Co-regency in Ancient Israel's Divine Council as the Conceptual Backdrop to Ancient Jewish Binitarian Monotheism

MICHAEL S. HEISER
SCHOLAR-IN-RESIDENCE, LOGOS BIBLE SOFTWARE

Scholars have long wondered what theological and hermeneutical trajectories allowed committed monotheistic Jews to embrace Christianity's high Christology. How exactly could devoted followers of Yhwh convert to Christianity and still consider themselves innocent of the charge of worshiping another deity? Alan Segal's seminal work on the "two powers in heaven" doctrine of ancient Judaism demonstrated that Judaism allowed a second deity figure identified with, but distinct from, Yhwh prior to the rise of Christianity. But Segal never succeeded in articulating the roots of this theology in the Hebrew Bible. This essay seeks to bridge this gap by proposing a Godhead framework put forth by the biblical writers in adaptation of the earlier Canaanite (Ugaritic) divine council involving a co-regency of El and Baʻal. The essay suggests that Judaism's two powers theology had its roots in an ancient Israelite co-regency notion whereby Yhwh and a second, visible Yhwh figure occupied both roles of the co-regency in the biblical writers' conception of the divine council.

Key Words: divine council, Yahweh, El, Baʻal, Christology, angel of the Lord, Israelite religion, Ugarit, Jesus, co-regent, two powers, binitarian, ditheism, anthropomorphism, name theology

INTRODUCTION

Discovering the Jewish roots of Christianity's high Christology has been one of the more important research trajectories in biblical and Jewish studies in recent decades.[1] The inquiry has in large part been propelled by questions

1. For example, Nathaniel Deutsch, *Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice-Regency in Late Antiquity*, Brill's Series in Jewish Studies 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1999); Charles Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*, AGSU 42 (Leiden: Brill, 1998); Darrell D. Hannah, *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*, WUNT 2/109 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999); Larry W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion*

concerning Christianity's emergence from Judaism. How was it that many Jews who took their monotheism so seriously as to risk death at the hands of their Roman overlords by rejecting Roman polytheism could in turn embrace the idea that Jesus of Nazareth was in some sense co-equal with the God of Israel? By what intellectual-religious permission could Jewish converts to Christianity still consider themselves innocent of the charge of worshiping a deity other than the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob?

Seminal scholarship on these issues was produced by the late Alan Segal, who sought to trace the intellectual path of ancient Judaism's "two powers in heaven" teaching.[2] His inquiry bore fruit with respect to Second Temple period sources (e.g., Philo and Jewish pseudepigraphical works), where writers made mention of a "second God" (δεύτερον θεόν) or "lesser Yhwh" (יהוה הקטון), and rabbinic exegesis of the Tanakh.[3] In regard to the rabbinic material, Segal took note that the rabbinic justification for a second power, a second Yhwh figure, was linked to passages such as Exod 15:3 and Dan 7:13. The former text portrayed Yhwh, the God of Israel, as "a man of war." The latter identified a second figure in the throne room of Israel's God (the "Ancient of Days") as a "human one" (בר אנש) who bore the epithet of the cloud rider, elsewhere used only of Yhwh in the Hebrew Bible.[4]

Research subsequent to Segal's study has produced compelling evidence in Jewish texts (prerabbinic and rabbinic) for a second exalted divinity figure (a "second power") that was both identified with and distinguished from Yhwh.[5] The discussion has therefore shifted to related, but no less important, questions. Did the two powers notion arise outside Judaism and subsequently infect it, or was it born from within and repurposed by Jewish Christians?

Scholars are in disagreement. Segal envisioned a prerabbinic proto-orthodoxy that led inexorably to the rabbinic orthodoxy of late antiquity. The two-powers doctrine was unacceptable to that trajectory. Others prefer to think of the two-powers theology as acceptable within Judaism amid a "polyform tradition in which no particular form [of Judaism] has claim to either orthodoxy or centrality over others."[6] In this perspective, the two

---

and Ancient Jewish Monotheism, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988); idem; "The Binitarian Shape of Early Christian Worship," in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*, ed. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, JSJSup 63 (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 187–213.

2. Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1977) ix.

3. Ibid., 159–81. The phrase δεύτερον θεόν is found in Philo, for whom the "second god" was the Logos: "no mortal thing could have been formed on the similitude of the supreme Father of the universe, but only after the pattern of the second deity [δεύτερον θεόν], who is the Word of the supreme Being" (*QG* 2, 62). יהוה הקטון ("the lesser Yhwh") refers to the angel Meṭaṭron in 3 En. 12:5, 48c:7; 48d:1[90]. Meṭaṭron is called God's vice-regent in 3 En. 10:3–6 and has his own throne, presiding over a celestial court (3 En. 16:1).

4. Ibid., 33–67, 148, 184–85.

5. See for example, Daniel Boyarin, "The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John," *HTR* 94 (2001) 243–84.

6. Daniel Boyarin, "Beyond Judaisms: Meṭaṭron and the Divine Polymorphy of Ancient Judaism," *JSJ* 41 (2010) 323–65, at p. 326. I agree with Boyarin's notion of variegated orthodoxy

powers teaching was not a teaching hostile to Judaism and a singular, *subsequent* rabbinic orthodoxy took shape in hostile response to it.

Despite its landmark status, Segal's effort did not succeed in solving the puzzle of the biblical provenance for the two powers in heaven theology. While following the rabbinic commentary on certain passages in the Hebrew Bible, Segal could offer only the speculation that the doctrine might be related to the divine warrior imagery of the broader ancient Near East.[7]

I believe Segal's instinct was correctly oriented. This essay seeks to build on his insight by proposing a framework derived from Israelite religious conceptions of God put forth in the Hebrew Bible that eluded Segal and that has not heretofore been put forward.

OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL

The proposal offered herein is that the two powers idea had its roots in an ancient Israelite co-regency notion that was part of the way biblical writers conceived YHWH's divine council. "Divine council" is a term that derives from Ps 82:1, which describes YHWH's heavenly host as an assembly, a bureaucratic conception widely shared in ancient Near Eastern pantheons.[8] The most salient ancient Near Eastern parallels to Israel in this regard are those from Syria-Palestine, particularly Ugarit.[9]

The conceptual religious overlaps between Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible have been well chronicled.[10] The divine council of Ugarit featured

---

produced by his polite but trenchant critique of Segal in this regard. His critique is actually a refinement of his own earlier views expressed in D. Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religions (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); idem, "Two Powers in Heaven or, the Making of a Heresy," in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel,* ed. H. Najman and J. Newman, JSJSup 83 (Leiden: Brill, 2004) 331–70. Analysis of passages in Philo, the Targums (the *Memra*), and rabbinic sources by Boyarin and others subsequent to Segal's landmark work has widened the scope of the relevant data. Boyarin in particular has ably dealt with earlier scholarship pessimistic in regard to the Memra and Philo's Logos as a second YHWH figure (see Boyarin, "Gospel of the Memra," 247–59). In addition to Boyarin and Segal on the two powers, see Daniel Abrams, "The Boundaries of Divine Ontology: The Inclusion and Exclusion of Meṭaṭron in the Godhead," *HTR* 87 (1994) 291–321; Moshe Idel, "Enoch is Meṭaṭron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–40; idem, *Ben: Sonship and Jewish Mysticism,* Robert and Arlene Kogod Library Judaic Studies 5 (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2008).

7. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 184.

8. See J. Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82," *HUCA* 14 (1939) 29–126; W. S. Prinsloo, "Psalm 82: Once Again, Gods or Men?" *Bib* 76 (1995) 219–28; Matitiahu Tsevat, "God and the Gods in Assembly," *HUCA* 40–41 (1969–70) 123–37.

9. Lowell K. Handy, *Among the Host of Heaven: The Syro-Palestinian Pantheon as Bureaucracy* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994); E. Theodore Mullen, *The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature,* HSM 24 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1980); See for example, Mark S. Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

10. George J. Brooke, Adrian Curtis, and John F. Healey, eds., *Ugarit and the Bible: Proceedings of the International Symposium on Ugarit and the Bible, Manchester, September 1992,* UBL 11 (Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 1994); M. Dahood, *Ras Shamra Parallels: Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible*, vol. 1, AnOr 49 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1972); Loren R. Fisher, *Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible,* vol. 2, AnOr 50 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical

a co-regency involving a high sovereign deity (El) who ruled heaven and earth through the agency of a second, appointed co-regent deity (Baᶜal). The co-regent Baᶜal, referred to as "king of the gods" outranked the other deities in council, including the "sons of El" and divine messengers (*mlʾkm*).[11] Scholars working in both the Ugaritic corpus and the Hebrew Bible demonstrated decades ago that the biblical writers drew on El and Baᶜal epithets and motifs when describing Yhwh. The strategy of identifying Yhwh with these two major rival deities reinforced the agenda of monotheism.[12]

Ugarit Council Hierarchy	*Israelite Council Hierarchy*
1. El ⟶	Yhwh
2. Baᶜal	

Another strategic use of Baᶜal epithets and imagery has gone largely unnoticed. Not only did Israelite religion attribute the status and powers of El and Baᶜal to Yhwh, but while doing so it adapted Ugarit's co-regent structure to its own conception of monotheistic sovereignty. This co-regent structure is reflected by the assignment of Baᶜal epithets and imagery to a *second* figure that is simultaneously identified with, but distinguished from, Yhwh. The second Yhwh figure is visibly portrayed in human form and serves the invisible, sovereign Yhwh.[13] The end result was a binitarian or ditheistic portrayal of Yhwh as both high sovereign (the "El role") and the co-regent (the "Baᶜal role"). This framework therefore followed the Canaanite co-regent structure but did not violate Yahwistic monotheism, since both roles were fulfilled by Yhwh.[14]

Ugarit Council Hierarchy	*Israelite Council Hierarchy*
1. El ⟶	"Yhwh 1" (invisible)
2. Baᶜal ⇢	"Yhwh 2" (visible)

Institute, 1975); S. Rummel, *Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible*, vol. 3, AnOr 51 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1981).

11. The divine council at Ugarit had at least three hierarchical tiers (El with co-regent Baᶜal / sons of El / messenger deities = *mlʾkm*). Some scholars have suggested there may have been a fourth tier that included "craftsmen deities," but the evidence is tenuous (Smith, *Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 45–57). Israel's council had three levels. The top tier included Yhwh and the co-regent Yhwh (see the ensuing proposal and discussion), the "sons of God" (בני אלים / עליון / האלהים / אלהים; Gen 6:2, 4; Pss 29:1; 82:1, 6; 89:7[6]; Job 38:7) and "angels" (מלאכים).

12. Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973) 1–76, 186–94; John Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*, JSOTSup 265 (New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) 13–127; Mark S. Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 19–65.

13. For example, Yhwh's angel (מלאך יהוה; Exod 3:2; 23:20–23; Judg 6:11, 12, 21–23) and the commander of the armies of Yhwh (Josh 5:13–15). See the ensuing discussion.

14. This structural adaptation would have been part of the theological-rhetorical strategy on the part of the biblical writers to fuse El and Baᶜal conceptually with Yhwh. According to Smith's assessment, this merging would have occurred by the 8th century B.C. (Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 49). This article's focus is the biblical text as received by Second Temple–era Jewish thinkers who drew on it for their two-powers theology. As such, issues of tradition history and redaction are peripheral to the current focus and space constraints.

