

The “Secret of the Creation of the Demons”: A Chapter in an Anonymous Lurianic Treatise Adapted by Moses Zacuto

Gerold Necker
University of Halle-Wittenberg

Abstract

This article questions the view that R. Moses Zacuto (ReMeZ) focused his kabbalistic efforts strictly on adapting Hayyim Vital’s version of Lurianic kabbalah. In doing so, an unknown Lurianic treatise found in an autograph of Zacuto will be specifically taken into account. The concepts of this treatise are affiliated with the school of Israel Saruq, and some of them resound in Zacuto’s work, in particular *Em la-Binah*. The first part analyzes a chapter on the creation of demons, and addresses the issue of possible sources, which leads to the identification of an Ashkenazi tradition that was also incorporated in Vital’s *Sefer ha-Liqqutim*. The second part discusses one of Zacuto’s glosses on this treatise and the connection to his dictionary of magic names, *Shorshei ha-Shemot*.

Introduction

The kabbalistic writings of Moses Zacuto (ca.1610 Amsterdam–1697 Mantua), who directed for some decades the reception and distribution of Lurianic works in Northern Italy, are strongly bound to his image as a staunch defender of Ḥayyim Vital’s version of Lurianic kabbalah, mainly according to the redaction of Jacob Tsemaḥ.¹ Joseph Avivi described in detail the process of Zacuto’s

* I would like to thank Prof. Gideon Bohak for giving me the opportunity to present a first draft of this article at “The Fourth Workshop for the Study of Ancient Jewish Magic” in Tel Aviv, May 30, 2019. The whole subject is part of a joint project with my colleague, Prof. Yuval Harari, “Encyclopedic Magic: A

choice of manuscripts, indicating the master copies with the meaningful phrase “fine flour” (סולת נקיה), and rejecting other versions of Lurianic kabbalah, in particular the editions of Joseph Solomon del Medigo (*Sefer Novlot Hokhmah*) and Naphtali Bacharach (*Emeq ha-Melekh*).² It comes as a surprise, then, that Zacuto’s own

Synergetic Approach to Rabbi Moses Zacuto’s Sources of Practical and Theoretical Kabbalah,” supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG). The project aims to reevaluate the writings of Moses Zacuto in general, and particularly his works on magic. An edition of *Sefer ha-Sodot* with special consideration of an autograph, The National Library of Israel, Jerusalem, Israel Ms. Heb. 40 615, is being prepared by Prof. Yuval Harari and his team, Dr. Eliezer Baumgarten and Dr. Uri Safrai; the Lurianic treatise in this manuscript, which is the object of the present article, will be edited by Eliezer Baumgarten and myself. I would like to express my gratitude to our colleagues in Israel.

- 1 There is an ongoing debate about the question of how and to what extent Lurianic teachings have been distributed in Europe in the first half of the seventeenth century, see Moshe Idel, “One from a Town, Two from a Clan – The Diffusion of Lurianic Kabbalah and Sabbateanism: A Re-Examination,” *Jewish History* 7 (1993): 79–104; Joseph Avivi, “קבלת האר”י, vol. 2 (Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute for the Study of Jewish Communities in the East, 2008), 1033–35; Zeev Gries, “מסורת ושינוי במעבר מכתבי יד לדפוס,” *Alei Sefer* 23/24 (2015): 28, n. 38. On the entanglement of Lurianic kabbalah in Ashkenaz with earlier esoteric lore, see Eliezer Baumgarten, “הערות על דרכי השימוש של ר’ נפתלי בכרך,” *AJS Review* 37, no. 2 (2013): 1–23. I thank Prof. Zeev Gries for his valuable comments.
- 2 Cf. Joseph Avivi, “סולת נקיה נפתו של רבי משה זכות,” *Pe’amim* 96 (2003): 76–79; the redaction of Lurianic manuscripts by Zacuto and his students is summarized in Avivi, “קבלת האר”י, vol. 2, 724–46. On Josef del Medigo’s two volumes *Ta’alumot Hokhmah* (Basel [Hanau] 1629) and *Novlot Hokhmah* (Basel [Hanau] 1631), see Avivi, “קבלת האר”י, vol. 2, 551–55. Concerning Naphtali Bacharach, Avivi “סולת נקיה נפתו,” 79, refers in particular to the order of the *hekhalot* as described in the treatise *Limmudei ha-Beriah*, which was incorporated into *Emeq ha-Melekh* (cf. Joseph Avivi, “כתבי האר”י באיטליה עד שנת ש”פ,” *Alei Sefer* 11 (1984): 95, n. 14; cf. also Isaiah Tishby, “לקבלת הרמ”ק,” in idem, מחקרים, “בכתבי ובחייו של אהרן ברכיה ממוריה חקרי קבלה ושלוחותיה, מחקרים,” in idem, *ומקורותיה*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1982), 197, n. 71, but “differs from Vital’s teaching regarding the order of the *hekhalot* and what is described therein” (Avivi, “סולת נקיה נפתו,” 79, n. 73, referring to the printed version of Vital in *Otsrot Hayyim*, Koretz 1783), which is why Zacuto rejected the order given in *Emeq ha-Melekh*, as noted by Gershom Scholem, *כתבי-היד בקבלה הנמצאים בבית הספרים הלאומי והאוניברסיטאי בירושלים*, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1930), 152, with reference to Zacuto’s commentary on the Zohar, *Yodei Binah*, Ms. Jerusalem 40 82, fol. 32b. However, this statement should be specified: Zacuto actually wonders

kabbalistic explanations, which are scattered in his commentaries, poems, letters, halakhic writings, dictionaries, and more,³ include a sort of residue or imprint which came out of an intense occupation with ideas pursuant to Israel Saruq’s school of thought.⁴ Though these traces turn up rather inconspicuously, like angelic names would do, they reveal Zacuto’s casual attitude towards terms that would be telling in Saruqian contexts. A good example is “*malbush*,” which appears time and again in his two commentaries on the Zohar. To be sure, as an “aspect” different from the Saruqian perspective, it

