. Sarah Coakley, *Powers and Submissions: Spirituality, Philosophy, and Gender* (Challenges in Contemporary Theology; Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), p. 8, warns us: “all commentators (or nearly all) concur that it is an anachronism to see Paul or his source expressing anything like the ‘two nature’ Christology of later ‘orthodoxy.’”

⁶⁹ Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, Tr. G.A. Maloney, S. J. (New York: Paulist Press, 1992), p. 100.

⁷⁰ Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, pp. 74, 232. The Homily II.20 first retells the Gospel story about the woman who was cured of the blood flow by touching the garment of the Lord and, then, describes Christ as the true physician of human nature, who adorn it with the garments of his grace (p. 151).

⁷¹ Crispin Fletcher-Louis, “4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christianity” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3:3 (1996), pp. 236-252; On the luminosity of the Moses face, see: M. Haran, *The Shining of Moses’s Face: A Case Study in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography* [Ex 34:29–35; Ps 69:32; Hab 3:4] In *The Shelter of Elyon* (Sheffield, 1984) (JSOT 31), pp. 159-173; W.

send out rays') has different interpretation revealed by the meanings of the verb *qeren* or *qaran* ('ray of light').⁷² A very few distinctive visionaries who were "predestined to encounter their heavenly counterparts and to behold the Divine Face like their own reflection in a mirror".⁷³ Moses too finds out that his luminous face is a reflection of the glorious face of the deity.⁷⁴

2 From Personhood to *Panim* – the face is the “essence of a person”

According to saint Gregory Palamas, man is in a certain sense higher than the angels, greater than them, created according to the image and likeness of God. Man's corporeity⁷⁵ indicates that

Propp, "The Skin of Moses' Face – Transfigured or Disfigured?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987), pp. 375-386; S.L. Sanders, "Old Light on Moses' Shining Face", *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2002), pp. 400-406; J.M. Philpot, "Exodus 34:29-35 and Moses' Shining Face," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 23 (2013), pp. 1-11.

⁷² וְנֹפֶה רֹעַ נֹרָאָה ("the skin of his face shone") and הַקֹּסֶם ("veil") in Exod 34:29-35.

⁷³ In 2 *Enoch* the motif of the luminous face of the seer was transferred for the first time to the seventh antediluvian patriarch. The text tells that the vision of the divine Face had dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light.

⁷⁴ The מַסְכָּה means veil/scarf, "a covering" or "robe" and derives from סָחַ or סָה, a *hapax legomenon* in Gen 49:11, where it refers to a "robe": "He washes his garments in wine, his robes in the blood of grapes".

⁷⁵ There is a contemporary retrieval of corporeality and the body had been seen as more deeply implicated in the transformation of the soul. Reuben Demetrios Harper, "Becoming Homotheos: St. Gregory Palamas' Eschatology of Body", Constantinos Athanasopoulos (ed.), *Triune God: Incomprehensible But Knowable-The Philosophical and Theological Significance of St Gregory Palamas for Contemporary Philosophy and Theology* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015), pp. 235-247; Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women,*

he is more perfectly in the Image of God than the angels.⁷⁶ The angels are given to be only reflections of light, but man is predestined to become God.⁷⁷ A created incarnate spirit, man is placed between the spirituality of the angels and the carnal corporeality of this world. St. Gregory of Palamas saw in this situation the primacy of man over the angels. The angels are

and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity (London: Faber & Faber, 1989), pp. 222, 236-237. Firstly, Bultmann gives pride of place to Pauline theology, interprets Pauline theology as anthropology, and makes *sōma* the key to that anthropology, reducing theology to anthropology. Paul uses *sōma* in the sense of the human person as a whole: “The most comprehensive term which Paul uses to characterize man’s existence by *sōma*”, cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (New York, 1951), pp. 192, 194. J. A. T. Robinson’s monography *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology* (London, 1952) is adopting and elaborating Bultmann’s holistic definition of *sōma*. The meaning of *sōma* may even be dematerialized completely - as “Self, Person”, but this ‘metonymy’ may lead to confusion, however, because Paul does not limit man to his physical body. Thus *sōma* is more completely identifiable with the personality than *sarx*, *pneuma*, or *psyche*, which also can alternate with personal pronouns. See, also: Robert H.Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 29, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 3-8, 241: “Idealistic commentators have escaped the scandal of physical resurrection by Hellenizing *sōma* as form.”

⁷⁶ Saint Gregory Palamas, *The one Hundred and Fifty Chapters*, a critical edition, translation and study by Robert E. Sinkewicz, C.S.B. (Toronto: Pontifical Institute Of Mediaeval Studies, 1988), pp. 126-127, Cap. 39: “*The intellectual and rational nature of the soul, alone possessing mind and word and life-giving spirit, has alone been created more in the image of God than the incorporeal angels*” [Ἡ νοερά καὶ λογικὴ φύσις τῆς ψυχῆς, μόνη νου ἔχουσα καὶ λόγον καὶ πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν, μόνη καὶ τῶν ἀσωμάτων ἀγγέλων μάλλον κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ παρ’ αὐτοῦ δεδημιούργηται].

⁷⁷ Nikolai Gavryushin, “The Concept of Personality in Russian Theological Literature”, *Studies in East European Thought* Vol. 61, No. 2/3, *The Discourse of Personality in the Russian Intellectual Tradition* (Aug., 2009), pp. 135-144; Kern, K, *Antropologiya sv. Grigoriya Palamy* (Paris, 1950).