If this perception is correct, then Segal's observation that the rabbis derived their two-powers theology from the "man of war" and the "human one" of Exodus and Daniel has roots both in ancient Near Eastern concepts of divine plurality and Israelite monotheism. This proposed framework provides a coherent backdrop to Judaism's two powers in heaven and Christianity's high Christology.[15]

Toward presenting this proposal, this essay will first outline the co-regency structure of Ugarit, paying particular attention to certain aspects of the role of Baʿal, the co-regent. The essay will then move to literary-theological portrayals of divine co-regency in the Hebrew Bible, focusing on passages and figures (e.g., the angel of Yʜwʜ; מלאך יהוה) that have drawn the attention of scholars engaged in the discussion of the two powers in ancient Judaism. Finally, the essay will draw attention to how conceptions of Baʿal specifically align with the *second* visible Yʜwʜ figure of the Hebrew Bible.[16]

El and Baʿal in the Divine Council of Ugarit

Distributed Rulership in Hierarchy

The Ugaritic material informs us that the divine sons of El were given spheres of ruling authority under the overarching sovereignty of El.[17] In a divine council scene in *KTU* 1.2, when the gods of the council (the *bn qdš*; "sons of the Holy One") see the messengers of Yamm, they "lower their heads . . . onto the thrones of their princeships."[18] In *KTU* 1.16.v.24–25, El commands, "sit, my children, in your seats, on your princely thrones." El,

---

15. One of the debates in regard to the rise of high Christology and the two powers teaching concerns what constitutes elevation of a second divine figure to the level of the God of Israel. Hurtado has been particularly focused in his insistence that evidence of worship (that is, cult) is essential. He writes: "As for the view that there were binitarian tendencies in ancient Jewish thought, I ask what evidence is there that a second 'divine' being—hypostasis, exalted patriarch, or principal angel—was worshiped alongside God as part of the devotional practice of Jewish religious groups?" (Larry W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism,* 2nd ed. [New York: T. & T. Clark] 38). Hurtado's criterion has been criticized by Boyarin and others for being too narrow. See §2.3 of this article for more discussion.

16. It is not accurate to presume that Baʿal motifs are assigned only to Yʜwʜ himself in the theological polemic of the biblical writers. This article seeks to demonstrate that a second figure receives Baʿal attributions in the Hebrew Bible. The identity of this second figure is distinguished from Yʜwʜ in certain contexts but at times is also made virtually indistinct from Yʜwʜ. More specifically, the Baʿal profile elements used to describe the second figure are aspects of Baʿal's rulership on behalf of El. That a figure who is but also is not Yʜwʜ performs these roles suggests a divine co-regency where both governing roles are assigned to a Yʜwʜ figure and no other god. While there are a range of elements in the Baʿal profile, they are not described in equal detail and thus are unequal in weight. The case put forth is cumulative.

17. Lowell K. Handy, "Dissenting Deities or Obedient Angels," *Biblical Research* 35 (1990) 18–35, at p. 21.

18. *KTU* 1.2.1.24–25, 27–29. *KTU* = M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit: Einschliesslich der keilalphabetischen Texte ausserhalb Ugarits*, vol. 1: *Transkription*, AOAT 24/1 (Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1976).

Baʿal, Yamm, Mot, and Athtar are all designated "kings" (*mlkm*) in Ugaritic literature, a situation that led to several theories about how best to understand the ruling relationships within the pantheon at Ugarit.[19] Additionally, Yamm and Mot are both described as "Beloved of El" (Yamm: *mdd ʾil*; Mot: *ydd ʾil*),[20] "a title which represents the oracular authority designating an heir to the throne."[21]

Other titles given to ruling deities at Ugarit include *zbl* ("prince")[22] and *ṯpṭ* ("judge").[23] The latter can mean more than a judicial function, as indicated by the Baʿal Cycle, where Yamm is called "prince (*zbl*) Yamm" in parallel to "Ruler (*ṯpṭ*) Naharu" several times.[24] This tandem of terms also appears with respect to Baʿal.[25] Scholars have therefore noted that the word *ṯpṭ* "should be understood as a designation for a ruler, parallel to *mlk*, 'king.'"[26] When used of deities, the word denotes authority over a specific geographical territory (*ʾil ṯpẓ b TN*).[27]

The Baʿal Cycle goes on to describe Baʿal's victory over Yamm and Baʿal's subsequent (but temporary) defeat by Mot. Baʿal ultimately emerges victorious in the subsequent struggle for superiority among the ruling gods.

The Co-regency of El and Baʿal

The Baʿal Cycle records the response of El to Baʿal's victory with the line *tgr ʾil bnh*, "El appointed his son regent."[28] The wording clearly implies

---

19. See *KTU* 1.3.5.32; 1.6.6.28; 1.2.3.8. Lowell K. Handy, "A Solution for Many MLKM," *UF* 20 (1988) 58.

20. For Yamm as "Beloved of El," see *KTU* 1.1.4.20; 1.3.3.38–39; 1.4.2.34; 1.4.6.12; 1.4.7.3. For Mot as "Beloved of El," see *KTU* 1.4.7.46–47; 1.4.8.23–24; 1.5.1.8, 12–13; 1.6.6.30–31.

21. Wyatt, "Quaternities in the Mythology of Baʿal," *UF* 21 (1989) 453. See also N. Wyatt, "'Jedidiah' and Cognate Forms as a Title of Royal Legitimation," *Bib* 66 (1985) 112–25.

22. Gregorio del Olmo Lete and Joaquín Sanmartín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2003) 2:998 (hereafter, *DULAT*).

23. *DULAT* 2:926.

24. For example, see *KTU* 1.2.3.15–16, 21–25; 1.2.4.29–30.

25. For *zbl,* see *KTU* 1.5.6.9–10; 1.6.1.41–43; 1.6.3.2–3, 8–9, 20–21; 1.6.4.4–5, 15–16; 1.9.18. For *ṯpṭ*, see *KTU* 1.3.5.32–33 and 1.4.4.43–44.

26. Handy, *Among the Host of Heaven*, 113. Handy cites René Dussaud, "Les Combats sanglants de ʿAnat et le pouvir universal de El (V AB et VI AB)," *RHR* 118 (1938) 151 n. 8. In addition, see J. Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan* (2nd ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1965) 87; C. Gordon, "*ṯpṭ*," *Ugaritic Textbook*, AnOr 38 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969). Wyatt also points out that the Punic term *špṭ* is "frequently translated in Greek and Latin texts by their equivalents for *mlk*, βασιλευς, and *rex*" (N. Wyatt, "Titles of the Ugaritic Storm God," *UF* 24 [1992] 422).

27. *DULAT* 2:926 (TN = toponym). The matter of how to parse the many *mlkm* ("kings") in Ugaritic religion has been closely examined by several scholars, all of whom note that the matter is inextricably related to the well-known contest for high kingship in the Baʿal Cycle between Baʿal, Yamm, and Mot (Handy, "A Solution for Many MLKM," 58). As del Olmo Lete notes, "The interrelationship of these three gods is one of conflict and battle to be declared 'king of the gods and of men/the earth,' i.e., as deputy of the 'supreme god'. . . . This conflict/declaration is the basic theme of the Canaanite Baal mythology, of its classical or standard style" (G. del Olmo Lete, *Canaanite Religion according to the Liturgical Texts of Ugarit* [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004] 49–50).

28. *KTU* 1.1.4.10–11. The translation is from Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*, 2nd ed. (New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) 48 n. 49. Wyatt is thus in agreement with de Moor's

that El is superior to Baʿal. However, Baʿal is subsequently given the titles "most high" (ʿly)[29] and "king, sovereign" (*mlk*).[30] More specifically, Baʿal declares, "I alone it is who will rule over the gods" (ʾaḥdy d ymlk ʿl ʾilm).[31]

Shortly after the decipherment of Ugaritic, scholars took this language as indicating the displacement of El by Baʿal.[32] Most scholars of Ugaritic religious texts now view Baʿal's kingship as operating under the authority of El and have put forth a coherent co-regent model between the deities.[33] Baʿal has won kingship, but is not superior to El. It is true that Baʿal declares, "I alone it is who will rule over the gods" (ʾaḥdy d ymlk ʿl ʾilm) and received the title "Most High" (ʿly), but it is El's prerogative to appoint successors to the kingship position when it is unoccupied.[34] And despite his exalted status, Baʿal does not have a house like other gods. In fact, El's permission must be solicited for one to be constructed.[35] Anat and Athirat, though they have called Baʿal their king, nevertheless must appeal to El for approval of Baʿal's palace as "the king who installed him [Baʿal]."[36] It is quite evident that El can, if he wishes, refuse.[37] Wyatt's conclusion is representative of the current consensus: "The old theory of El's emasculation and deposition may now be discarded. . . . His authority is unquestioned."[38]

In the divine council scene of *KTU* 1.2.i, while the sons of El are *sitting* on their princely thrones anticipating a great banquet, Baʿal is described as *standing* by El (*qm ʿl ʾil*). The posture and position are stock elements of the attending co-regent, though most of the evidence is drawn from council scenes that are more legal in nature, not having a meal in view.[39]

---

opinion that the form in the text should be a Dt (<y>tgr) from the root *gr.* The translation is derived from the Arabic cognate *ǧarrā*[y]. See Johannes C. de Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Baʿlu* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971) 118 (cf. *DULAT* 1:310). It is also possible to render the phrase *tgr ʾil bnh* as "El has opposed his son," given the Hebrew cognate *grh* ("to oppose"; cf. *HALOT* 1:202; *DULAT* 1:926). However, the phrase describes El's *response* to Baʿal's victory, and so "oppose" is very awkward.

29. *DULAT* 1:169. *KTU* 1.16.3.6, 8. See Wyatt, "The Titles of the Ugaritic Storm God," 419.

30. *DULAT* 2 :550. *KTU* 1.3.5.32; 1.4.4.43.

31. *KTU* 1.4.7.50.

32. M. H. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, VTSup 2 (Leiden, Brill, 1955) 102; U. Oldenburg, *The Conflict between El and in Canaanite Religion*, Supplementa ad Numen, Altera 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1969) 206.

33. See Conrad L'Heureux, *Rank among the Canaanite Gods,* HSM 21 (Missoula: MT: Scholars Press, 1979) 1–108; J. C. L. Gibson, "The Theology of the Ugaritic Baal Cycle," *Or* 53 (1984) 207–10; P. D. Miller Jr., "Aspects of the Religion of Ugarit," in *Ancient Israelite Religion*, ed. P. D. Miller Jr., P. D. Hanson, and S. D. McBride (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 60.

34. *KTU* 1.4.7.50; N. Wyatt, "The Titles of the Ugaritic Storm God," 419; *KTU* 1.3.5.35–36; 1.4.4.44–47; 1.6.1.45–65. El also appointed Yamm king prior to Baʿal's victory (*KTU* 1.1.4.13–32).

35. *KTU* 1.4.4–6.

36. *KTU* 1.4.4.43–48.