“from where” the author of *Emeq ha-Melekh* adapted his arrangement (ולא ידעתי מנין לו, *ibid.* fol. 32a), which differs from the “genuine version of R. Isaac Luria and R. Hayyim Vital (סולת נקיה מדברי האר”י והרח”י).” The particular version of *Limmudei ha-Beriah* used by Naphtali Bacharach — which was apparently based on Ezra of Fano’s copy of the second part of *Hathalat Hokhmah* (cf. Avivi, “קבלת האר”י”, vol. 1, 305-307, vol. 2, 559-560; on this version, see also Ronit Meroz, “אסכולת סרוק: היסטוריה חדשה,” *Shalem* 7 [2001]: 156) — was therefore unknown to Zacuto, his acquaintance with early versions of Lurianic kabbalah circulating in Northern Italy notwithstanding. Elsewhere I shall compare Zacuto’s explanations concerning the *hekhalot* with the *hekhalot* of *malkhut de-beriah* in the last (but fragmentary) chapter (in addition to chapter 113) of the anonymous treatise discussed in the present article (see below) on the one hand, and the traditions of the Saruq school collected by Alexander Katz (for Katz’ redaction see Avivi, “קבלת האר”י”, vol. 1, 440-43) on the other.

- 3 A comprehensive mapping of Zacuto’s works will be carried out by Yuval Harari and his team; the genre of letters and Zacuto’s halakhic writings are being studied by Maximilian de Molière and Dr. Vladislav (Zeev) Slepoy of the German team. For the time being, see the list of Zacuto’s published writings, Yaakov Lattes, “כתביו של רבי משה זכות שבדפוס,” *Pe’amim* 96 (2003): 20-33.
- 4 For research on different branches and topics of this school, see Gershon Scholem, “ישראל סרוק – תלמיד האר”י,” *Zion* 5 (1940): 214-43 (=Daniel Abrams, ed., *קבלת האר”י*, אוסף מאמרים מאת גרשם שלום, [Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2008], 295-329); Moshe Idel, “בין קבלת ירושלים לקבלת ר’ ישראל סרוק (מקורות לתורת ר’ ישראל סרוק),” *Shalem* 6 (1992): 165-73; Ronit Meroz, “ר’ ישראל סרוק, פרוש אנונימי,” *Da’at* 28 (1992): 41-50; eadem, “לאדרא רבא הנמנה עם אסכולת סרוק, או: מה בין סרוק וחבריו ובין אירגאס, שפינוזה ואחרים,” *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 12 (1996): 307-78; eadem, “Contrasting Opinions among the Founders of Saruq’s School,” in *Expérience, Écriture et Théologie dans le Judaïsme et les Religions du Livre*, ed. P. Fenton and R. Goetschel (Paris: Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2000), 191-202; eadem, “אסכולת סרוק,” Sharron Shatil, “The Kabbalah of R. Israel Saruq: A Lurianic-Cordoverian Encounter,” *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 14, no. 2 (2011): 158-87.

is well known in Vital's *Ets Hayyim*.⁵ In fact, it connotes both a midrashic and a magical background,⁶ and, what is more, the Cordoverean idea of what Bracha Sack described as the “dynamical process” of revealing by mantling, to wit “השגת מלבוש.”⁷ But Zacuto even stresses the “secret” of the “world of *malbush*,” implicating the emanation of the Alphabet, suited as א"ל ב"ם at the “center of *malbush*,” and the function of יר"ד האומנת, the formative agent of “wisdom” for improving the world of *Atsilut*, a female expression in line with Moses Cordovero's explanation of *Malkhut* and *Binah*.⁸ These — admittedly unusual — borrowings were integrated specifically into Zacuto's *Em la-Binah*; the raw material of this book is found at the very beginning of Ms. Jerusalem 615, collected but never published by Zacuto himself.⁹