“the second lights”, reflecting the light of God. Man is transmuted into light and illumines the world.⁷⁸ According to Orthodox scholar Panayiotis Nellas, even “dust” is no longer simply “matter”, but “carries in actual fact the principle and the form of man”.⁷⁹ On the other hand, says Evdochimov, “*Man can revive the flame of love or the fire of Gehenna*” and he can “*extinguish the Spirit* (1 Thess. 5, 19), cause the source of his life to dry up, have carnal thoughts and reduce himself to animal flesh, the prey of death and hell”.⁸⁰ After the Fall, says Father Stăniloae, the breath of the Spirit “no longer blows freely within them”, because now they are “only flesh instead of life itself.”⁸¹ The

⁷⁸ For the link between the primordial luminosity of Adam’s garments, baptismal garments and the luminosity of ascetic holy man, see: Bogdan Gabriel Bucur, *Scripture Re-envisioned: Christophanic Exegesis and the Making of a Christian Bible* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2019), pp. 24-26; Samuel Rubenson, “Transformative Light and Luminous Traditions in Early Christian Mysticism and Monasticism,” *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift* 90 (2014), pp. 179-187. Rubenson brings us back to the Desert Fathers becoming fire and radiant light and, for him, the ascent to light is linked to a descent of light; and Georges Habra, *La Transfiguration selon les Pères grecs* (The Transfiguration According to the Greek Fathers) (Paris: Éditions SOS, 1973; 3rd ed. Éditions du Jubilé, 2017).

⁷⁹ Panayiotis Nellas, *Deification in Christ: The Nature of the Human Person*, trans. Norman Russell (New York: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1987), p. 65.

⁸⁰ Paul Evdokimov, *The Struggle with God* [original French Edition, *Les âges de la vie spirituel*], Translated by Sister Gertrude, S.P. (Glen Rock, New Jersey: Paulist Press, Paulist Fathers, 1966), pp. 131-133.

⁸¹ Dumitru Stăniloae, *The Experience of God. Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, Volume 5. The Sanctifying Mysteries*, translated and edited by Ioan Ioniță and Robert Barringer, foreword by Alkiviadis C. Calivas (Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2012), pp. 27, 29. Thus, the Lord clothed Adam and Eve not with garments of skins but with garments of glory. ‘Garments of light (‘ō r)’ refers to the clothes of the first man, which were like a torch [shedding radiance], broad at the bottom and narrow at the top. See, Alexander Toepel, “When Did Adam Wear the Garments of Light?,” *JJS* 61 [2010], pp. 62-71. The homopho-

heavenly image was illumined by the divine energies, and the ineffable light of the Holy Spirit was dwelling within us, making God a tangible reality in our souls. A person who is complete in this way is a “bearer” of the divine image, a bearer of God Himself and both his soul and his body have become the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit. When Adam fell, he separated himself from the Spirit, and thereby lost God, and died a spiritual death. The light drained from his body, and he was filled with darkness and he ‘was suddenly deformed, disfigured, ugly, and vile’. And thus God said to him: Adam, where are you? (Gen 3.9). At this point, only the “Here am!” of the response can raise the appeal to the level of a “You are there!”⁸² But, as the Father Archimandrite Aimilianos reveals to us, God himself comes in search of the fallen man: “*With the glorious light of His countenance, God searches the house of paradise for the lost coin, which bears His sovereign image (cf. Lk 15.8)*”.⁸³

ny between עור (“skins”) and אור (“light”) was, also, exploited, interpreting the luminous garment as the gift of the Holy Spirit, lost in Eden, recovered in Christian baptism, and brought to full expression in the eschaton.

⁸² Jean-Luc Marion “The Voice without Name: Homage to Levinas” in Jeffrey Bloechl (ed.), *The Face of the Other and the Trace of God. Essays on the Philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas* (Fordham University Press: New York, 2000), pp. 224-242, here p. 233. In this volume the contributors remind us of “the epiphany of the face” when “nothing can remain hidden; everything must be brought to presence”. Certainly, this is “the initiative of an Other, which is the opposite of an attempt to consider oneself the origin” (Bloechl, *The Face of the Other and the Trace of God*, pp. 191, 206). Therefore, during the mystic experiences, this “desire for his presence” is fulfilled sometimes as “the epiphany of His face” and the essentially veiled presence of God is revealed as divine light radiating from his face.

⁸³ Archimandrite Aimilianos of Simonopetra, *The Way of the Spirit. Reflections on Life in God*; Preface: Archimandrite Elisiaos Abbot of the Sacred Monastery of Simonopetra, Mt. Athos; Translation, introduc-

On the day that Adam fell, God appeared, walking in paradise (Gen 3.8), and when He saw Adam, He wept, and said: *“I created you as a being of pure light, and now you are all darkness! I, God, your creator, am Light; My essence is light, My energy is light, and in My light I bathed and clothed you, what, then, is this darkness that now enshrouds you?”*.⁸⁴ These assertions remind us of Mac-

tion: m. Maximos Simonopetrites [Nicholas Conostas] (Indiktos: Athens, 2009), p. 236.