37. Gibson, "Theology of the Ugaritic Baal Cycle," 208. See L'Heureux, *Rank among the Canaanite Gods*, 10–25.

38. Wyatt, "Quaternities in the Mythology of *Baʿal*," 453.

39. See Mullen, *The Divine Council*, 230–32 for a discussion of the vocabulary of "standing" in the council. However, Mullen focuses only on "legal" decision-making contexts of council scenes. Though the location of the standing is not given here, the expectation would have been that the co-regent was positioned at the right hand of El. There are hints of Baʿal at this station later in the epic. For example, after Mot has defeated Baʿal, he apparently mocks

The description of Baʿal standing by El comes at the point in the Baʿal Cycle where Yamm (by means of messengers) challenges the gods of the council to surrender Baʿal, "the god whom you obey."[40] The gods of the council cringe at the demand, and are rebuked by Baʿal, who is not intimidated. This is the beginning of the conflict for the co-regency.[41]

Characterization of the Co-regent

Baʿal emerges as the undisputed divine co-regent, but what does that mean? How do the Ugaritic religious texts cast the divine co-regent? These questions are essential for framing the backdrop for certain religious and rhetorical strategies undertaken by the biblical writers, strategies that would be drawn on by later Jewish thinkers working with the final form of the biblical text for a two powers doctrine.[42]

Lord of the Nations

One of the more familiar titles of Baʿal is *zbl bʿl ʾarṣ* ("the prince, lord of the earth"). This title "is found on nine occasions . . . but [is] never used until Baʿal's victory over Yamm is assured."[43] This would mean that the title is associated with co-regency. According to Wyatt, the title "appears to indicate that the conflict between Baʿal and Yamm is concerned with lordship of the earth."[44] This would make contextual sense, because the other sons of El had "princely thrones" and were referred to as kings, princes, and judges.[45] El's decisions on establishing these dominions are described most often with the verb *mlk* ("to rule"),[46] though the Ugaritic texts also utilize *kn* and *škn* ("establish"; "assign").[47] These dominions were subsumed under the authority of Baʿal, the co-regent appointed by El after Baʿal's victory over Yamm. As such, there was a presumed sovereignty over

---

Baʿal before El, asking where he can be found. The text is broken but contains the phrase "right hand" (*KTU* 1.5.4.5–1.5.5.5).

40. Ibid., 61. See *KTU* 1.2.1.34, and the earlier reference in *KTU* 1.2.1.17–18.

41. The interchange is curious, for Yamm at the time is referred to as the "ruler of the gods," but Baʿal is a threat that must be challenged. Wyatt notes in this regard, "though Baal is Yamm's successor on the divine throne, it appears from the present passage that he also had a prior claim to it, but was passed over by El in favour of Yamm" (Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*, 49 n. 55). Baʿal's position in the council as standing by El is in some way connected to the perception among the gods of the council that they owe Baʿal obeisance. The posture therefore may be a subtle foreshadowing of that Baʿal's ultimate victory in the epic is rightly deserved. In any event, the two powers in the Ugaritic pantheon are certainly El and Baʿal, and despite the latter's lofty titles, the former is still the ultimate authority.

42. Since the goal of this essay is to understand how postbiblical Judaism read the Hebrew Bible with respect to a two-powers doctrine, the focus throughout is on the final form of the biblical Hebrew text.

43. Wyatt, "The Titles of the Ugaritic Storm God," 416.

44. Ibid.

45. *KTU* 1.16.5.24–25; Handy, "Dissenting Deities," 21; idem, "A Solution for Many MLKM," 58.

46. *DULAT* 2:549. For example, *KTU* 1.6.1.47–55, the installation of Athtar, uses this verb four times.

47. *DULAT* 1:447, 2:815. See *KTU* 1.3.5.36 for *kn* and *KTU* 1.16.26–27 for *škn*.

the nations of humankind on the part of the co-regent. Pardee echoes this assessment by noting, "Baʿlu was somehow seen as the king of the earth in the context of divine contact with the earth at Mount Ṣapānu."[48]

Some scholars have understood the word ʾarṣ in the epithet as the Underworld.[49] This position is based on the supposition that rpʾu mlk ʿlm ("the hero, the eternal king"), a description of the lord of the underworld, refers to Baʿal. Other scholars disagree, citing the ambiguity of this line in *KTU* 1.108 along with the interpretive difficulty of restricting zbl bʿl ʾarṣ to only the underworld.[50] Rahmouni, author of a recent exhaustive study of divine epithets in the Ugaritic texts, believes the epithet points to Milku.[51] She concludes: "[ʾArṣ] undoubtedly refers to the entire world: land, sea, and underworld. . . . Baʿlu's victory reaffirms his role as acting king of the Ugaritic pantheon and his ruler over the entire world, not just the underworld."[52]

I concur with Rahmouni's estimation, but because divine rulership of the earth was conceived at Ugarit as distributed and hierarchical, the interpretive dispute is moot. Milku could indeed be the king (mlk) of the underworld, but Baʿal was now firmly established as El's co-regent, king over all gods and therefore overlord of their respective domains. The members of the councils of El and Baʿal (whether those were separate councils or not) control their respective domains under the overarching sovereignty of El and Baʿal. The portrayal is one of a hierarchical administration of the unseen realm of the gods and the territories of the earth.

Victorious Warrior

Another characterization of Baʿal is his warrior status. Several epithets in Ugaritic material reveal this element: ʾalʾiyn bʿl ("victorious Baʿal"; "Baʿal the mighty one"); ʾalʾiy qrdm ("the mightiest of heroes"); gmr hd ("annihilator Haddu"); and rkb ʿrpt ("rider of the clouds").[53] This last title, though on the surface less obvious as a conquest epithet, is nevertheless important in regard to Baʿal's warrior-god role.[54] The epithet depicts Baʿal on his cloud chariot, a description often associated with storm clouds and Baʿal's role as the bringer of rain for the land's fertility. However, cloud terminology in Ugaritic mythology also serves on occasion to describe divine

48. Dennis Pardee, "The Baʿlu Myth," in *The Context of Scripture*, ed. William W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger Jr. (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997) 269–70 n. 250.

49. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Die Baʿal Titel bʿl arṣ und aliy qrdm," *UF* 12 (1980) 391–93, at 392; *DULAT* 1:107.

50. Wyatt, "The Titles of the Ugaritic Storm God," 423–24.

51. Aicha Rahmouni, *Divine Epithets in the Ugaritic Alphabetic Texts*, trans. J. N. Ford (Leiden: Brill, 2008) 163, 295. See also *DULAT* 1:550–56, 743.

52. Ibid., 164.

53. See Wyatt, "The Titles of the Ugaritic Storm God," 404–6, 420–22; Rahmouni, *Divine Epithets*, 49–63, 147–49, 288–91. Haddu (Hadad) is identified with Baʿal at Ugarit (*KTU* 1.101.1–4). See J. C. Greenfield, "Hadad," *DDD*: 377–82.

54. *KTU* 1.1.3.17; 1.3.4.32; 1.4.8.15. See P. D. Miller Jr., *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*, HSM 5 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973) 24–45. W. Herrmann, "Rider upon the Clouds," *DDD*: 703–5; Sigmund Mowinckel, "Drive and/or Ride in O.T.," *VT* 12 (1962) 278–99.

messengers,[55] and so "coming with / upon the clouds" subtly speaks of Baʿal in procession with his retinue.

The description of Baʿal's victory procession in *KTU* 1.4.vii.7–13 affirms Baʿal's characterization as the victorious warrior, as well as the earlier motif of ruler of the nations:

> He traveled [from city to] city;
> he went from tow[n to to]wn.
> He seized sixty-six cities,
> seventy-seven towns.
> Eighty Baal [smote]
> ninety Baal [captured?].
> Baal [sett]led into his house,
> into the midst of his palace.[56]

Smith and Pitard note on this passage:

> This section describes Baal's victory march through the towns and villages of his domain. . . . This passage appears to make use of the imagery of the divine warrior's campaign against his enemies (cf. similar imagery in Deut 33:2, Judg 5:4–5 and Ps 68:8–9, 18–19). . . . However, Baal's procession does not seem to be a true military campaign, since there is no real indication of resistance by the towns. It rather seems to be a victory tour in which all the cities and towns demonstrate their submission to the conqueror. . . . [T]he poet makes use of a traditional numerical formula . . . clearly intended not to be taken literally, but . . . intended to suggest that Baal's conquests go beyond any conventional numerical scale; *he is king over all the earth.*[57]

Enthroned in His House-Temple

Another familiar element in the epic of Baʿal's rise to co-regency is the appeal to El for Baʿal to have his own house or palace-temple. Following the declaration of Baʿal's victory over Yamm in *KTU* 1.4.iv.43–45, the matter is undertaken. Though they have called Baʿal their king, the goddesses Anat and Athirat must nevertheless appeal to El for approval of Baʿal's palace, since El is "the king who installed him [Baʿal]."[58] Anat's plea is eventually honored by El (*KTU* 1.4.v.25–40).

---

55. For the notion of clouds (Ugar: ʿnn) used to describe divine messengers, see Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 165–66 n. 86; Richard J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*, HSM 4 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972) 112; Thomas Mann, "The Pillar of Cloud in the Reed Sea Narrative," *JBL* 90 (1971) 21–23. Scholars have pointed out that the terminology (ʿnn) is used of lesser deities that are not meteorological in character, and so there is no exclusive connection to Baʿal. See Mark S. Smith and Wayne T. Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*, vol. 1: *Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU/CAT 1.1–1.2* (Leiden: Brill, 2009) 292; R. M. Good, "Cloud Messengers?" *UF* 10 (1978) 436–37.

56. The translation and uncertainty mark are from Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*, 108.

57. Mark S. Smith and Wayne T. Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*, vol. 2: *Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU/CAT 1.3–1.4* (Leiden: Brill, 2009) 660–62.

58. *KTU* 1.4.4.43–48 (emphasis added).

That the "house" (*bt*) of Baʿal is a temple is indicated by the use of that lemma when the phrase is parallel to "sanctuary (*qdš*) of Baʿal" in texts like *KTU* 1.119.32–34 and *KTU* 1.17.i.30–32.[59] Smith points out that a "constellation of temple themes" is illustrated in the Baʿal Cycle:

> The palace narrative, especially in *KTU* 1.4, contains many of the temple themes identified in Genesis 2–3, Ezekiel 28 and many psalms. The wood for Baal's palace also is obtained through a journey for cedars in Lebanon and brought to Baal's mountain where the palace is to be constructed (*KTU* 1.6 VI 16–21). Precious metal and stone are likewise to come from a distance, from mountains (*KTU* 1.4 V 12–18). Like the divine abode mentioned in the critique of Tyre in Ezekiel 28 (cf. Gen 2.11–12), Baal's heavenly palace consists of gold and precious stone (specifically, lapis lazuli, the stone associated with the heavenly palace in Exod 24:9–11. . . . In sum, the Baal Cycle embodies traditional themes of the temple as royal garden-sanctuary.[60]

Anthropomorphic Portrayal

The final salient point to be made in the Ugaritic material concerns the anthropomorphic language utilized in portraying the divine co-regent.[61] The blow-by-blow recounting of Baʿal's battle and his subsequent victorious march through his domain are overtly anthropomorphic. The section of the Baʿal Cycle that describes Baʿal's acquisition of a house is consistent with these portrayals. For example, Baʿal presents offerings in his house (*KTU* 1.4.vi.39–41), serves food and drink at his house-warming party (*KTU* 1.4.vi.44–58), and "settles" into his new home (*KTU* 1.4.vii.13–14).