- 5 In the following entry of Jacob Tsemah's dictionary *Erkhei ha-Kinuyyim* (ed. Moshe Zuriel, Jerusalem: Yerid ha-Sefarim, 2006, 377), conceptions found in Cordovero's and Vital's works are condensed in a way that appears to have been taken up again in the Saruqian approach: “Two times the ‘filling’ of the (divine name) א"ל amounts to the same numerical value as אור פני"אל and as חשמ"ל (the gematria of both is 378; see Zohar 2:246b), which corresponds to the numerical value of מלבר"ש, since (the *Sefirah*) *Binah* attires male and female.” Cf. *Limmudei Atsilut*, Muncázs 1897, fol. 11a; Joseph del Medigo's *Novlot Hokhmah*, Basel (Hanau) 1631, ch. 15; Naphtali Bacharach, *Emeq ha-Melekh* (Jerusalem: Yerid ha-Sefarim, 2003), 151 (*sha'ar* 1:54), and the second chapter (*sod ha-malbush*) of the treatise *Ofanim* to be described below. For Cordovero, see e.g. *Pardes Rimmonim* (Jerusalem: Yerid ha-Sefarim, 2000), 397, col. a (*sha'ar* 24, *perek* 2), and for Luria, see *Sefer ha-Liqqutim* (Jerusalem: Lifshitz Brothers, 1913), *parashat Tetse, siman* 22, fol. 63c.
- 6 See PesK 22:5, and *Sefer ha-Malbush*, which is referred to in Zacuto's commentary *Yodei Binah* on Zohar 1:75a in the context of Cordovero's explanation of Metatron as Agent Intellect (*sekhel ha-po'el*): “המלבוש המודיע סדר ההשבעות וזמן הנכון לכול פעולה שהוא אסור לעשותו” (ed. Isaac Nahum, Bithah: Qol Bithah, 2010, 252).
- 7 Bracha Sack, בשערי הקבלה של רבי משה קורדוביר (Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press, 1995) 68.
- 8 See Moses Cordovero, *Pardes Rimmonim* (Jerusalem: Yerid ha-Sefarim, 2000), 295, col. a (*sha'ar* 23, *erkhey ha-kinuyyim*, *perek* 1, entry “אומנת,” referring to *Binah* in the context of Ruth 4:16); for an adaption in the Saruq-school, see Joseph del Medigo's *Novlot Hokhmah*, Basel (Hanau) 1631, chs. 25, 28, 30, and 36. Cf. also the treatise *Ofanim*, chs. 2–5 (the four letters of Alphabet א"ל ב"ם amount to 73 like *hokhmah*; יוד האומנת refers to the last Yod of the name 63, the second spelling of the Tetragramm, which is the secret of the “lower wisdom” hinted at in Ps 104:24).
- 9 *Em la-Binah* was published first as an appendix of *Sha'arei Binah* by Isaac Tsaba, Saloniki 1813, fol. 63a-104b; concerning the quotations see Ms. Jerusalem 615,

However, no such concepts have been analyzed in Zacuto’s texts thus far. Toward starting a discussion on that front in the near future, the impact of an anonymous treatise of the Saruq-school embedded in an autograph of Zacuto will be examined here. First, I will focus on the chapter “the secret of the creation of the demons,” which allows some conclusions concerning the sources of the treatise, after which I will highlight one of the scarce marginal notes by Zacuto.

Preliminary Remarks on the Treatise *Ofanim*

The untitled treatise is structured by 121 *ofanim* (“ways”) — which is why it will be called in the following by this name — and each “way”¹⁰ expounds the first verse of the Bible, which appears also as an epigraph at the very beginning of the treatise, while almost all chapters, including the first one, are tagged by subtitles (“secrets”) on the margin. The sequence of chapters follows a hierarchic order, guided by a Lurianic conception of the Saruq school, starting with “the secret of *tsimtsum*,” “the secret of *malbush*,” “the secret of the folding of *malbush*,” etc. Following Ronit Meroz, it is evident from the order of this creation process and the typical *termini technici* that these teachings belong to the third and last stage of the development of the Saruq school in the seventeenth century.¹¹

The earliest of the three known manuscripts is found in The National Library of Israel, Jerusalem, Israel Ms. Heb. 4°615,¹² written

fol. 13a. I will discuss *Em la-Binah* and the didactic genre it represents elsewhere. The Saruqian material which is included in Ms. Moscow, Guenzburg 1448, will be part of Yuval Harari’s edition of *Sefer ha-Sodot*.

- 10 The ambiguity of this term (meaning also “wheel”, when pronounced *ofan*, and in particular — based on Ezek. 1:15 — the class of angels active in the lower world) is part of its application in mystical texts, cf. e.g. Abraham Azulay, *Sefer Hessed le-Avraham*, Amsterdam 1685, fol. 29a (*ma’yan* 3, *nahar* 3): ותכף ומיד לאחר שנחבר הבית הקדוש ברוך הוא פתח את החלון והוריד את עול’ [עולם] האופנים וצמצם מלכו’ [מלכות] עולם האופנים בתוך החלון כדי שלא יסגר עוד ולעולם פתח זה לא נסתם כי אם דוקא בשעת החרבן and see the continuation of this quotation below (note 25).
- 11 See, Meroz, “אסכולת סרוק,” 158, 161; or eadem, “Contrasting Opinions,” 197, cf. in particular the concepts of טהירו עלאה and קיפול המלבוש.
- 12 Fol. 58a-108b. The other two manuscripts, which trace back to the Jerusalem manuscript, are in the Russian State Library, Moscow, Russia Ms. Guenzburg

by Zacuto in 1655,¹³ but all three versions are incomplete, because the last section breaks off in the middle of an explanation of the Four Worlds.¹⁴ Nevertheless, we learn that the author followed a somehow encyclopedic intention, by pooling all kabbalistic secrets with the help of Genesis 1:1, in his words: “אין כוונתי בחיבור הזה רק “לכתוב בקצרה רוב סתרי החכמה האלהית להכליל הכל בפסוקנו הנכבד”.¹⁵ Throughout the treatise the author points repeatedly to his other kabbalistic work, *Sefer Yemin Moshe*¹⁶ — apparently an exegetical work based on Moses Cordovero. However, in light of a short hint towards the end of the treatise, there is reason to believe that this work was written parallel to *Ofanim*, and probably never finished.¹⁷ As a preliminary suggestion for a potential author, I would suggest Moses ben Solomon ha-Levi of Frankfurt, a resident of Zolkiew, who composed the commentary *Yoel Moshe* on Menahem Azariah Fano’s *Asarah Ma’amarot* (Amsterdam 1649).¹⁸

474, and The Ritman library, Bibliotheca Philosophica Hermetica, Amsterdam, Netherlands Ms. M 473.