⁸⁴ Aimilianos of Simonopetra, *The Way of the Spirit*, pp. 235-236. See also, Maximos Conostas, “Transfigured in the Night: The Life and Teachings of Elder Aimilianos of Simonopetra”, part 2, *The Orthodox Word* 296 (2014), pp. 114-151, for here pp. 124-126. elder’s disciple and successor, Archimandrite Elisaios: “*At that monastery (i.e., St. Bessarion), Fr. Aimilianos was granted arevelation of the monastic life, or rather, a profound mystical experience of the light of God, which inundated him at the hour of the Liturgy. Henceforth his every Divine Liturgy, prepared for by a long vigil, was a sublime experience of God’s glory, a mystagogy, reminiscent of the decisive revelatory events that sealed the history of the people of Israel. (He describes this in a nebulous fashion in one of his addresses.) As a result, he resolutely made up his mind to partake of the ascetic tradition rather than to assume ecclesiastical duties in the world*”, Apud Archimandrite Elisaios, “The Spiritual Tradition of Simonopetra” in *Mount Athos The Sacred Bridge: The Spirituality of The Holy Mountain*, ed. Dimitri Conomosand Graham Speake (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2005), p. 189, according to M. Conostas, “The Life and Teachings of Elder Aimilianos of Simonopetra”, p. 124. A more detailed description of what happened is provided by the elder himself, in a story he told before a large public audience in 1983. The story is allegedly about a “certain monk he once knew,” although it is in fact an account of the mystical experience that forms the central chapter in the elder’s spiritual biography: “it was as if everything around him – even the darkness outside – had become light! He looked to see where such light might be coming from, but it was coming from nowhere. The darkness, which has no existence of its own, had become light, although his heart remained in the dark. And when he turned around, he saw that his cell had also become light! He examined the lamp to see if the light was coming from there, but that one, small oil lamp could not become light itself, neither could it make all things light! (...) He did not know how he opened the door and entered the church, or when he had vested; he did not know when the other monks arrived, or when

arian theology.⁸⁵ The motif of the garments of darkness bestowed by Satan on the first humans brings us to the connection between the Macarian Homilies and the Targumic traditions.⁸⁶ To this interpretation, father Stăniloae comes to add that the Absolute Himself has hidden its personal face from man. The image as inner impulse, as tendency toward God, and the features of it have remained but have been, in part, distorted, just as in a “*caricature the facial elements*” remain but are distorted. “Thus, the image as aspiration toward the absolute has been

the Liturgy began. What exactly happened he didn’t know. Gone was the ordinary connection of things, and he knew only that he was standing before the altar, before the invisibly present God, celebrating the Liturgy. And striking, as it were, the keys of both his heart and the altar, his voice resounded above, to the altar beyond the heavens. The Liturgy continued. The Gospel was read. The light was no longer all around him, but had built its nest within his heart. The Liturgy ended, but the song that had begun in his heart was endless. In his ecstasy, he saw that heaven and earth sing this prayer without ceasing, and that the monk truly lives only when he is animated by it. For this to happen, he needs only to cease living for himself” - Monk Maximos Simonopetrites, “Charisma and Institution at an Athonite Cloister: Historical Developments and Future Prospects,” in *Friends of Mount Athos Annual Report 2007*, pp. 21-23; according to M. Conostas, “The Life and Teachings of Elder Aimilianos of Simonopetra”, pp. 125-126.

⁸⁵ Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, pp. 192-193: “After such good things, what evils you have chosen! After such glory, what shame you now bear! What darkness are you now! What ugly form you are! What corruption! From such light, what darkness has covered you!”.

⁸⁶ Andrei Orlov, “Vested with Adam’s Glory: Moses as the luminous counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Macarian homilies”, *Christian Orient*, Vol. 4, No. 10 (2006), pp. 498-513, here p. 508, n. 41, reprinted in Andrei A. Orlov, ed. *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*. Leiden: Brill, 2007, pp. 327-343. See, also, Nicholas Meyer, *Adam’s Dust and Adam’s Glory in the Hodayot and the Letters of Paul. Rethinking Anthropogony and Theology* (Novum Testamentum, Supplements, Volume: 168; Brill, 2016).

preserved, but the absolute has hidden its personal face from man, and consequently, the image in man has lost its luminous quality and its clarity”.⁸⁷ Let’s keep that in mind– the link between ‘personal face’ and ‘image luminosity’. According to Father Stăniloae the incorruptibility and immortality of man was linked to participation to God’s uncreated light: “the Holy Fathers are correct when they attribute to man before the Fall the condition of one who was incorruptible, immortal, and radiant in God’s light”.⁸⁸ He remembers a romanian legend saying that

⁸⁷ Dumitru Stăniloae, *The Experience of God. Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, Volume 2. The World: Creation and Deification*, translated and edited by Ioan Ioniță and Robert Barringer, preface by Ion Bria (Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2000), p. 90. Image that has been weakened, although it is never totally lost. Hence Christ is said to have reestablished the image or to have found the image that was lost, but it is not said that he created it again. Paul Ladouceur, “The Experience of God as Light in the Orthodox Tradition”, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 28:2 (2019), pp. 165-185. The experience of God as interior or spiritual light, frequently called “Uncreated Light,” can be interpreted in different ways. The experience of the Divine Light is itself a *theosis*, we become bearers of Light. St. Paul employs these senses of light when he tells the Ephesians that “once you were darkness, but now you are light in the Lord; walk as children of light (for the fruit of light is found in all that is good and right and true),” and he exhorts them to receive the light or truth of Christ: “Awake, O sleeper, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give you light” (Eph 5.8-9; 14).