Anthropomorphic descriptions of deity, including the language of embodiment, are nothing new to scholars interested in such portrayals at Ugarit and in the Hebrew Bible. The most exhaustive work in this regard is undoubtedly Korpel's 1990 study, *A Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine*, in which the author devotes nearly 100 pages to chronicling and categorizing the human properties applied to deities in both corpuses.[62] Anthropomorphism was an important means by which Ugaritic scribes characterized the co-regent of its religion's divine council.[63]

59. See Marjo C. A. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1990) 372–73; Nicolas Wyatt, *Space and Time in the Religious Life of the Near East* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 152–53.

60. Mark S. Smith, "Like Deities, Like Temples (Like People)," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day (London: T. & T. Clark and Continuum, 2007) 9. See also Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds*, 374–78; E. M. Bloch-Smith " 'Who Is the King of Glory?' Solomon's Temple and Its Symbolism," in *Scripture and Other Artifacts: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King*, ed. M. D. Coogan, J. C. Exum, and L. E. Stager (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1994) 19–23.

61. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds*, 378.

62. Ibid., 88–207.

63. El of course is also portrayed anthropomorphically in Ugaritic literature. The point being made here and in the corresponding biblical material that follows is not that anthropomorphisms are unique to the divine co-regent or that Baʿal must be anthropomorphized to have a divine co-regency. Rather, the point is that Baʿal, whose role in Ugaritic religion as El's

ISRAEL'S DIVINE CO-REGENCY

This brings us to our point of transition in the direction of the Hebrew Bible. While the attribution of descriptions and epithets of El and Baʿal to Yhwh are a well-known element of Israelite religion, the attribution of the characterizations of Baʿal outlined above to a *second* figure in the Hebrew Bible has been seldom considered. Consequently, the observation that El and Baʿal were subsumed into Yhwh in Israelite religion is incomplete.

The four characterizations of the Ugaritic co-regent were terrestrial sovereignty, victorious warrior imagery, enthronement in a house-temple, and anthropomorphic portrayal. The remainder of this essay turns to how the biblical writers applied these characterizations to a second Yhwh figure and thus created a divine co-regency in their religion that did not violate exclusive fidelity to Yhwh. This co-regent structure was discerned by Jewish thinkers of the Second Temple era, a perception that led to the two powers doctrine and, subsequently, to the articulation of high Christology by those Jews who emerged from within Judaism as Christ-followers.

As we explore the biblical material, we will consider the four characterizations in reverse order.

Anthropomorphic Portrayal: Yhwh's Co-regent in Human Form

Recent Research Related to Biblical Anthropomorphism
Recent scholarship has demonstrated how biblical writers utilized the language of anthropomorphism, including divine embodiment and how their conception of God included the notion that Yhwh could simultaneously be present in divergent figures and at different places.

Aside from Korpel's monumental study referred to earlier, the issue of anthropomorphic language for describing Yhwh or the divine Presence has received focused attention in three recent, stimulating works related to the religious conceptions of the writers of the Hebrew Bible.

The first study is that of Esther Hamori.[64] Although her focus is primarily on two passages (Gen 18:1–15; 32:23–33), Hamori actually devotes the majority of her monograph to investigating anthropomorphism.[65] She constructs a coherent, useful taxonomy of anthropomorphic language and offers an explanation and critique of modern scholarly resistance to the notion that the Israelites could have conceived of their God as embodied.[66]

---

co-regent is established in a range of Ugaritic texts, is described as a warrior using anthropomorphic language.

64. Esther J. Hamori, *"When Gods Were Men": The Embodied God in Biblical and Near Eastern Literature*, BZAW 384 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).

65. Of the seven chapters in the book, only two (chs. 1, 4) primarily deal with the two passages under investigation in her study.

66. Hamori's taxonomy is as follows: "concrete anthropomorphism" (passages that describe physical embodiment); "envisioned anthropomorphism" (where the deity is seen in presumably human form in a vision or dream); "immanent anthropomorphism" (a description short of embodiment and not in a vision or dream, designed to convey immanence); "transcendent anthropomorphism" (descriptions that cannot fit into the first three); and "figurative

Her proposal is that scholars should think of anthropomorphism more broadly and avoid caricaturing it as "primitive or theologically unsophisticated," a perspective that drives scholars to consider anthropomorphism in only metaphorical terms. Hamori concludes that "Israelite texts do portray God in concretely anthropomorphic terms, and do so with some theological sophistication."[67] Hamori is careful to substantiate this conclusion against the backdrop of the broader ancient Near Eastern world.[68]

The second work of importance is that of Benjamin Sommer.[69] Sommer's work deals with biblical and post-biblical perceptions of God's "physicality" and presence. Sommer proposes what he calls a "fluidity model," whereby, in the mind of the biblical writer, God can simultaneously be present in many personalities and localities, including ways that involve various embodiments. Tensions created by this divine worldview are tolerated and even created by the biblical writer, as they were a means to express that Yhwh cannot be confined by boundaries erected in accord with human sensitivities.[70] Regarding anthropomorphism, Sommer bluntly describes the modern scholarly effort: "[They] collect copious and convincing examples of God's embodied nature, only to deny the corporeality of the biblical God on the basis of an unsupported assertion that the biblical authors didn't really mean it at all."[71] Sommer rejects this assertion, concluding, like Hamori, that the biblical writer certainly did at times cast God as embodied. He in turn declares, "[T]he evidence for this simple thesis is overwhelming."[72] Especially noteworthy for this article is Sommer's demonstration of what he calls "fragmentation" within the fluidity model, where divinities simultaneously "somehow are and are not the same deity."[73]

The third study that serves to undergird the proposal offered in this essay is Stephen L. Herring's *Divine Substitution: Humanity as the Manifestation of Deity in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East.*[74] Herring's work deals with how certain passages in the Hebrew Bible repurpose the ancient

---

anthropomorphism" (descriptions of divine body parts). See Hamori, *"When Gods Were Men,"* 26–34.

67. Ibid., 53–54.

68. Ibid., 129–49. This is the subject of Hamori's sixth chapter, "Anthropomorphic Realism and the Ancient Near East."

69. Benjamin D. Sommer, *Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

70. Ibid., 13, 19. Sommer elsewhere notes the difficulty of discerning whether or not terms such as *name* and *glory* denote substantial presence or are merely metaphorical (pp. 58–62).

71. Ibid., 8.

72. Ibid. It is curious that in the midst of his bold treatment of Israelite portrayals of God, Sommer concludes that the Deuteronomist cannot be included in such betrayals. Several scholars have demonstrated the serious weaknesses of this proposition. The ensuing discussion of the name theology in Israel therefore diverges in certain respects from Sommer's thoughts in his third chapter (pp. 58–79).

73. Ibid., 13.

74. Stephen L. Herring, *Divine Substitution: Humanity as the Manifestation of Deity in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East,* FRLANT 247 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 2013).

Mesopotamian conceptualization of the cultic and royal statue (the image, *ṣalmu*). Specifically, he argues that the human image was permissibly used to manifest Yhwh:

> [A]t least three biblical texts (Gen 1:26 f.; Ex 34:29–34; and Ezek 36–37) portray the conceptualization that material images could manifest divine presence in positive terms . . . [but were] limited to a certain type of material image—humans.[75]

Herring's thesis is in large part a careful application of Zainab Bahraini's pioneering reformulation of how ancient Mesopotamians understood cult images.[76] Rather than viewing the cult image (*ṣalmu*) as mimesis, a copy of the deity, the perspective of most modern scholars, Bahraini demonstrates that the Mesopotamian conception is better understood as "a doubling or multiplication, but not in the sense of mimetic resemblance; rather it is a repetition, another way that the person or entity could be encountered."[77] Herring explains:

> The complexity of this concept; i.e. that a representation 'becomes an entity in its own right,' is exactly the reason why scholars such as Jacobsen and Dick refer to the Eucharistic conception of 'real presence.' This type of conceptualization has been contrasted with a Platonic, *mimetic* view of representation in which reality and representation are seen as disparate things, both logically and ontologically. In such a view, the representation is considered an imitation of the reference and, therefore, secondary to it. In the ancient Near East, however, *ṣalmu* was not simply an imitation of the reference but actually substituted for it, becoming part of the real itself.[78]

Herring's work shows how this understanding of iconism explains the biblical writers' presentation of humanity as Yhwh's image. For the purposes of this essay, his work has explanatory power for the broader anthropomorphic portrayals of Yhwh as a man. As Sommer had concluded earlier, Herring writes:

> It is likewise clear that the presence of the deity could exist in heaven and earth simultaneously and that the deity's presence on earth could be in multiple locations at the same time, with no priority given to any one representation as being a more valid manifestation of the presence of the god than any other.[79]

These three studies and the data they produce introduce us to an ancient interpretive matrix that helps us decipher the logic of deity in the ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible. Israel's co-regency has two Yhwh figures, both of whom are Yhwh but are distinguishable in its council hierarchy.

---

75. Ibid., 9 (abstract).
76. Zainab Bahraini, *The Graven Image: Representation in Babylonia and Assyria* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2003).
77. Ibid., 113.
78. Herring, *Divine Substitution*, 36.
79. Ibid., 31.

The Angel in Whom Is the Name:
*An Anthropomorphized "Second Y*HWH*"*

The preceding ideas intersect in a significant way in Exod 23:20–23, one of the passages Alan Segal discovered was fundamental to rabbinic thinking concerning a two powers doctrine in Judaism:

> I am sending an angel before you to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place that I have made ready. Pay heed to him and obey him. Do not rebel against him, for he will not pardon your offenses, since My Name is in him; but if you carefully obey his voice and do all that I say, I will be an enemy to your enemies and a foe to your foes. (NJPSV)

This particular angel is distinguished by virtue of having YHWH's name (שֵׁם; *šem*) in him. He is pledged to guide Israel to the promised land. Judges 2:1–3 more explicitly refers to this angel as the angel of YHWH (מַלְאַךְ יהוה).

While other passages clearly distinguish YHWH and his angel,[80] the language of Exod 23:20–23 serves to closely identify the two figures in a canonical reading. This is discerned by yet another parallel passage to how Israel was guided into the land. In Deut 4:37–38, Moses tells the Israelites that YHWH "brought you out of Egypt with his own presence, by his great power, driving out before you nations greater and mightier than you, to bring you in, to give you their land for an inheritance." YHWH's own presence (פָּנִים) is the guide and deliverer, whereas Exod 23:20–23 assigns that role to the angel with the name. The very presence of YHWH is found within the angel. For a reader of the final form of the Torah, the references to YHWH, his presence, and this angel as delivering Israel overlap.