- 13 A detailed description of this manuscript and its significance for the evaluation of Zacuto’s writings in the field of practical and theoretical kabbalah will be published by Yuval Harari.
- 14 *Ofen* 121 (titled “the secret of the palaces of *Malkhut ha-Briah*”) parallels the structure of the so-called four worlds (אבי"ע) to four biblical terms related to different parts of the temple (1. Kg 6:5): ‘azarot (the courts), ‘ulam (the porch), *hekhal* (the main hall), *devir* (the inner sanctuary). The explanation does not reach the Holy of Holies, but rather stops within the *hekhal*, which corresponds to the “world of creation,” so at least the expected relation between *devir* and ‘*olam ha-atsilut*’ is missing. Furthermore, the whole treatise seems to be arranged according to the four worlds; see end of *ofen* 104, fol. 100b, cross heading: והיצירה והעשיה --- סודות עולם הבריאה. Thus, the first part (up to *ofen* 105) was related to ‘*olam ha-atsilut*’.
- 15 *Ofen* 42, fol. 73b (“In this treatise I intend to write a plethora of kabbalistic secrets in a nutshell in order to include all in our honored verse [i.e. Gen 1:1]”).
- 16 At least five times: fol. 65a, 65b, 68a, 100a, 102a. The title refers to Isa 63:12. Eliezer Baumgarten suggests that the author refers also to a third work, apparently an interpretation of the Exodus from Egypt.
- 17 See fol. 102a: אם יגזור האל העליון בחיים גם אנחנו נדבר בדברים האלה בספר ימין משה שלנו.
- 18 The first name “Yoel” is an abbreviation and refers to the author’s teacher, R. Judah Aryeh Leib (see Marvin Heller, *The Seventeenth Century Hebrew Book*, vol. 2 [Leiden: Brill, 2011], 661), whose traditions are also included. Not very much is known about Moses ha-Levi, though (but see Idel, “One from a Town,” 87f.). Some evidence is found in the introduction of this commentary, in particular

Despite his trust in the kabbalistic authority of Cordovero, the author of *Ofanim* follows the school of Israel Saruq, thereby adapting traditions that we also find in the works of Joseph del Medigo and Naphtali Bacharach. The basic idea of his approach is at first glance related to that part of Nathan Shapira’s *Megalleh ‘Amuqot* (Kraków 1637) which presents 256 *Ofanim* on Deut. 3:23. In addition, both works make frequent use of numerology and letter permutations, and they quote similar Lurianic sources such as *Kanfei Yona* and *Yonat Elem*, though Shapira ascribes them both to Luria, while the author of *Ofanim* refers to Menachem Azariah da Fano (with the honorific *zikhrono livrakha*) as the author of *Yonat Elem*.¹⁹ In addition, the treatise *Ofanim* applies a systematic-didactic approach, addressing the esteemed reader time and again, and shows acquaintance with Lurianic texts such as *Sha’ar ha-Kavvanot* or *Hathalat ha-Ḥokhmah* and *Limmudei ha-Beriah*.²⁰ By contrast, Nathan Shapira’s homiletic *Megalleh ‘Amuqot* is rather informed by the mystical traditions of medieval Ashkenaz, in particular *Sefer ha-Ḥesheq*, as Agata Paluch has shown.²¹ In *Ofanim*, only one reference applies to the “בעל סודי רזי” (Elazar of Worms),” in the context of specifying the names of the four angels related to the faces of the chariot in the “world of *yetsirah*.”²²

interpretations of Gen 1:1 (which is set as model for “*limud qabbalah*,” cf. *Asarah Ma’amarot*, Amsterdam 1649, *haqdamah*, fol. 5c); references to Moses Galante and Nathan Shapira of Kraków (in *Ofanim* both of them [“Rav Galante,” Ms. Jerusalem 615, fol. 63a, 104b; and *Megalleh Amuqot* on fol. 101b] are among the few references to other kabbalists aside from Cordovero and Menahem Azariah da Fano, but of course the Zoharic writings and “ha-ARI” are often mentioned); the praise of Moses, who corresponds to the *sefirah Tiferet* and to Metatron (*sar ha-panim*); and the hint to *malkhut de-beriah* being the garment (*levush*) of *malkhut* and the “source of souls” (*haqdamah*, fol. 6a).

19 E.g. *ofen* 59 (da Fano as author of *Yonat Elem*). Apparently, the author of *Ofanim* used a version of *Kanfei Yona* which originated in the circle of Moses Najara; see the reference to *Kanfei Yona* in *Ofen* 103 that would fit e.g. to Ms. London, British Library, Add. 26969, fol. 66b; on this version, see Avivi, קבלת האר”י, vol. 1, 316, 395.

20 See e.g. fol. 65a, 70b, 83b.

21 See Paluch, *Megalleh ‘Amuqot: The Enoch-Metatron Tradition in the Kabbalah of Nathan Neta Shapira of Krakow (1585-1633)* (Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2014), 60–62; 75–79.

22 הוֹאֵלִיָּה corresponds to the face of man, מַפְפִּיָּה to the lion, אֲמַצְיָה to the bull, and עַפְפִּימִיָּהָאֵל to the eagle (fol. 103a).

However, another singular reference is more relevant for the historical setting of *Ofanim*: within the broad range of Lurianic writings belonging to the Saruq school, the phrase אדם קדמון שני (fol. 61a; “the second primeval man”) is exceptional, but found at least in the last chapter (*sha’ar* 22) of *Emeq ha-Melekh*, written shortly before the violent Chmielnicki upheaval in Ukraine (1648).²³ Unfortunately, the sources Naphtali Bacharach used are not completely known to us.²⁴ But it might be possible to reconstruct the motives and concepts both works share, and thus to trace their common source backwards.