⁸⁸ Dumitru Stăniloae, *The Experience of God. Volume 2. The World: Creation and Deification*, p. 109. John Behr, “The Glory of God: A Living Human Being”, in Elie Ayroulet, ed., *Saint Irénée et l’Humanité Illuminée* (Paris: Cerf, 2018), pp. 93-116. In Qumran texts we find also the idea of “Humanity as the Glory of God”. The Qumran community believed then, that it was their vocation to fulfil the responsibility originally given to Adam to embody God’s own Glory. Adam was created in the likeness of God’s Glory, being the theophanic presence of the light or of the perfect light of God’s presence. Adam is identified in some way with the Glory occupying God’s throne in Ezekiel 1. The identification is not absolute since Adam is only made *in* (ב) the likeness of God’s Glory. In the Greek version of 3 *Baruch* 4:16, Adam was clothed in the Glory of God before he fell, but he was “stripped of the

in the beginning the earth was transparent, but Cain strove to cover it over so that the corpse of his brother Abel could no longer be seen in it.⁸⁹ He says, “Adams wish to hide from the face of God and escape from communion with him cannot be completely realized, but to a certain extent, it has taken away the transparency that creation and our own being had for God and for that fullness of the riches and love that are possible among humans. In this way the human being has often attained a tormenting solitude like that of Cain.”⁹⁰ Indeed, the guilt and

Glory of God (τῆς δόξης θεοῦ ἐγυμνώθη)” probably implies he had previously *worn* the Glory. This kind of Adam theology lies behind Romans 1:23 and 3:23. An identification of the Glory of God with Adam’s form is probably also intended by the echo of Isaiah 6:1-3 in Genesis 1:26-28. Crispin H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *All The Glory of Adam. Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah; Vol. 42; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2002), pp. 91-93; Alexander Golitzin, “Recovering the ‘Glory of Adam’: ‘Divine Light’ Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Ascetical Literature of Fourth-Century Syro-Mesopotamia” in J. R. Davila, *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St Andrews in 2001* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 275-308. Alon Goshen-Gottstein, “The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature,” *Harvard Theological Review* 87:2 (April 1994), pp. 171-195, speaks of the bodily connotations of *zelem* (“image”) and *demut* (“likeness”) and suggests that “the only meaning of *zelem* in rabbinic literature” (p. 174) is that “the correspondence between man’s body and the divine body is understood to be exact”.

⁸⁹ Dumitru Stăniloae, *The Experience of God. Volume 2. The World*, p. 184.

⁹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 185. The familiar stories of Cain and Abel reveal the character of post-Edenic humanity and the internalisation of transgression. Irenaeus is equally desirous to show that God actively worked to prevent Cain’s sin, as well as encourage him toward repentance after the fact. In this he is inspired by the specific wording of the Septuagintal text of Gen 4.7, which differs from the Masoretic. In the reading of the LXX: “οὐκ ἔάν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, ἤμαρτες; ἡσύχασον· πρὸς σὲ ἡ ἀποστροφή αὐτοῦ, καὶ σὺ ἄρξεις αὐτοῦ. But what has direct value on the consideration of God’s benevolence towards Cain is the Greek ἡσύχασον - ‘be at peace’ or ‘be calm’. There is

shame cause Adam and Eve to hide themselves from the presence (פָּנִים, *panim*) of the Lord God among the trees of the garden (Gen. 3:8b). The word translated “presence” is the word for face. Thus, it is not just his spiritual presence they are hiding from but his physical presence as well — his literal “face.” They can no longer be “face to face” intimacy with God. Theologically, this view of Adam and Eve’s embodiment of a state of righteousness or sin, which Father Stăniloae also hold, reflects the biblical view of personhood.⁹¹ *The important conclusion here is that their bodies reflect their relationship with God and they had to hide from his face.*⁹² The fallen face of Cain in the Garden of Eden illustrates the important role that the face plays in embodying sin. The human body, made in the image of God, is capable of bearing God’s special revelation in the form of his radiant holiness and glory. The Jewish philosopher Philo and the Christian theologian Origen both interpret Israel to mean “the one who sees God”.⁹³ Those who encounter God face to face are

no equivalent command in the Masoretic reading, but for Irenaeus this single word is at the centre of the verse’s theological meaning. Through it he discovers the divine reaction to the envy and malice in Cain’s heart. Irenaeus also employs the verb ἡσυχάζω at 3.19.3, of the Word as ‘quiescent in Christ during the temptation’ (Lamp, *PGL* 608). It is remarkable that Lampe nowhere notes the verb as present in the LXX of Genesis, nor does he mention Irenaeus’ important reading of it. The only other occasions of its usage cited in his lexicon, apart from a myriad of later texts on hesychasm and monastic contemplation, refer to tranquility of life as conducive to prayer; cf. Evagrius, *De oratione* 3; *Apothegmata* PG 65:201C. cf., Steenberg, *Irenaeus on Creation*, p. 198.

⁹¹ John Wilkinson, “The Body in the Old Testament,” *The Evangelical Quarterly* 63.3 (July-Sept. 1991), pp. 195-210.

⁹² Craig G. Bartholomew and Michael W. Goheen, *The Drama of Scripture: Finding Our Place in the Biblical Story* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014), p. 43.