Segal demonstrated that certain Jews took note of the language and identified this angel as YHWH. He drew attention to *Sanh.* 38b of the Babylonian Talmud, a passage where Rabbi Idith seeks to refute the claim of heretical Jews (*minim*[81]) that the angel of Exod 23:21 is YHWH. Segal writes:

> The demonstration of R. Idi's competence is exceedingly interesting. Without naming the heresy, he describes a passage conducive to the "two powers" heresy (Exod 24:1). In that Scripture, God orders Moses and the elders to ascend to the Lord. Since the text says, "Come up to YHWH" and not "Come up *to me*," the heretic states that two deities are present. The Tetragrammaton would then be the name of a second deity, a conclusion further supported by the lack of an explicit subject for the verb "said" in the Massoretic Text. The high god can refer to

---

80. See for example, Exod 3:1–6; Num 22:22–24; Judg 6:21–23.
81. Segal notes that the term *minim* is "the rabbinic word for 'sectarian' or 'heretic'. . . . In English the words 'sectarian' and 'heretic' express different degrees of disapproval and social distance. A sectarian is probably best described as a disapproved rival among many factions within the parent group, while a heretic is someone who began in the parent group but who has put himself beyond the pale with respect to some canon of orthodoxy. The transition between 'sectarian' and 'heretic' in rabbinic literature would have been apparent only when rabbinic Judaism was acknowledged to have become 'normative'" (Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 5). Segal goes on to elucidate how those who held to a belief in two holy powers were considered heretics by the 2nd century A.D.

his helper as YHWH because the helper is the same figure of whom it
is said, "My name is in him" (Exod 23:20f.). Obviously, this is another
case of heretics believing in a principal angel with divine perquisites
because the Lord's name is in him.[82]

Contemporary scholars might dismiss the two powers understanding of
Exod 23:21 on the grounds that the so-called "name theology" of the He-
brew Bible rules out the notion that YHWH himself was present on earth.
Demonstrating the weakness of that assumption requires a brief survey of
the state of that question. Some of what has already been introduced in
the work of Hamori, Sommer, and Herring undermines a pessimistic as-
sessment of a name theology, but more detail is necessary.

The Name as Enthroned YHWH in His Earthly Temple

The Name Theology in Recent Discussion

Much of the discussion of the name theology centers on Deuteronomy and
the larger Deuteronomistic History (DH). It is in this material that one
encounters formulaic expressions intended to convey the idea that YHWH's
name inhabits the sanctuary. The primary phrase in this regard is *lešakkēn
šemô šām* ("to cause his name to dwell there") though similar phrases (*lašum
šemô šām* ["to put his name there"]; *lihyôt šemî šām* ["that my name might
be there"]) are also relevant.

From the 19th century through most of the 20th, the predominant
understanding of *lešakkēn šemô šām* was "to cause his name to dwell."[83]
The translation implied that the name was some sort of entity, similar to
but lesser than YHWH, that is made to inhabit a location or structure. This
presumption moved scholars to conclude that the Deuteronomistic History
(DH) indicated a paradigm shift in Israel's theology of the divine presence,
in effect the abandonment of the anthropomorphic portrayals of the im-
manent God in J and E, in favor or a more abstract, demythologized YHWH
who no longer dwelled among his people. YHWH's own "self" was in the
heavenly realms, replaced on earth in the sanctuary in favor of some sort
of divine hypostasis referred to as the Name of YHWH, something that was
approximately YHWH, but not actually YHWH.

The latter decades of the 20th century to the present day witnessed
important modifications to this consensus. The first noteworthy departure
was that of Roland de Vaux, who in 1967 undertook an investigation of the
important phrase *lešakkēn šemô šām.*[84] Departing from the heretofore cus-
tomary focus on the phrase's meaning in some religious evolutionary arc,

---

82. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 68.

83. For a more detailed summary of the history of scholarship on the name theology, see
Sandra L. Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology:* lešakkēn šemô šām *in the
Bible and the Ancient Near East*, BZAW 318 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002) 1–35. This section highlights
certain particulars in Richter's overview.

84. Roland de Vaux, "Le lieu que Yahvé a choisi pour y établir son nom," *Das Ferne und
nahe Wort: Festschrift Leonhard Rost zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres am 30. November 1966
gewidmet*, ed. Frtiz Maass, BZAW 105 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967) 219–28.

de Vaux sought to find the meaning of the phrase on the basis of etymology and appeal to comparative Semitic analogies. Though he limited his data to a handful of instances from el-Amarna, de Vaux succeeded in demonstrating: (1) that the phrase was idiomatic and communicated the idea of ownership; and (2) the idiom should not be translated "cause his name to dwell" but "put or place his name." He concluded the name theology did not denote any corrective transformation of Israelite religion in terms of how the divine presence was perceived or understood.[85]

In 1971, Gordon J. Wenham argued that a theological disjunction between YHWH and the Name, an important element in the predominant view, made little sense in light of the fact that Israelite cultic observances associated with the name idiom in Deuteronomy occurred *liphnê* YHWH ("before the Lord")—in God's very presence.[86] The dichotomy between a transcendent YHWH and immanent Name was therefore a false one. The name was not a hypostasis of YHWH, some "near but lesser form" of YHWH. Rather, it was another way to refer to YHWH himself.

Ian Wilson's contribution challenged the view that Deuteronomy (and hence the DH) emphasized YHWH's transcendence to the exclusion of His immanence on earth—that YHWH was not present Himself in the sanctuary but only his hypostatic Name.[87] Specifically, Wilson compared parallel passages between Deuteronomy and the books of Exodus and Numbers and demonstrated that Deuteronomy neither altered nor eliminated the presence of YHWH from earthly contact with Israel. His work showed that in Deut 12–26, "not only is the localized presence of YHWH at the central sanctuary regularly articulated as the Israelites are commanded to perform their worship *liphnê* YHWH, but these same chapters are replete with the Name formulae."[88]

More recently, Sandra Richter has concluded that the formulaic expression *lešakkēn šemô šām* and similar phrases have nothing to do with making a statement about how YHWH's divine presence is to be understood in the DH. She contends there is no "name theology" in the Hebrew Bible. Rather, the idiomatic DH phrases about "placing" the name denote only ownership. That is, the phrases were designed to telegraph the idea that when it came to the land, YHWH was the landlord.[89]

---

85. Two years later, McBride's Harvard dissertation attempted to detect all the instances of the primary name theology phrase in wider ancient Near Eastern literature (S. Dean McBride, "The Deuteronomic Name Theology," Ph.D. diss. [Harvard University, 1969]). The result was a confirmation of de Vaux's translation. McBride retained the idea of hypostatic name theology, contending that it was consistent with other ancient Near Eastern conceptions of *šem*. This view (really, any hypostatic view) would fall into disfavor, most notably expressed by Richter. See the ensuing discussion.

86. Gordon J. Wenham, "Deuteronomy and the Central Sanctuary," *TynBul* 22 (1971) 103–18.

87. Ian Wilson, *Out of the Midst of the Fire: Divine Presence in Deuteronomy*, SBLDS 151 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).

88. Ibid., 213.

89. Richter, *Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology*, 36–40.

While generally well received, Richter's views have not gone unchallenged. A basic criticism of reviewers is that the discussion of a "name theology" is necessarily wider than a focus on the formulaic expressions used in Deuteronomy and the DH. Biblical writers employ *šem* ("name") outside these formulas in ways that plausibly suggested that *šem* denoted the divine presence, at times in clearly anthropomorphic terms.[90] Examples cited include Exod 23:21 (cf. Deut. 4:37), where Yhwh's name-presence is in the angel, Ps 20:2 ("May the Lord answer you in time of trouble, the name of Jacob's God keep you safe"), Isa 30:27 ("the name of the Lord comes from afar, burning with his wrath . . . his lips full of fury, and his tongue like a devouring fire"), and the priestly benediction of Num 6:24–27, where the priests put Yhwh's name on the people three times. As one reviewer noted about this last example, "Are the priests, by blessing the people using a formula containing the Tetragrammaton three times and thereby placing Yhwh's name on the people, declaring his ownership of Israel, declaring his fame, or are they invoking his presence so that he may do the honor?"[91] The point is that more than one approach is feasible. Richter's position is not self-evident.

The most sweeping critique of Richter's conclusions has come from Michael Hundley in a detailed article on the "name language" of Deuteronomy and DH.[92] While agreeing with Richter's contention that the name formulas have been misunderstood and misapplied, Hundley argues that, "her analysis of the formulae and the implications she draws from it are ultimately untenable."[93] Toward making that case, Hundley offers six arguments that, in one form or another, assert that name language in Deuteronomy and DH concerns more than ownership of the sanctuary and sacred space.

Broadly speaking, Hundley argues that, if Richter is correct, her proposed meaning only works with the formulaic phrases, not other texts and contexts. For example, he contends that Richter has left the phrase *libnôt bayit laššem* ("to build a house for the name") unexplained and draws attention to passages that seem to quite coherently require the meaning of "to dwell." The "building a house" wording of course hearkens back to the enthroned Ugaritic co-regent, Baʿal. Psalm 74:7 refers explicitly to the temple as the "dwelling place of God's name" (משכן־שמך). In Jer 7, the lemma *škn* ("to dwell") appears twice in the Piel stem (vv. 3, 7) with the

90. See Tryggve Mettinger, review of Sandra L. Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology:* lešakkēn šemô šām *in the Bible and the Ancient Near East*, *Review of Biblical Literature* [accessed May 1, 2014]. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/bookdetail .asp?TitleId=3007&CodePage=3007. Richter acknowledged that in some passages "the name" could well be understood as referring to Yhwh himself (Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology*, 11).

91. Victor Hurowitz, review of Sandra L. Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology:* lešakkēn šemô šām *in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, JHS* 5 (2004–5) [accessed February 23, 2012]. Online: http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/reviews/review157.htm.

92. Michael Hundley, "To Be or Not to Be: A Reexamination of Name Language in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History," *VT* 59 (2009) 533–55.

93. Ibid., 534.

Israelites as the object, followed by a third Piel form of the lemma (v. 12) referring to God's name (אֲשֶׁר שִׁכַּנְתִּי שְׁמִי שָׁם). It is difficult to see how a translation of "put" or "place" works in all three instances, as opposed to "settle," an alternative that suggests habitation by the divine presence in v. 12 ("where I settled my name").[94] Escaping Hundley's criticism requires translating the third Piel form differently than the preceding two, a choice that would seem motivated by interpretation.