The Sources of “The Secret of the Creation of the Demons”

The first example provides an idea of how Lurianic kabbalah affects the approach to divine names, not in respect of *kawwanot*, but in the context of demonology and magic. The translation of Ms. Jerusalem 615, fol. 67b (*ofen* 27) will be followed by a synoptical reading of the Hebrew text with a parallel in *Sha’ar ha-Liqqutim*.

<The secret of the creation of the demons.> You shall know: at the time of the destruction,²⁵ the demons have been created, they have been created at sunset, as the Sages said.²⁶ The reason for this is, when the vessels of the points of *Ze’ir*, who is called sun, as is well known, were broken, it was at his sunset, to be sure. This is the secret of the time between the destruction and the reparation before the balance (*matqala*)²⁷ when the (seventh) day was sanctified, since there are six weekdays

23 Cf. *Emeq ha-Melekh* (Jerusalem, 2003), 1050 (*sha’ar* 22). For the historical background of *Sefer Emeq ha-Melekh*, see Gershom Scholem, *Sabbatai Zevi: The Mystical Messiah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 70.

24 See the list in Avivi, קבלת האר”י, vol. 2, 559.

25 *חורבן* implies the destruction of the temple; in Rabbinic literature, there is no connection to *shedim*. But see Abraham Azulay’s *Hesed le-Avraham*, Amsterdam 1685, fol. 29a: “at the time of the destruction the demonic forces [*ha-hitsonim*] were allowed to enter the Land of Israel in order to destroy the temple.”

26 Mishnah Avot 5:6.

27 The term *matqala* (“scales”) refers to Zohar 2:176a (*Sifra di-Tsniuta*); see the comprehensive discussion of the different linguistic meanings of this term in the Zohar by Yehuda Liebes, “פרקים במילון ספר הזוהר.” (PhD diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1977), 329–32, 334, entry “טיקלא, תקלא”.

corresponding to the six ends. After the six days have been destroyed, and Shabbat, that is, the secret of Tiqqun, wanted to arrive, at that time the demons have been created. This is the secret of the verse “it will come like destruction from *Shaddai*,”²⁸ for it is the sixth day which is the secret of *Yesod* called *Shaddai*. At this time the destroying destruction arrives. Furthermore, you know that it is the name *Elohim* which brings forth demons for *Imma* on high, that is to say “one named Eldad, and the other named Medad,”²⁹ and (the letter) *heh* in the middle signifies the milk, as I will explain to you with God’s help.³⁰

Thus Scripture states “it will come like destruction from *Shaddai*,” for in respect of the upper mother there are “bitter clusters.”³¹ This is where the demonic forces are seizing from outside (*aḥizat ha-ḥitsonim mi-baḥuts*), and therefore they are called “other gods” (*elohim aḥerim*),³² because they are attracted by and seize the name *Elohim*, which is the secret of the demons, and they are from outside, that’s why they are called “others,” and you know that the Sages said six things

28 Isa. 13:6 (cf. Joel 1:15); cf. Menahem Recanati, *Perush al ha-Torah, lekh lekha* (Jerusalem: Aharon Barzani and son, 2003), 196 (on Zohar 3:119b, referring to the name *El Shaddai*).

29 Num. 11:26.

30 Referring to the *he* in the middle of the name *Elohim*, which is identified with the “milk”; the promised explanation is given at length in the chapters of *ofanim* 65–70, starting again with the explanation of Eldad and Medad. Similar material can be found among the Lurianic *derushim* in Ms. London, British Library, Or. 10734, fol. 105b–106a (titled “*sod ha-ḥalav*”). Related explanations are found also in Menachem Azaryah Fano, *Qitsur Yonat Elem, ot 22* (*Sefer Ma’amrei ha-Ram’a mi-Pano*, vol. 1, Jerusalem: Yishmah Lev-Torat Moshe, 1997, p. 295: סוד החלב הוא שם אהיה שבבינה ... בה' של אלקים יש חלב קל וכבד בשתי דרכים (ומן הה"א שבאמצע יעלה החלב לדר ימין ולדר שמאל בבניה יש לה דדים ... ואלו הדדי') Ta' alumot Hokhmah, Basel (Hanau) 1629, fol. 82a הם בסוד אלהי' וסמך אלד' ומוד' אל' ד'ד' ומי' ד'ד' אל' ד'ד' ימי' ומי' ד'ד' שמאל On Zacuto’s version see below, note 41.

31 Deut. 32:32, referring to the fruit Adam received from Eve; see Zohar 1:192a, adapting the language of GenR 19:5: “Adam’s wife squeezed grapes for him, bringing death upon him and upon the whole world”; according to LevR 12:1, not only Noah but also the sons of Aaron drank wine of those deathly grapes, the “bitter clusters”; cf. also Zohar 1:73b.

32 Exod. 20:3 et passim.

concerning the demons:³³ in regard to three, they are like the ministering angels, and in regard to three like the human beings. The reason is that their reality was caused by an actual point of the vessels of *Ze ʿir*, thus in regard to three things they are like human beings, and since they have been created by subtle elements,³⁴ they are in regard to three things like angels. Behold, this is indicated by our verse *bereshit bara Elohim* (Gen 1:1), meaning “at first,” prior to the world of *Tiqqun*, “Elohim” — that is *Imma* in the secret of the demons, for they are the secret of *Elohim* — “created Elohim,” and the interpretation is: the demons, who are called “other gods,” in keeping with the heaven and with the earth, they are in regard to three things like the ministering angels who dwell in heaven, and in regard to (three) things like human beings who live on earth, and they, too, are created from heaven and from earth, due to the seven kings who died, and this creation happened when the earth was in the state of *tohu wa-vohu*, that is, at the time of nullification.