⁹³ C. T. R. Hayward, *Interpretations of the Name Israel in Ancient Judaism and Some Early Christian Writings: From Victorious Athlete to Heavenly Champion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 17. Cornelius

changed internally and externally. Body is capable of being a vessel in which rays of God’s glory shine through. The human body can function as a vessel that reflects God’s holiness and glory. The fallen face of Cain in the Garden of Eden illustrates

den Hertog, *The Other Face of God. ‘I Am that I Am’ Reconsidered* (Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012), p. 219: The participle *ho ōn* in Exod. 3.14 refers only in general terms to the effective presence of God (‘I am *the one who shows himself to be there*’). According to the beginning of the divine discourse in the six chapter of Exodus, says den Hertog, God appeared to the ancestors ‘but my name *Kyrios* I did not disclose to them’ (Exod. 6.3). The niphāl of *yd*, ‘to make oneself known’, has been translated by *dēloō*, ‘disclose’. Interestingly, this verb may mean ‘reveal’ (then the name itself is involved) but also ‘explain’ (then the meaning of the name is concerned). This discourse therefore seems to suggest that according to the translator “either the divine name has not yet been revealed or its meaning has still not been disclosed” (den Hertog, *The Other Face of God*, 201). For ‘divine Face’ interpretation see: Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1988), pp. 329-334. He explains that the great priestly blessing in Num. 6: 23-27 concludes a cycle of priestly instructions to the people of Israel. It opens with an instruction to the Aaronids delivered by Moses, ‘In this manner shall you bless the Israelites’, and then proceeds with the blessing itself: (24) May YHWH bless you and protect you; (25) May YHWH brighten his countenance towards you and show you favour; (26) May YHWH raise his countenance towards you and give you peace. At the conclusion of this blessing, there is a final instruction: ‘And when they shall put my name over the Israelites, I shall bless them’ (v. 27). The same terminology in Ps. 67:1-2 leaves no reasonable doubt that its source is Num. 6: 24-26. In this instance, the psalmist opens his prayer with the invocation, ‘May Elohim show us favour and bless us; may he brighten his countenance among us – *selah*’ and the psalmist calls upon YHWH to ‘raise over us the light of your presence (*se-lāh*. :סְלַח - ‘it-tā-nū - אֲתַנְנוּ - pā-nāw - פָּנֵינוּ - yā-’êr - יָאֵר = *Selah upon us His face and cause to shine* in Ps. 67:1, pā-ne-kā - פָּנֵינוּ - hā-’rāh - הָאֲרָה = *Make Your face Shine* in Ps. 31:16). These and other references to the Priestly Blessing in the Psalter and, particularly, the recurrence of similar language in the Psalter and many biblical genres, suggest that such imagery as ‘shining the face’ in favour, or ‘raising the face’ in beneficence, were widely diffused throughout the culture (Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, pp. 330-331).

the important role that the face plays in embodying sin. Cain embodied his sin in his face. The face of YHWH appears in the narrative as Cain went away “from the presence (or “face” [פָּנִים], *panim*) of the Lord” (Gen. 4:16).⁹⁴ But the Lord questions Cain not just about his internal disposition of anger, but also about his fallen face: “Why are you angry, and why has your face fallen?” (Gen. 4:6).⁹⁵

⁹⁴ Samuel E. Balentine, *The Hidden God: The Hiding of the Face of God in the Old Testament* (Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 45-80. Original word is סָתַר (the verb *sathar* or *saw-thar*, to hide, conceal [Genesis 4:14: וְהָיִיתִי אֶסְתָּר וּמִפְּנֵי הָאָדָמָה: “and from your face I will be hidden, and I will be a fugitive”; Deuteronomy 31:17-18 and 32:20: פְּנֵי יְהוָה אֶסְתָּר וְיִאמַר: “Then He said, I will hide My face”; Job 13:24: וְתַחֲשַׁבְנִי תִסְתִּיר פְּנֵיךָ לְמַדָּה: “Why do You hide Your face”]. Balentine challenges the common impression given by much of biblical scholarship that the hiddenness of God is not always to be understood as a manifestation of divine judgement in response to man’s sinfulness. Particularly in the Psalms, God’s hiding is a subject for lament and protest as innocent suppliants charge that they have done nothing to warrant divine abandonment. These implications of the lament concerning an inexplicable divine hiddenness have thus far received inadequate attention (Balentine, *The Hidden God*, 164-177). To Samuel E. Balentine, *Prayer In The Hebrew Bible. The Drama of Divine-Human Dialogue* (Fortress Press, 1993) a text prayer is a vehicle for theological argument a “Two-way traffic between heaven and earth” (p. 48). For him, this is a bifurcation in theological studies and a matrix of the embedded tradition that itself generates and yields theology – this is the neglected of the subject “prayer” in the theology of the Hebrew Bible as the divine-human relationship, which is ‘fundamentally dialogical’ (pp. 225-246, 261-264) Gerald L. Schroeder, *The Hidden Face of God: How Science Reveals The Ultimate Truth* (New York: The Free Press, 2001) is an intriguing book that claims to find scientific support for theism. Much of Schroeder’s case for the hidden face of God consists of observations of the wonders of nature, “For most of my life I’ve felt a transcendence within nature, some spiritual rumbling” (p. 123).

⁹⁵ Raanan Eichler, “When God Abandoned the Garden of Eden: A Forgotten Reading of Genesis 3:24”, *Vetus Testamentum* 65 (2015), pp. 1-13. Eichler analyzes the biblical writer viewed “the fall of Man” and the ensuing relationship between humans and the divine. When Man and his wife disobeyed Yhwh and ate the forbidden fruit, their deed led not