The Name and Israelite Co-regency: Yʜᴡʜ's "Double Presence"
Ultimately, Hundley and other scholars, the present writer included, opt for the existence of a name theology mindful of the work of Richter and others who have forced more careful thinking on the matter. Hundley concludes that the name language of Deuteronomy, DH, and wider Hebrew Bible has three possibilities for interpretation:

> Either God is 1) present in some form, perhaps approaching hypostasis, or 2) fully present as in Zion-Sabaoth theology but unnaturally so, truly belonging in heaven yet unbound by the confines of both, or 3) present only in heaven so that the temple is merely a forwarding station. The contexts render the third option unlikely for various reasons. The Deuteronomistic history uses language that suggests some form of divine presence, while a total abandonment of divine presence in the earthly sphere seems to be too extreme a departure from earlier theories. . . . The Deuteronomist's principal contribution lies not in moving God to heaven but in leaving undefined God's presence on earth. Rather than being a substitute presence or merely a descriptor of hegemony, the name *(šem)* serves to simultaneously guarantee Yʜᴡʜ's practical presence and to abstract the nature of that presence. It ensures that God is present enough to act on Israel's behalf for the sake of his name, while shrouding the nature of his presence in mystery to prevent unnecessary divine limitations.[95]

I concur with Hundley's estimation. Neither of the first two interpretive options locates Yʜᴡʜ only on the earth and absent in heaven. Both allow for at least the simultaneous location of Yʜᴡʜ's divine presence in both heaven and earth, differing only in the precise nature of that presence. Deuteronomy 4:35–39 seems clearly to indicate the third option is not in view (emphasis added):

> It has been clearly demonstrated to you that the Lord alone is God (האלהים); there is none beside Him. *From the heavens* He let you hear His voice to discipline you; *on earth* He let you see His great fire; and from amidst that fire you heard His words. And because He loved your fathers, He chose their heirs after them; He Himself, in His great might, led you out of Egypt, to drive from your path nations greater and more populous than you, to take you into their land and assign it

94. Ibid., 542–43 n. 44.
95. Ibid., 551–53.

to you as a heritage, as is still the case. Know therefore this day and keep in mind that the Lord alone is God *in heaven above and on earth below*; there is no other. (NJPSV)

Verse 35 makes clear the Israelite creedal commitment: Yнwн is God *par excellence* (האלהים); he is unique among all gods.[96] Verse 39 declares that Yнwн alone "is God in heaven above and on earth below." Nathan Mac-Donald asks in regard to this statement:

> What does such a statement mean? Does it mean that Yнwн is pow-erful in heaven above and on the earth below, or is it in some way an expression of divine presence? The use of 'in heaven above' and 'on the earth below' together is surprisingly rare, found on only three other occasions: Josh. 2.11; 1 Kgs 8.23; and Eccl. 5.6. . . . In Josh. 2.11 and 1 Kgs 8:23 the phrase is used of Yнwн in a similar way to that which is found in Deut 4.39. In both cases it is connected with Yнwн's actions on Israel's behalf. That the phrase is connected with Yнwн's presence is indicated by Eccl. 5.6 where the terms are used antitheti-cally: God is in heaven and man is upon the earth; and also by the other occurrences of 'in heaven' when used of Yнwн. Thus, the phrase 'in heaven above and on the earth below' makes a statement about Yнwн's presence, not about the extent of his power. The use of the word-pair 'heaven'—'earth' elsewhere in [Deuteronomy 4] indicates that the totality of the cosmos is intended . . . there is nowhere that Yнwн is not present as האלהים.[97]

This "double presence" is consistent with the comparative ancient Near Eastern data marshaled by Hamori, Sommer, and Herring.[98] Hundley con-curs that the idea of Yнwн's simultaneous presence in more than one loca-tion and in different forms is consistent with wider ancient Near Eastern conceptions. He notes:

> In the ancient Near East, the gods can be present in multiple forms in multiple places, including heaven and earth, without diminishment. For example, in Egypt, Amun is present in various locales, while Ra is present in various earthly temples, most notably Heliopolis, and in the sun itself. . . . The gods are likewise present to some extent in all of their various images, including temple reliefs. In Mesopotamia, Shamash, for example, is both in his temple and in the sun. In Ugarit, Baal is present in his various temples and in his divine storm cloud.[99]

---

96. For the syntax and semantics of האלהים (definite article present) see Nathan Mac-Donald, *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of "Monotheism"* (FAT 2/1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003) 69, 79–81. MacDonald notes that האלהים "is clearly distinct from the other uses of אלהים in Deuteronomy . . . in Deuteronomy, as also in 1 Kings 18, to call Yнwн האלהים is to make a claim about Yнwн's uniqueness" (pp. 79–80).

97. Ibid., 195.

98. Hamori, *"When Gods Were Men,"* 129–49; Sommer, *Bodies of God*, 12–37; Herring, *Divine Substitution*, 31, 36.

99. Hundley, "To Be or Not to Be," 539–40 n. 28.

The implications are germane to the thesis of this paper. If the data suggest that the name is Yʜwʜ and that Yʜwʜ can be present in more than one location or, more cautiously, that the name somehow "is but is not Yʜwʜ" with the result still being that Yʜwʜ is in some sense present in more than one location, then the notion of a divine co-regency where both roles are occupied by Yʜwʜ is an interpretive possibility.

Further, this "second co-regent Yʜwʜ" is at times described with the language of human appearance in the form of the angel of Yʜwʜ. Jews confronted with these phenomena in the received text could therefore quite conceivably have parsed the material as describing something approximating a second Yʜwʜ who was a "man of war" (Exod 15:3) or "human one" (Dan 7:13). As Segal demonstrated in his work on the two powers, this was indeed the interpretive path taken by a portion of Jewish thinkers.

Israelite Worship and the Name

The religion of the biblical writers, then, contained the notion of two Yʜwʜ figures—one in the heavens and the other ensconced on earth in the temple. The earthly Yʜwʜ worshiped in the temple was naturally referred to as Yʜwʜ, but was also referenced as the name.

This element is at the core of name theology. Its implications need to be brought into brief focus given the debate over the criteria for identifying a second Yʜwʜ figure in Judaism and the development of high Christology.

Hurtado and others have insisted that there is no evidence of Israelite or Jewish worship of a second divine being.[100] For these scholars, unless there is evidence of cult, there is no deity figure. For Hurtado, the worship of Jesus is therefore unique for a Jewish sect; it is an innovation that has no real precedent. Others have thought this analysis too restrictive. Boyarin notes in this regard:

> While in general I find Hurtado's argument bracing and important, his exclusive reliance on only one criterion, worship, as determining the divine nature of a given intermediary seems to me overly narrow and rigid. There may be no gainsaying his demonstration, I think, that worship of the *incarnate* Logos, is a *novum*, a 'mutation' as he styles it, introduced by Jesus-people, but the *belief* in an intermediary, a *deuteros theos*, was common to them and other Jews.[101]

While this writer tends to agree with Boyarin, the debate may be moot. If the biblical writers believe Yʜwʜ was both in heaven and on earth as the name in the temple, when they offered prayers, offerings, and sacrifices toward the temple, they were in fact worshiping the name who was (but wasn't—in terms of "exclusive" location) Yʜwʜ. This thinking is indeed reflected in the biblical text, precisely in the material where one would expect it (the DH).

For example, in 2 Sam 6:1–2 (cp. 1 Sam 4:4; Jer 7:12) we read:

100. See p. 199 n. 16.
101. Boyrain, "The Gospel of the Memra," 257 n. 53 (emphasis in the original).

David again gathered all the chosen men of Israel, thirty thousand.
And David arose and went with all the people who were with him
from Baale-judah to bring up from there the ark of God, which is
called the name, the name of the Lord of hosts (אֲשֶׁר־נִקְרָא שֵׁם שֵׁם יְהֹוָה
צְבָאוֹת) who sits enthroned on the cherubim. (ESV)

The Hebrew of the Masoretic Text (MT), represented here, literally reads:
"which is called the name, the name of Yhwh of hosts." Taken straightfor-
wardly, the passage informs us that the ark of the covenant was referred to
as the name. English translations as a pattern obscure the MT since many
scholars consider the dual occurrence of שֵׁם to be an instance of dittogra-
phy.[102] While this is possible, there is no inherent interpretative problem
with MT as it stands in view of the evidence for divine co-regency already
noted. Even if one were to remove one instance of שֵׁם the parallel pas-
sage of 1 Chr 13:6 makes the same point, with the same sort of tantalizing
ambiguity blurring two referents seen earlier. In that passage David brings
up אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים יְהֹוָה יוֹשֵׁב הַכְּרוּבִים אֲשֶׁר־נִקְרָא שֵׁם׃ ("the ark of God, Yhwh who
sits enthroned on the cherubim, who/which [?] is called the name"). That
the ark could be called the name is understandable, since the ark was a
place-holder for the very presence of Yhwh, who is the name.

Other passages in the DH are more direct. The double presence name
theology of the DH informs readers of the canonical text that the name
indwelled the temple and acts of worship were to be directed there.

The famous temple dedication prayer of Solomon, contains these lines:

"But will God really dwell on earth? Even the heavens to their ut-
termost reaches cannot contain You, how much less this House that I
have built! Yet turn, O Lord my God, to the prayer and supplication of
Your servant, and hear the cry and prayer which Your servant offers
before You this day. May Your eyes be open day and night toward this
House, toward the place of which You have said, 'My name shall abide
there'; may You heed the prayers which Your servant will offer toward
this place. . . . "Or if a foreigner who is not of Your people Israel comes
from a distant land for the sake of Your name—for they shall hear
about Your great name and Your mighty hand and Your outstretched
arm—when he comes to pray toward this House, oh, hear in Your
heavenly abode and grant all that the foreigner asks You for. Thus
all the peoples of the earth will know Your name and revere You, as
does Your people Israel; and they will recognize that Your name is
attached to this House that I have built. . . . "When they sin against
You . . . and they turn back to You with all their heart and soul, in the
land of the enemies who have carried them off, and they pray to You
in the direction of their land which You gave to their fathers, of the
city which You have chosen, and of the House which I have built to

102. See P. Kyle McCarter Jr., *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and
Commentary*, AB 9 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008) 163. However, even without
the second שֵׁם the translation "the ark of God, which is called the name" is still coherent and
echoes the thought of the parallel 1 Chr 13:6).

> Your name—oh, give heed in Your heavenly abode to their prayer and supplication, uphold their cause. (1 Kgs 8:27–29, 41–43, 46–49; NJPSV)

The passage has God dwelling in the temple and presuming the propriety of directing prayers to the earthly temple in which the God of heaven dwells as the name. Foreigners and repentant Israelites are directed to do the same. It is difficult not to see such prayers as acts of worship.

Sacrifices are also connected to the place where the name dwells. In Deut 12 and 16, one reads:

> When you cross the Jordan and settle in the land that the Lord your God is allotting to you, and He grants you safety from all your enemies around you and you live in security, then you must bring everything that I command you to the site where the Lord your God will choose to establish His name: your burnt offerings and other sacrifices, your tithes and contributions, and all the choice votive offerings that you vow to the Lord. (Deut 12:10–11; NJPSV)

> You shall slaughter the passover sacrifice for the Lord your God, from the flock and the herd, in the place where the Lord will choose to establish His name. . . . You are not permitted to slaughter the passover sacrifice in any of the settlements that the Lord your God is giving you; but at the place where the Lord your God will choose to establish His name, there alone shall you slaughter the passover sacrifice, in the evening, at sundown, the time of day when you departed from Egypt. (Deut 16:2, 5–6; NJPSV)

The biblical writers had no qualms about such language against their own broader religious context of Yhwh's double presence precisely because the second figure was Yhwh. It does not seem unthinkable or illogical that Jews of a later era could have utilized this sort of thinking as a rationale for insisting that the worship of Jesus did not violate Jewish monotheism. The Gospel of John, for example, has Jesus receiving and manifesting the name of God (John 17:6, 11–12, 26).

The task that remains is to show how the biblical writers attributed the last two fundamental characterizations of the co-regent Baʿal to the angel of Yhwh. Given the co-regent framework indicated by the name theology and the anthropomorphic angel in whom Yhwh's name-presence dwelled, the motifs of divine warrior who is lord over the nations should be discernible in regard to this second figure.