Though certain passages in the broad range of Lurianic writings deal with the issue of Eldad and Medad, the only text which comes close to the wording and some particular details of *ofen* 27 happens to be an Ashkenazi tradition, at the end of a lengthy interpretation on Gen. 36, included in *Sefer ha-Liqqutim*.³⁵ This version is found in Ms. London, British Museum Or. 10555, fol. 208b.³⁶

33 BT Hag 16a; see also *Pardes Rimmonim* (Jerusalem: Yerid ha-Sefarim, 2000), 431, col. a (*sha ʿar* 26, *pereq* 8).

34 I.e. fire and wind, cf. Moshe ben Nahman (*Perush ha-Ramban ʿal ha-Torah*, vol. 2, ed. Charles B. Chavel [Jerusalem: Mossad ha-Rav Kook, 1960], 95f.) and Bahya ben Asher (*Beʿur al ha-Torah*, vol. 2, ed. Charles B. Chavel [Jerusalem: Mossad ha-Rav Kook, 1967], 505f.) on Lev 17:7.

35 Jehuda Zvi Brandwein, ed., *Kol Kitve ha-ARI*, vol. 15 (Jerusalem: unknown publisher, 1988), 108; additional material is found in *Shaʿar ha-Pesuqim* (vol. 7), 170, *Sefer Liqqutei Torah* (vol. 11), 208 (and the parallels noted there relating to *Ets Hayyim* and *Mevo She ʿarim*). See also the various elaborations on Eldad and Medad in Naphtali Bacharach, *Emeq ha-melekh* (Jerusalem: Yerid ha-Sefarim, 2003), 584–87, 642 (*shaʿar* 14:43–47, 87).

36 Avivi, *קבלת האר"י*, vol. 2, 587 refers to the Ashkenazi tradition in this version and the relation to the manuscript Manfred and Anne Lehmann Foundation, New York, NY. USA Ms. D 127 (= F 72683), dated 1634.

ספר הליקוטים פרשת וישלח, פרק לו	אופן כז
כשנשברו הכלים של נקודות ז"א שהוא שמש הנה בין השמשות שלו דהיינו בין השברים נבראו השדים קודם המתקלא של קדושת היום	<סוד בריאת השדים> והנה דע לך כי בעת החורבן נבראו השדים שנבראו בין השמשות כאשר חכמים הגידו וטעם הדבר הוא כי הנה כשנשברו הכלים של נקודות זעיר שהוא נקרא שמש כידוע הלא בין השמשות שלו הוא סוד בין עת השברון לעת התיקון קודם המתקלא שאז נתקדש היום
	כי הלא ימי החול הם ששה כנגד שש הקצוות ואחרי שנשברו שש הימים ורצה לבוא יום השבת שהוא סוד התיקון אז ביני ביני נבראו השדים והוא סוד כשוד משדי יבוא כי ביום הששי שהוא סוד היסוד הנקרא שדי אז בא השוד השודד
וידוע בסוד אלד"ד ומיד"ד שנתבאר במקומו כי שם אלהים הוא הממציא שדים לאם	ועוד כבר ידעת כי שם אלהים הוא הממציא שדים לאימא עילאה דהיינו א"ל דד אחד מ"י דד אחר ו"ה שבאמצע הוא החלב כמו שתדע לפניך בעזרת האל ולכן אמר כשד משדי יבוא
שכנגדה בלבד יש אשכולות מרורות, שמהם אחיזת המזיקים מבחוץ כטעם אלהים אחרים	כי כנגד האם העליונה יש אשכולות מרורות אשר משם אחיזת החצונים מבחוץ ועל כן נקראו אלהים אחרים בעבור שהם נמשכים ואוחזים בשם אלהים הוא סוד השדים ועל שהם מבחוץ לכן נקראים אחרים
ולפי שמציאותם הוא מנקודה ממשית של כלי זעיר יש להם ג' דברים כבני אדם ולפי שנבראו מדקות היסודות יש להם ג' דברים כמלאכי השרת	וכבר ידעת מה שאמרו חכמים ע"ה על השדים שיש להם ששה דברים שלשה כמלאכי השרת ושלשה כבני אדם והטעם שמציאותם מנקודה ממשית של כלי זעיר על כן יש להם שלשה דברים כבני אדם ומפני שבריותם מדקות היסודות לכן יש להם שלשה דברים כמלאכי השרת
	והנה נרמז בפסוקנו בראשית ברא אלהים ירצה בתחלה קודם עולם התיקון ברא אלהים היא אימא בסוד השדים שהם סוד אלהים את אלהים פי' את השדים הנקראים אלהים אחרים וזה עם השמים ועם הארץ רוצה לומר עם השלשה דברים כמלאכי

והנה ה' של אלהים במלואה הוא מקור החלב ששני דדין א"ל מ"י משפיעים אותו למטה עד היסוד... עכ"מ מכתבה אשכנזית	השרת הדורים בשמים ועם הדברים כבני אדם היושבים בארץ וגם נבראו מן השמים ומן הארץ מן שבעה מלכין דמתו³⁷ והבריאה הזאת היתה כאשר הארץ היתה תוהו ובוהו ר"ל בעת הביטול.
---	---