The sad state our being attained through sin is due to the Fall from its ‘ontological-dialogic relationship with God’. Obviously, the light, have not disappeared totally from creation’s existence. The light has continued to shine in the darkness, but, say Father Stăniloae, the “‘image of God’ in us was only overshadowed and weakened, not totally erased”.⁹⁶ Also, even though, the image in its own reality remains without change, but in its action in its action it is reduced to “ontological silence”.⁹⁷ Only in Christ we become capable of ‘coming before God’, who deems us ‘worthy of seeing Him’ as the ones who are sanctified, by “offering us in Himself in the sight of the Father, especially those who turned

only to their expulsion from the garden but to Yhwh’s self-expulsion as well, to the “fall of God”, who decided that he would go whithersoever they went. This was to keep an eye on his unruly creations. The former point is reinforced in the Eden story itself, which speaks of Yhwh “walking about” in the garden and of Man and his wife hiding from him (3:8-10); the latter by the fact that Yhwh speaks on two separate occasions with Cain (4:6-7, 9-15). Yhwh too is now located outside the garden - Cain’s location as being “in the presence of” Yhwh (4:14, 16), a combination of *אֵת שָׁכַן* (“dwells with”) and *אֵת יָקָר שְׁכִינָתוֹ* (“the glory of his Immanence”). In this reading Yhwh continues to be overtly solicitous as well as wary of Man (see 3:21), going so far as to continue living with him in order to provide him with vital protection (Targumim is thus consonantly identical to the Masoretic Text but differs from it in the vocalization of the single word: the masoretic vocalization of this word is *וַיִּשְׁכַּן*, meaning “he caused to dwell” and targumic renderings is *וַיִּשְׁכַּן*, meaning “he dwelled”). The wording *אֵת יָקָר שְׁכִינָתוֹ* (“he caused the glory of his Immanence to dwell”), literally, “he caused the glory of his Immanence to dwell”, is simply the way in which the Targumim, which tend to avoid applying anthropomorphic language to the Deity, render “dwell” when the subject of the verb is God.

⁹⁶ Dumitru Stăniloae, *The Experience of God. Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, Volume 2*, pp. 189, 186.

⁹⁷ Paul Evdokimov, *L’Orthodoxie* (Collection Bibliothèque théologique, Neuchâtel, Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé. 1959), p. 88, in D. Stăniloae, *The Experience of God. Volume 2. The World*, p. 91.

away from His face due to Adam's disobedience".⁹⁸ Some of the Fathers see the judgment precisely in the fact that those who shaped themselves according to Christ's image "will eternally behold the face of Christ; while the others will eternally behold the face of the devil"⁹⁹ and the face of the devil is the softness of pleasure.¹⁰⁰ From those who on earth 'refused the light of communion', Christ's face is turning away because the darkness, that they have produced, does not allow them to see Christ's glory and 'they feel God's presence not as glory, but as fire'.¹⁰¹ According to the Christian faith, says father Stăniloae, "the sinners in hell exist in the darkness": "*They are blind to the light that is coming to them from another plane. The dimension of person that opens out on the infinite ... transparent of their ultimate personal cause remain hidden from such people*".¹⁰² Is it not more truly a hiding of Christ, who enlightens, and saves when He manifests Himself. Is not Christ veiled, says Father

⁹⁸ St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Adoration in Spirit and Truth* (PG 68:1013D); Dumitru Stăniloae, *The Experience of God. Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, Volume 5. The Sanctifying Mysteries*, translated and edited by Ioan Ioniță and Robert Barringer, foreword by Alkiviadis C. Calivas (Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2012), pp. 97-98.

⁹⁹ St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Homily 14* (PG 77:1081). Dumitru Stăniloae, *The Experience of God. Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, Volume 6. The Fulfillment of Creation (henceforth EG-ODT 6)*, translated and edited by Ioan Ioniță, foreword by Metropolitan KALLISTOS (Ware) of Diokleia (Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2013), p. 183.

¹⁰⁰ *To Thalassius: On Various Questions* 50, PG 90.472B-D; Dumitru Stăniloae, *The Experience of God. Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, Volume 2. The World: Creation and Deification*, translated and edited by Ioan Ioniță and Robert Barringer, preface by Ion Bria (Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2000), pp. 161, 211.

¹⁰¹ Idem, *The Experience of God. Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, Volume 6, The Fulfillment of Creation* (New York: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2013), p. 185.

¹⁰² Idem, *The Experience of God. Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, Volume 2*, p. 162.

Stăniloae, but, “paradoxically, the awareness of Christ’s presence is combined with the inability to see Him in His true reality”.¹⁰³ Unwilling to be a medium for the generous propagation of God’s love, he is totally imprisoned in the hole of solitude and “his subjectivity, grown to monstrous proportions, makes him no longer able to see the reality of others”.¹⁰⁴ Being the victim of a spiritual short circuit he who ‘does not want to enlighten others does not enlighten himself.’¹⁰⁵ In Holy Scripture, remember father Stăniloae, the believer often asks God to not send him away from His face or countenance, or he asks that he might share in the light of His face.¹⁰⁶ Therefore, as St. Macarius describes, for those who fall outside His Kingdom, they will not see each other face to face as they are in reality, but they will only see the ‘masks of others’ because of the completely atrophy of their power of communion.

Here, into the eschatological description of the Christ’s Face, we noticed that the terms of Person, Face and Light become essentially equivalent, through a deconceptualization of concepts. Bring on the Christ’s luminous Face involves, in my opinion, a shift in father Stăniloae theology from *Personhood* to *Panim*. The human face (dogmatic-liturgical-mystical leitmotif) does not send or refer, in his eschatology, to that Greek *prosopon*. The notion of personhood-*prosopon* is revived by the recovery of his biblically-semitic semantics found it into the concept

¹⁰³ Idem, *The Experience of God. Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, Volume 6*, p. 55.

¹⁰⁴ Ibidem, p. 44.

¹⁰⁵ Ibidem, p. 97.