Yhwh's Angel as Victorious Warrior

Yhwh and His Warrior Angel: Blurring the Distinction

As noted earlier, Baʿal's portrayal as a warrior is well known.[103] At first glance, there may seem little to connect warrior Baʿal with the rabbinical defense of a second power in heaven from Exod 15:3 noted by Segal

---

103. See the earlier discussion along with Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*, 24–45.

("Yhwh is a man of war").[104] Several passages have Yhwh's angel present with Israel prior to the crossing of the Red/Reed Sea, the event that occasioned the Song of Moses of Exod 15. Most familiar is Exod 3:1–7, where Yhwh responds to the cries of his people (Exod 3:7, 16) by calling Moses at the burning bush. The angel is present in the bush along with Yhwh (Exod 3:2).

The passage illustrates how Yhwh and his angel could simultaneously be distinguished and yet blurred. Verse 4 includes anthropomorphic language (Yhwh "saw" and "turned"; Exod 3:4). If this was intended as imagery associated with the angel, the narrative effectively blurs the identity of Yhwh and the angel since the one who sees, turns, and then speaks is identified as Yhwh in the same verse. Yhwh of course could be cast as embodied (Gen 18:1–15), but if the anthropomorphic language is to be attributed to Yhwh, why mention the angel here? The issue under consideration here is not how do we as moderns sort out a presumed confusion by analysis of sources and redaction layers, but how Second Temple period Jews would have interpreted what they saw in the text.

The reader next encounters the angel in Exod 14:19, "The angel of God, who had been going ahead of the Israelite army, now moved and followed behind them; and the pillar of cloud shifted from in front of them and took up a place behind them" (NJPSV). The scene is not completely clear. Was the angel in the cloud? It seems that the answer would be no, since in Exod 14:24 we read, "At the morning watch, the Lord looked down upon the Egyptian army from a pillar of fire and cloud, and threw the Egyptian army into panic" (NJPSV). This would mean Yhwh was veiled inside the cloud and the angel was visible outside of, but in close relation to, the veiled Yhwh.

It is interesting to reflect back on Baʿal at this juncture. The Ugaritic co-regent could be simultaneously present in his (storm) cloud, and yet on earth in one or more of his temples. We have seen that the biblical writer could express the same idea, describing Yhwh in one mode (the cloud) while having the co-regent Yhwh on earth.

Numbers 20:16 hearkens back to the burning bush scene, the moment when Yhwh responds that he has heard the cry of his people, with this statement: "We cried to the Lord and He heard our plea, and He sent a messenger (מלאך) who freed us from Egypt" (NJPSV). The wording links the angel to the deliverance from Egypt. That deliverance is suggested by both descriptions of the crossing of the sea and the description in Exod 15:3 to the divine man of war.

Readers of the final form of the Torah had been prepared for this language and imagery by the book of Genesis. By the time readers reached the exodus deliverance, Yhwh and his angel had been closely identified with each other. For example, in Jacob's deathbed blessing of Joseph's children, the patriarch offers this blessing (Gen 48:15–16; NJPSV):

---

104. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 33–67, 148, 184–85.

The God (האלהים) in whose ways my fathers Abraham and Isaac
walked,
The God (האלהים) who has been my shepherd from my birth to this
day—
The Angel (המלאך) who has redeemed me from all harm—
Bless (יְבָרֵךְ) the lads

The startling item in this brief section is that האלהים and המלאך are united
as subjects of the same grammatically *singular* verb. It is hard to imagine
a tighter fusion of the figures involved—or a better opportunity for an
editor to make sure the two were not blurred together if that mattered for
Israel's theology. One must either interpret this verse as: (1) an identifica-
tion of the God of Israel as a מלאך, a being of lowest rank in Canaanite
divine councils; (2) a reference to God sending a מלאך to help Jacob who is
awkwardly identified with YHWH here by the grammar; or (3) a particular
מלאך who is tightly identified with YHWH, but who is still distinct from,
and of lesser hierarchical rank, than YHWH. [105] The first is incoherent in
light of YHWH's incomparability among all the host of heaven throughout
the Hebrew Bible.[106] The second and third options are both possible, but
the third is the most plausible. The use of the article with מלאך and the
parallelism of המלאך to האלהים indicate a correspondence is being struck
between a particular מלאך and the incomparable God of Israel.

There are only two instances in Jacob's life that might be construed
by an interpreter as the angelic referent of his blessing. One is Gen 31:11,
where the angel of God (מלאך האלהים) informs him how to outwit Laban.
That the מלאך האלהים is the מלאך יהוה is evident from the juxtaposition of
the two phrases with respect to the same divine figure in other passages.[107]
This identification is significant since מלאך האלהים is also the phrase used in
Exod 14:19 for the angel at the Red/Reed Sea. This confirms that the angel
in that scene is the angel of YHWH.

The second option is Gen 32, where Jacob wrestles with a "man" (איש;
Heb. 32:25). Genesis 32:23–33 is one of two passages Hamori describes as
an איש theophany, the other being Gen 18:1–5. For Hamori, the man of Gen
32:23–33 is YHWH himself. Hosea 12:4–5 uses the term מלאך of this "man."
Hamori considers the term a gloss.[108] In view of Gen 48:15–16, a passage
Hamori cites but does not discuss, it is unclear why a gloss explanation is
necessary. If the man of Gen 32:23–33 is indeed the angel, as this writer sus-
pects, then Gen 18:1–15 is the only passage that clearly portrays YHWH as

---

105. This third option seems more consistent with the broad range of data than the first
because *mlʾkm* of Ugaritic and Israelite councils were considered low-tier deities. See Handy,
Among the Host of Heaven, 149–68; Smith, *Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 47–53.
106. The literature on this theme is copious. See for example, Catrin H. Williams, *I Am
He: The Interpretation of ʾanı̂ hû in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*, WUNT 2/113 (Tübingen:
Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Casper J. Labuschagne, *The Incomparability of Yahweh in the Old Testament*
(Leiden: Brill, 1966).
107. Compare Judg 6:20; 6:11–12, 21–22; and Judg 13:6, 9 with Judg 13:2, 13, 15–21.
108. Hamori, *"When Gods Were Men,"* 110–11.

a man. The implication would be that the biblical norm for such language is the angel, who also happens to be Yhwh.

Warrior Baʿal and Yhwh's Double as Commander of Yhwh's Host

The identification of the angel as a warrior becomes more explicit after Sinai. In Exod 23:20–23, the angel's task is described as leading the camp to the promised land. Verse 23 is more specific: "When my angel goes before you and brings you to the Amorites and the Hittites and the Perizzites and the Canaanites, the Hivites and the Jebusites, and I blot them out." The angel's guidance is accompanied by conquest (cf. Exod 33:2). When the time for conquest approaches under the leadership of Joshua, the Israelite general encounters a mysterious figure described in terms that make his identity unmistakable:

> Once, when Joshua was near Jericho, he looked up and saw a man standing before him, drawn sword in hand. Joshua went up to him and asked him, "Are you one of us or of our enemies?" He replied, "No, I am captain of the Lord's host. Now I have come!" Joshua threw himself face down to the ground and, prostrating himself, said to him, "What does my lord command his servant?" The captain of the Lord's host answered Joshua, "Remove your sandals from your feet, for the place where you stand is holy." And Joshua did so. (Josh 5:13–15, NJPSV)

Two elements make it clear that the commander of Yhwh's host, an explicit warrior epithet, is the angel of Yhwh, though that phrase does not appear in the passage. First, the wording of the commander's charge to Joshua in v. 15 regarding the removal of the sandals and the holy ground is nearly identical to God's command to Moses at the burning bush (Exod 3:5), space occupied by both Yhwh and the angel of Yhwh (Exod 3:1–14). Second, Josh 5:13 contains the rare phrase חַרְבּוֹ שְׁלוּפָה בְּיָדוֹ ("his sword drawn in his hand"). This phrase occurs only two other times in the Hebrew Bible: Num 22:23 and 1 Chr 21:16. In both instances the figure so described is identified as the angel of Yhwh.

The picture that thus emerges from these descriptions of the deliverance from Egypt is that angel of Yhwh, in whom was Yhwh's name-presence (Deut 4:37), was cast in the form of a man leading Yhwh's people against her enemies and into Canaan. The "man of war" interpretation underlying the two powers idea of later Judaism becomes quite comprehensible.

The Anthropomorphized Yhwh as Lord of the Nations

The Victory March of the Man of War

Recall that, after warrior Baʿal won the co-regency, the Baʿal Cycle records his triumphant victory march (*KTU* 1.4.vii.7–13) through a number of towns and villages of his domain. As noted earlier, Smith and Pitard draw attention to several important items in this description, namely, that it bore

resemblance to the imagery of biblical passages describing Yhwh's march to Zion (Deut 33:2; Judg 5:4–5; and Ps 68:8–9, 18–19).[109] It is appropriate at this juncture to expand on the earlier quotation, for their point is important for the imagery of the Israelite divine co-regency. In their words:

> Baal's procession does not seem to be a true military campaign, since there is no real indication of resistance by the towns. It rather seems to be a victory tour in which all the cities and towns demonstrate their submission to the conqueror. . . . From a literal point of view, these numbers are not particularly large. As noted above, the kingdom of Ugarit itself contained at least ca. 150 towns and villages. But within the poetic formula, these numbers are as large as are necessary to make the point. . . . They certainly are intended to suggest that Baal's conquests go beyond any conventional numerical scale; he is king over all the earth.[110]

Although Baʿal's march would, taken straightforwardly, cast him as lord over a number of towns in the immediate vicinity of Ugarit, the real point of the description is that Baʿal is terrestrial sovereign, lord of the nations. This belief was inseparable from Baʿal's kingship over the gods. To be king of the gods meant lordship over the nations, and vice versa. This is not unexpected since, as noted earlier, deities at Ugarit had territorial dominions.

The victory march and the belief in terrestrial sovereignty are also united in Israelite religion with respect to the anthropomorphized co-regent Yhwh. Each of the biblical passages referenced by Smith and Pitard describes the divine warrior's march in anthropomorphic terms. Each is also well known for its appropriation of Baʿal imagery and epithets associated with Baʿal's victory.[111] Since the usual referent when Yhwh is described in human form is the angel who is Yhwh on earth, these divine processions could have been processed by some Second Temple interpreters as depictions of the warrior angel leading Israel to Zion.

In his seminal work, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, F. M. Cross noted that the ancient poetic portrayals in Deut 33, Judg 5, Ps 68, and Hab 3 are "marked by a ubiquitous motif: the march of Yhwh from the southern mountains (or from Egypt) with heavenly armies."[112] Cross also noted the overlapping motifs in these passages with Exod 15 and the Red/Reed Sea event, a focal point for two powers thinking as described above because it directly involved the angel who is Yhwh. Other scholars have noted a

109. Smith and Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle Volume II*, 660–62.

110. Ibid., 662.

111. John Day, "Echoes of Baal's Seven Thunders and Lightnings in Psalm XXIX and Habakkuk III 9 and the Identity of the Seraphim in Isaiah VI," *VT* 29/2 (1979) 143–51; W. Herrmann, "Rider Upon the Clouds," *DDD* 705; Theodore Hiebert, *God of My Victory: The Ancient Hymn of Habakkuk 3*, HSM 38 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986); H. Niehr, "He-of-the-Sinai," *DDD* 388; Stan Rummel, *Ras Shamra Parallels*, 237, 260–61, 458–60; Mary K. Wakeman, *God's Battle with the Monster: A Study in Biblical Imagery* (Leiden: Brill, 1973) 92–101.

112. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 100 (cf. p. 157).

range of philological and literary parallels between these passages and Exod 15.[113] These connections take us back to the angel.

Perhaps the most transparent example is the march in Hab. 3. Its reference to "pestilence" (דבר) and "plague" (רֶשֶׁף) are of interest. Hendel, like many other scholars, takes the two nouns as personifications. He argues that the "destroyer" (מַשְׁחִית) of Exod 12:23 sent by Yhwh to kill the Egyptian firstborn "is probably a variant of these plague demons."[114]

Hendel's notion of a relationship between the two passages is useful, though I disagree with its application. I think it more coherent to see the Destroyer as the anthropomorphized second Yhwh figure. The references to "plague" and "pestilence" take the reader's mind back to Egypt. The presence of these terms in Hab 3:3–5, a clear portrayal of an anthropomorphized warrior, was designed to identify the divine figure marching to the land of promise as the same figure who delivered Israel from Egypt.

The word מַשְׁחִית can be textually connected to Yhwh's angel. In 1 Chr 21:15, one of the passages that linked the angel of Yhwh with the commander of Yhwh's host before whom Joshua bowed, מַשְׁחִית is used to describe the angel "working destruction" for Yhwh. The line between Yhwh and the Destroyer is blurred, much in the way the distinction between Yhwh and the angel is obscured, because Exod 12:23 has the Destroyer killing the first born but describes Yhwh as passing through Egypt to strike down the firstborn. Other passages have Yhwh vowing to kill the firstborn using the first person.[115] Subsequent retellings of the episode have the Destroying angel killing the firstborn accompanied by a retinue or host (Ps 78:49–51), as is the case in Hab 3.

The victory march of an anthropomorphized Yhwh figure bears strong resemblance to the Baʿal co-regent characterization. Connections back to the exodus event also provide a clear interpretive path to the co-regent angel who was the visible Yhwh. But was the march motif connected to terrestrial sovereignty in Israelite thinking? For the parallel to be coherent the idea of the marching co-regent must contain the idea that the Yhwh figure is lord of gods and their nations, as Baʿal was so conceived.

A Warrior Yhwh as Lord of the Nations

Most scholars of Israelite religion believe that the idea that Yhwh's kingship over the gods and their nations is a postexilic idea, an element of the climactic innovation of monotheism. That larger issue is of course more complex than this essay's focus. For current purposes, it must be noted that the rhetoric of preexilic biblical material does on occasion embrace the idea of Yhwh's terrestrial lordship. As was the case with warrior Baʿal, the victory march motif cannot be coherently divorced from terrestrial dominion.

---

113. William Irwin, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," *JNES* 1 (1942) 10–40; Francis I. Andersen, *Habakkuk: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 25 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974, 2008) 345.

114. Ronald Hendel, "The Exodus in Biblical Memory," *JBL* 120 (2001) 609.

115. See Exod 4:23; cf. 11:4–5; 12:12–13:23a.27.29; Pss 78:51; 105:36.

For example, terrestrial lordship is transparently stated in several enthronement psalms that date to well before the exilic period. Psalm 29:10 declares, "The Lord sat enthroned at the flood; the Lord sits enthroned, king forever" (NJPSV). In Israelite cosmology, the flood upon which Yhwh sat was the watery covering thought to be over the solid dome that enclosed the round, flat earth. This throne obviously did not cover *only* Israel. As such, it cannot coherently be denied that the author viewed the foreign nations under the dome and flood as being under the authority of Yhwh.[116]

The same kingship perspective is echoed in the Song of Moses. In Exod 15:11 we encounter the rhetorical challenge, "Who is like you, O Lord, among the gods?" (ESV) followed in v. 18 by, "The Lord will reign forever and ever" (ESV). As Cross noted many years ago, "The kingship of the gods is a common theme in early Mesopotamian and Canaanite epics. The common scholarly position that the concept of Yhwh as reigning or king is a relatively late development in Israelite thought seems untenable."[117]

Other preexilic texts can be brought to the discussion. Psalm 47:2 not only declares that Yhwh is a great king over all the earth, but in so doing it equates Yhwh with Elyon: "For the Lord (Yhwh), the Most High, is to be feared, a great king over all the earth." Verse 7 adds, "God is the king of all the earth." This psalm belongs to the category labeled by scholars as "enthronement psalms." J. J. M. Roberts argued that the psalm should be situated in the "cultic celebration of Yhwh's imperial accession, based on the relatively recent victories of David's age."[118] A narrative sampling of the same idea is readily available in the Deuteronomistic History (DH). The writer(s) of the DH presumed that Yhwh controlled the destiny of the nations targeted for removal from Canaan. Israel's preexilic biblical writers expressed the belief that Yhwh had defeated and banished the nations in Israel's land, an idea that presumes Yhwh was supreme over the gods

---

116. Scholars disagree on whether *mabbûl* refers to the heavenly primeval ocean of ancient Israelite cosmology. In the first volume of his commentary on the Baal Cycle (lines 11b–15a // lines 19–23a), Smith remarks, "The phrase would appear to refer to time past based on the contrastive parallelism with *lĕʿôlām* (rather than the location of enthronement according to most commentators; see *CMHE* 147 n. 4; Cunchillos 1976: 111–21)." Nevertheless Smith adds, "The use of *ʾaḥar hammabbûl* (Gen 9:28; 10:1, 32; 11:1) and (*mê ham)mabbûl* (Gen 6:17; 7:6, 7, 10, 17; 9:11 [twice], 15) as temporal expressions may have inspired a secondary interpretation of Ps 29:10 along the lines of the biblical flood traditions." See Mark S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle: Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU 1.1–1.2* (vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 1994) 348, n. 223. The sources of Smith's citations are Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, (op. cit); and J. L. Cunchillos, *Estudio des Salmo 29: Canto al Dos de la fertilidad-fecundidad. Aportación al conocimiento de la Fe de Israel a su entrada en Canaan* (Valencia: La Institución San Jérónimo, 1976). I would agree with Smith's temporal perspective, though I would contend that this approach does not mean the psalmist considered the waters above the earth absent from their cosmology after the flood (Gen 7:11; 8:2; cf. Psa 148:5 after the flood). I take Smith's observation to indicate that in Ps 29, the psalmist looks back at a time when the nations that had emerged from the judgment of the flood (Gen 10), a time when Yhwh was king over those nations, prior to disinheriting them and taking Israel as his portion to initiate a new stage in salvation history (Deut. 4:19–20; cf. Deut. 32:8–9, reading v. 8 with LXX and 4QDeutʲ).

117. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic,* 99 n. 30.

118. J. J. M. Roberts, "The Religio-Political Setting of Psalm 47," *BASOR* 221 (1976) 132.

of those nations. And as we have seen, this supremacy is cast anthropo-morphically via the angel in whom was the name, who was Yhwh (Exod 23:23–24; Judg 2:1–3).

The co-regent's lordship of the nations is of course most clearly conveyed in later material, notably Dan 7:9–14, a divine council scene. As noted at the beginning of this essay, this passage played a crucial role in Judaism's two powers theology.

Scholars have noted that Dan 7 follows the flow of the Baʿal Cycle. [119] A close reading reveals El and Baʿal motifs assigned to the high sovereign figure (the "Ancient of Days"). However, imagery related to Baʿal is aligned with a second figure. The well-known description of Baʿal as the rider of the clouds is particularly significant in this regard. [120] The description was repurposed in several passages in the Hebrew Bible of Yhwh, the God of Israel. [121] The lone exception to this usage in the Hebrew Bible is Dan 7, where it is applied to the second figure who is referred to as a "human one" (בר אנש).

Ugarit / Baʿal Cycle	Daniel 7
(A) El, the aged high God, is the ultimate sovereign in the council. (B) Baʿal defeats Yamm (C) El bestows kingship upon the god Baʿal, the Cloud-Rider. (D) Baʿal is king of the gods and El's vice-regent. His rule is everlasting.	(A) The Ancient of Days is the ultimate sovereign in council, and thus plays the El role in the scene. However, he is also seated on the fiery, wheeled throne-chariot, a Baʿal motif. (B) The Ancient of Days also fulfills a Baʿal role here, since he, along with the council, decide that the fourth beast from the sea (יַמָּא; *yammaʾ*) must be killed. He also plays an El role, by withdrawing kingship from the other three beasts.[122] (C) The Ancient of Days, bestows kingship upon the human one who comes upon the clouds, the co-regent figure. (D) The human one who comes upon the clouds is given everlasting dominion as a deity-level co-regent. He is king of all the nations and so also over their gods.

119. On the relationship of the Baʿal Cycle to Daniel 7, see John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 280–94; J. A. Emerton, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery," *JTS* 9/2 (1958) 228. One of the more insistent objectors to the Ugaritic provenance is Arthur J. Ferch, *The Son of Man in Daniel 7*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 6 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1979); idem, "Daniel 7 and Ugarit: A Reconsideration," *JBL* 99 (1980) 75–86. For Collins's response to Ferch, see John J. Collins, "Apocalyptic Genre and Mythic Allusions in Daniel," *JSOT* 21 (1981) 83–100. This writer concurs with Collins' carefully argued rejections of an Iranian or Babylonian background for the visions in favor of a Canaanite provenance, specifically that of the Baʿal Cycle.

120. W. Herrmann, "Rider Upon the Clouds," *DDD* 703–5; Patrick D. Miller, "God and the Gods: History of Religion as an Approach and Context for Bible and Theology," in *Israelite Religion and Biblical Theology: Collected Essays*, JSOTSup 267 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000) 365–96 (esp. p. 381); Mark S. Smith, *The Early History of God*, 54, 80.

121. Deut 33:26; Pss 68:32–33; 104:1–3; Isa 19:1.

Daniel 7, then, includes a second deity figure under the God of Israel's authority in an Israelite divine council scene. The second figure shares ruling authority with the high sovereign. The text applies motifs associated with the co-regent Baʿal to this figure, who is human in appearance. That the text also applies Baʿal motifs to the high sovereign marks a mutual deity status of the high sovereign and the co-regent and also serves to telegraph "sameness" between the two, yet with an unmistakable hierarchical distinction.

Conclusion

This article has proposed that an ancient Israelite divine council co-regency framework can be discerned in certain literary-theological strategies in the Hebrew Bible. The genius of the adaptation of Ugarit's co-regent conception for divine authority was to have Yhwh occupying both roles. In this way, an Israelite co-regency within the divine council did not violate exclusive fidelity to Yhwh. This co-regent structure was discerned by Jewish thinkers of the Second Temple era and later, contributing to the teaching that there were two holy powers in heaven. Christ followers from within Judaism perceived in this co-regency structure a biblical precedent for the belief in Jesus as Yhwh incarnate that maintained loyal monotheism to the God of Israel.

---

122. See *KTU* 1.2.iii.17–18 and 1.6.vi.26–29, where Athtar and Mot respectively are threatened by El with the withdrawal of their kingship.