This short paragraph shows some typical characteristics of the treatise *Ofanim*: first, the topic is a secret related to the Lurianic understanding of creation; second, this secret is expounded in a midrashic way, here by playing on the words *shed*, *shod*, *shoded*, *shaddai*; and finally, the paragraph culminates in the interpretation of Genesis 1:1. Aside from rabbinic sources (Mishnah Avot; Bavli Ḥagigah), the salient parallel to Ḥayim Vital's *Sefer ha-Liqqutim* casts light on how the author composed this paragraph. Both texts share some motifs almost verbatim, and *Sefer ha-Liqqutim* complements also an explanation of the milk deriving from the two breasts called "El" and "Mi": both are attached to the letter *heh*, which is sandwiched between "El" and "Mi" in the name *Elohim*, the reference name for the power of judgment. At the end of Vital's text, which elaborates on Genesis 36 in the context of the seven kings of Edom, a short note identifies the Ashkenazi provenance of the quoted tradition: *עד כאן מצאתי מכתבה אשכנזית*, which points to a source that may have been known also to the author of *Ofanim*.

Eldad and Medad, two half-brothers of Moses according to aggadic tradition, do not figure prominently in medieval theoretical or practical kabbalah; to the best of my knowledge, they appear at least in a 15th-century manuscript as reference for the successful

37 On the "death of the seven kings" in zoharic literature, see Avishar Har-Shefi, *'מלכין קדמאין': הבריאה וההתגלות בספרות האידרות של הזוהר* (Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2015); concerning the difference between Cordovero's conception and the Lurianic development, see Esther Liebes, "בהינה מחורשת – קורדובירו והאר"י – של מיתוס מות מלכי אדום," in R. Moshe Cordovero, *Ma'yan 'Ein Ya'acov: The Fourth Fountain of the Book 'Elimah*, ed. Bracha Sack (Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2009); in Lurianic Kabbalah, see Isaiah Tishby, *תורת הרע והקליפה בקבלת האר"י* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1962), 28–34.

application of a recipe against forgetfulness.³⁸ According to Bavli Sanhedrin 17a, they prophesied the death of Moses, and also concerning Gog and Magog, that is, the evil powers threatening Israel. In addition, they are named among the so-called seven pious men of the world, by which the late Targum Sheni portrays seven branches on the left side of a golden Menorah at the top of king Solomon’s throne, as opposed to seven branches on the right side formed by the seven Patriarchs.³⁹ Such descriptions could have been useful in particular for Lurianic elaborations on creation, when Eldad and Medad are actually for the first time introduced as kabbalistic concepts, as evident in the writings of Hayim Vital and others.⁴⁰ They exemplified the secret of the demons as encapsulated in the divine names *Elohim* and *Shaddai*, and their incorporation within the divine structures, the four spellings of the Tetragrammaton as well as the ten *sefirot*. Naphtali Bacharach, for instance, stresses this idea in *Emeq ha-Melekh* when describing the nursing of the female power: והנה הדדים נקראו שדים וסודם הוא שם שדי והנה הדדים נקראו שדים וסודם הוא שם שדי (...).⁴¹

38 Gideon Bohak, ed., *ספר כשפים יהודי מהמאה ה־17*, כתב יד ניו יורק, הספריה הציבורית (Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2014), 152 [§114]. (לשעבר ששון 56)

39 According to Beate Ego, *Targum Scheni zu Esther: Übersetzung, Kommentar und theologische Deutung* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1996), 24, it can be dated to the seventh to eighth century; see Steven Fine, *The Menorah: From the Bible to Modern Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), 67. The list includes the “Patriarchs” Adam, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Job, and on the other side the seven “pious ones,” Levi, Qehat, Amram, Moses, Aaron, Eldad, and Medad, “as well as the prophet Haggai.”

40 See above, notes 30 and 35.

41 Naphtali Bacharach, *Emeq ha-Melekh* (Jerusalem: Yerid ha-Sefarim, 2003), 982 (*sha ʾur* 16:68). *Shaddai* equals 314: the numerical value of YHWH is 26, which when multiplied by three results in 72 (the first of the four spellings of the Tetragramm), and three times 72 amounts to 216 (the sum of the letters in Exod 14:19-21; each verse contains 72 letters). This appears to be also the climax in Zacuto’s interpretation of “and his hand [יָדוֹ] grasping [Esau’s heel]” (Gen 25:26) in his commentary on Zohar 1:138a (*Yodei Binah*, ed. Isaac Naḥum, Bithah: Qol Bithah, 2010, 470f.). Introduced by the statement that the destruction of the Temple was linked to *Hod* (the fifth of the seven lower *sefirot*), Zacuto explains the secret of (mother’s) milk, including the “secret of the name *Elohim*, (i.e.) the secret of Eldad and Medad with the remaining letter *heh*,” which can be drawn by piecing together the letters *dalet* and *waw*, or *dalet* and *yod*. This is why they are written in “his hand” (Gen 25:26). The secret of “nursing” implies the “lifting of the refinements (*berurim*)” of the

The “secret of the creation of the demons” relates to the transition stage just before the possible redemption, and to the involvement of evil, which was introduced in *ofen* 17 by the “breaking of the vessels” — actually a distension of the letters by overflowing *ḥasadim* or “light of kindness” — and the “death of the kings of Edom (Gen 36)” corresponding to the six days of creation, but without any sign of a potential dualistic tendency. On the contrary, only the lack of “balancing” the isolated points forming the world of *Tohu* empowered demonic forces to affect what are recognized as catastrophic events in history. The weak point — effectively the strong judgment — within the divine world allowing this kind of access “from outside” is manifest in the divine names themselves. In the end, it appears to be part of the “dynamical process” of the configuration called *Ze’ir Anpin* (before its final metamorphosis into the central *partsuf*), symbolized by the sun, which is considered to link angels, men, and demons to both the heavens above and the earth below.