¹⁰⁶ Ibidem, p. 178. The reference texts are from Ps 4:6; 27:9; 31:16; 36:9-10; 44:3; 105:4; Isa 2:5; 60:19; Mic 7:8; Hab 3:4; John 8:12; Col 1:12; 1 Thess 5:5; 1 Tim 6:16; Rev 21:24; 22:5. We have here the proof that the father Stăniloae uses biblical texts and their theological meanings, even if he does not always quote them.

of *face/panim* (the ontological content of the person). For Father Staniloae person/face is presence, because that “shinning face” which irradiates uncreated light is the presence of Christ within the man. Therefore, an important role in this context is been given to “the human face,” which, in Father Stăniloae thinking, is a “*face of communion*” created in the image of the Triune God, expressing on earth the eternal movement of love, the *perichoresis*. He seeks to unify the inner logic of the Orthodox faith, recovering the biblical theology of person (*panim* in hebrew) into the neopatristic synthesis. The word face is itself sometimes deeply significant for the Greek ascetic fathers.¹⁰⁷ One thinks of the startling and evocative anecdote related in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* about Macarius the Great, which suggests that face-to-face contact provides a kind of solace to those suffering in Hell.¹⁰⁸ Abba Paul the Simple was reputed to have

¹⁰⁷ Augustine Casiday, *Reconstructing the Theology of Evagrius Ponticus: Beyond Heresy* (Cambridge University Press, New York 2013), p. 173.

¹⁰⁸ *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers. The Alphabetical Collection*, Translated, with a foreword by Benedicta Ward, SLG, Preface by Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, Cistercian Publications 59 (Kalamazoo, Michigan: The Institute of Cistercian Studies, Western Michigan University, 1975), pp. 136-137, p. 38: “Abba Macarius said, ‘Walking in the desert one day, I found the skull of a dead man, lying on the ground. As I was moving it with my stick, the skull spoke to me. I said to it, ‘Who are you?’ The skull replied, ‘I was high priest of the idols and of the pagans who dwelt in this place; but you are Macarius, the Spirit-bearer. Whenever you take pity on those who are in torments, and pray for them, they feel a little respite.’ The old man said to him, ‘What is this alleviation, and what is this torment?’ He said to him, ‘As far as the sky is removed from the earth, so great is the fire beneath us; we are ourselves standing in the midst of the fire, from the feet up to the head. It is not possible to see anyone face to face, but the face of one is fixed to the back of another. Yet when you pray for us, each of us can see the other’s face a little. Such is our respite.’” (Abba Macarius the Great); cf. Judah Goldin, trans., *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* (2nd ed.; New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1983), p. 15: in rabbinic literature “when the Holy One, blessed be He, created Adam, He

the gift of “seeing the state of each man’s soul, just as we see their faces.”¹⁰⁹

The Hebrew word for “face” (פנים) is transliterated as *panim* (paw-neem) or *paneh*. As we will see in his eschatology, Father Stăniloae is very close to this biblical concept when he describes the person of the Savior as a Judge. In fact, the Hebrew word (פנים, *panim*) can communicate either face or presence: “*The capacity of people to physically reflect the glory of God in their bodies and particularly in the face has received little attention. It is true that the human body reveals God’s amazing power. In this sense, the body is part of general revelation and ‘an important form of God’s self-disclosure’. But what about the human body’s capacity for ‘special’ revelation as God’s radiating glory?*”

formed him (with two faces), front and back, as it is said, *Thou hast fashioned me in back and in front, and laid Thy hand upon me* (Ps. 139:5). (...) Another interpretation of *And Thou hast laid Thy hand upon me*: when Adam sinned, the Holy One, blessed be He, took away one of his faces”.

¹⁰⁹ *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers*, pp. 205-206: “Blessed Abba Paul the Simple, the disciple of Abba Anthony, told the Fathers that which follows: One day he went to a monastery to visit it and to make himself useful to the brethren. After the customary conference, the brothers entered the holy church of God to perform the synaxis there, as usual. Blessed Paul looked carefully at each of those who entered the church observing the spiritual disposition with which they went to the synaxis, for he had received the grace from the Lord of seeing the state of each one’s soul, just as we see their faces. When all had entered with sparkling eyes and shining faces, with each one’s angel rejoicing over him, he said, ‘I see one who is black and his whole body is dark; [...]. Shortly after the end of the synaxis, as everyone was coming out, Paul scrutinized each one, wanting to know in what state they were coming away. He saw that man, previously black and gloomy, coming out of the church with a shining face and white body, the demons accompanying him only at a distance, while his holy angel was following close to him, rejoicing greatly over him” (Abba Paul the Simple). See, for example, Arsenius 27 (96 BC; ET 13), and Abba Joseph of Panephysis’ “fingers of flame”, Joseph of Panephysis 7 (229 CD; ET 103).

*The lack of attention to this question is surprising given the vast amount of literature devoted to texts such as the Mount of Transfiguration (Matt. 17:1–9) and Paul’s discussion of Moses’s shining face (2 Cor. 3).*¹¹⁰ Their faces and bodies become vessels of the divine nature.¹¹¹ The human body, and especially the face of a

¹¹⁰ David H. Wenkel, *Shining Like the Sun. A Biblical Theology of Meeting God Face to Face* (Wooster, OH: Weaver Book Company, 2016), p. 3.

¹¹¹ Qohelet is a "theological anthropology" and speaks more of humanity (*’ādām*, 48 times) than of God (*’ēlōhîm*, 40 times). The word *’ādām* is part of Qohelet’s distinctive vocabulary. It is used 49 times, more frequently than any other word in the text. In this *’ādām* there are hearts and eyes. In Qohelet, the two organs repeated most frequently throughout the text are the heart and the eye. The word *lēb* is used in Qohelet 42 times. Also high in frequency are words related to the eye and seeing (9 and 47 occurrences, respectively). The eye, like the face, is not only the subject, but also the object of vision. The sentiments of the heart come out in the eyes as well as in the face. God’s eye signals God’s intimacy, or omnipotence and watchfulness. The opening of the eyes expresses the acquisition of knowledge (cf. Gen 3:5, Num 24:4; Isa 35:5). The eye in its epistemological capacity remains a part of the body, and thus it breaks down the dualism of mind/body. Emphasizing these aspects of the eye undermines the Western ideology of the eye: There is no seeing/knowing outside of the experience of the body. The seeing of Qohelet is also occasionally linked to a verb of motion: "I turned to see" (Qoh 2:12). This baseline meaning does not disappear in the abstraction of mental activity—"to see" adheres to *r’h*, the eye moves and takes in light, experience - "Light is sweet and it is pleasant for the eyes to see the sun" (11:7). The word *caḡin* ("eye") is used in the book of Qohelet 9 times, and verbs for seeing (*r’h*, "to see") are used 47 times. Whereas "eye" in Qohelet has not met with any scholarly inquiry, "to see" has been scrutinized. Following the noun *adam* ("man" or "human") and the verb *hyh* ("to be"), *r’h* ("to see") is the most frequently used word in Qohelet. Studies on this word focus particularly upon its first person usage—where the speaker claims to have seen this or that for a total of 21 times. One should include in this list Qoh 1:16 where Qohelet’s heart sees, and 2:12 where Qohelet turns to see, making a total of 23 times. However, neither translators nor commentators have remained content with the simple literal meaning of "to see" for *r’h*. (Jennifer L Koosed, *(Per)Mutations of Qohelet: Reading the Body in the Book*, New York T & T Clark Interna-

person, is able to communicate one's relationship with God. The Bible testifies that the face is the "essence of a person."¹¹² A christophany is related to a theophany and when we read Exodus within the context of the entire Old Testament, the best theological term to describe YHWH's appearance as a man is "christophany."¹¹³ The human body is made in the image of God and was originally designed to embody holiness. We were designed, says Wenkel, to have a face-to-face relationship with God (פנים אל-פנים, panim el-panim, πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον, prosōpon pros prosōpon).¹¹⁴ So, the ascetics have the capacity to physically reflect the glory and holiness of God when they meet him face to face, the way the human body can function as

tional, 2006, pp. 37-45). Hans Walter Wolff, in his otherwise comprehensive examination of the anthropology of the Hebrew Bible, ascribes little importance to the eye. In the book *Body Symbolism in the Bible*, Thomas Staubli and Silvia Schroer attribute Wolffs striking omission of the eye to his "word-centered theology of hearing" and the Protestant "hostility to images"; see Thomas Staubli and Sylvia Schroer, *Body Symbolism in the Bible* (trans. Linda D. Maloney; Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 2001), pp. 15, 112. Edouard Dhorme ascribes more importance to the eye than Wolff does – see: Edouard Dhorme, *L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en Hébreu et en Akkadien* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthnes, 1963), pp. 75-80.

¹¹² Nonna Vernon Harrison, *God's Many-Splendored Image: Theological Anthropology for Christian Formation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010), p. 7; and Charles A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (AGJU 42; Leiden: Brill, 1998), p. 141.

¹¹³ David H. Wenkel, *Shining Like the Sun*, 8. For a critique of this position, see Andrew S. Malone, "The Invisibility of God: A Survey of a Misunderstood Phenomenon," *EQ* 79, no. 4 (2007), pp. 311-29.

¹¹⁴ David H. Wenkel, *Shining Like the Sun*, 21. In the first instance the people do not "know" (יָדַע) (what has happened to Moses (32:1). In the second instance Moses does not "know" (יָדַע) (that his face is shining (34:29). Lord has shown him his glory (34:5-7). His face was radiant (בְּגִדְךָ יִרְאָה אֶת־פָּנָיו) because of his speaking with him" [that is, with the Lord] 34:29). See, on this: Joshua M. Philpot, "Exodus 34:29-35 and Moses' Shining Face" *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 23, no. 1 (2013), pp. 1-11, here p. 8.

a vessel that reflects God's holiness and glory. The human body is capable of being a vessel in which rays of God's glory shine through. Therefore, the people of Israel would see the face (*panim*, פנים) of Moses, that the skin of Moses' face (פנים, *panim*) was shining. And Moses would put the veil over his face (פנים, *panim*) again, until he went in to speak with him (Exod. 34:34–35). What Moses' shining face actually looked like has been debated for some time.¹¹⁵ The Septuagint translation of Exodus 34:29 uses the vocabulary of glory (δοξάζω, *doxazō*) for the Hebrew verb "to send out rays of light" (קָרַן, *qaran*). So, Wenkel emphasize that one of the primary focal points that the biblical authors used when referring to the body's ability to communicate holiness is the face.

¹¹⁵ David H. Wenkel, *Shining Like the Sun*, pp. 35-37. One of the strongest pieces of evidence for the fact that a face-to-face encounter with God will physically change a person's appearance is the textual unit of Exodus 34:29-32. Moses' face embodied the holiness and glory of YHWH. The glory on Moses' face was not only brilliant, but permanent. See, also: David H. Wenkel, "A New Reading of Anointing with Oil in James 5:14: Finding First-Century Common Ground in Moses' Glorious Face," *HBT* 35 (2013), p. 174; and Scott J. Hafemann, "The Glory and Veil of Moses in 2 Corinthians 3:7–14," in Gregory K. Beale (ed.), *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), p. 296.