Moses Zacuto’s Magic Application

In the last chapters of *Ofanim*, the divine structures below the World of Emanation proceed to the domain of the angels. In this context, the second example presented in the following shall clarify one aspect of Zacuto’s marginal notes to *Ofanim* (totaling seven altogether) and the relation to the other texts in his autograph.⁴²

In *ofen* 119,⁴³ the reader’s attention is drawn to the importance of human deeds that may generate by stimulation (called “rising of the female waters”) three aspects of divine consciousness (*moḥin*) within the sefirotic structure of the World of Formation (*olam ha-yetsirah*): with regard to *Ḥokhmah* arises the name יהוּא, regarding

lowest part up to *Ḥesed*, *Gevurah*, and *Tiferet*, which are called “the hands on high,” and belong to the three divine names of 26, 72, and 216, which amount to 314. To them the verse “resting between my breasts” (Song 1:13) applies. See *Yodei Binah* (ibid., with reference to *Mevo She’arim*, *sha’ar* 5, 2:1-2). The hint to *Hod* is based on an interpretation of Dan 10:8.

42 The marginal notes appear on fol. 59b, 81b, 92a, 95a, two on 101a, and 107b (*ofen* 119).

43 Subtitle: עור על מוחי היצירה וכן כל מדותיה. The core subject is the correlation between human deeds and the effects of divine consciousness (*moḥin*) in this area.

Binah the name שמועאל, and מטטרון in the *moah* of *Da'at*.⁴⁴ The priestly blessing (“the Lord lift up his countenance upon you, and give you peace,” Num 6:26) addresses the secret of these names, and connotes also the notarikon of YHWH, *Shaddai*, and *Adonai* (ישא), representing the extension of divine energy from the World of *Atsilut* unto the three lower worlds, which are illuminated by *El Shaddai*, *El YHWH*, and *El Adonai*. *Metatron*, whose name equals *Shaddai*, is represented by the word *shalom* (Num 6:26).⁴⁵ In addition, the notarikon of the three names *Yaho'el*, *Shamoa'el*, and *Metatron* can be identified with the word (ר)ישם in Num 6:26, and these letters refer to שמי, “my name,” in Exod. 3:15. Against this background, Exod. 23:20, “I’m sending an angel before you,” also called “the secret of *Metatron*,” is explained as follows:

The name יה"ו illuminates the World of *Yetsirah* ... When spelled with fillings of Aleph ... its numerical value is equal to כו"ו (i.e. a derivation of YHWH),⁴⁶ and this name again filled with Alephs, i.e. כף ואו זין ואו, results in 193, which equals the sum of the last letters of Exod. 23:20 until *ha-maqom*. And 193 is also the numerical value of טפטפיה. Rabbenu Bahya wrote about this in

44 Cf. Naphtali Bacharach, *Emeq ha-melekh* (Jerusalem: Yerid ha-Sefarim, 2003), 1083 (*sha'ar* 18:1): ‘זה שמי’ אשר סימנם יהואל אשר סימנם יהואל אשר סימנם יהואל. On the three names see also *Brit Menuḥah*, ed. Oded Porat (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 2016), 142.

45 Cf. Zacuto’s entries in *Em la-Binah* as noted in Ms. Jerusalem 615, fol. 13a, referring to *Metatron*, who rules in *Olam ha-Yetsirah*, and fol. 48a, referring to *shalom*, *Yesod* and *El Shaddai*; both entries refer also to the name Moses (also in *ofen* 119 the same numerical value of “Moses” and *El Shaddai* is highlighted; see below). On the names of the three angels interwoven in the emanation process as described by Naphtali Bacharach, see Baumgarten, “הערות,” 14.

46 Compare Zacuto’s statement in *Em la-Binah*: אהיה has the same numerical value as יה"ו, and leads up by the help of Gematria to the name *Taftafyah*, “which is a great name (שהוא שם גדול)” and equals, when counted by *milui*, the numerical value of תכלה, “light-blue” (Ms. Jerusalem 615, fol. 17b). One of the first copies of the material of *Em la-Binah* after it was arranged alphabetically appears to be Ms. New York, JTS 2193, which includes also David ben Jehuda he-Ḥasid’s *Sefer ha-Gevul* — a prime example for the early evidence of the graphic design of a hexagram together with the designation *magen David*, describing the divine countenance according to the *Zohar*, and placing the name *Taftafyah* at the center.

*parashat mishpatim*⁴⁷ that from this verse emerges a name useful for travelling, and this relates to what we said, for its name is called *sar ha-magen*,⁴⁸ since he includes the three lines of חד"ר (i.e. *Ḥesed*, *Din*, *Raḥamim*), which belong to *Mikha'el*, *Gavri'el*, *Nuri'el*. Also the divine name *El*, when multiplied three times, refers to the numerical value of *magen*, which is 93. (fol. 107b)

At this point, Zacuto adds the following gloss:⁴⁹

[More] on this secret: by mentioning this name one says 'Taftafyah order fear upon shield — upon armed forces (*tsava*),' for both words amount to the same value as the name itself, 'order fear' is in Gematria 193, also 'upon shield' and 'upon armed forces,' the number of each equals the name *Taftafyah*.⁵⁰

Exactly this information was used by Zacuto for the entry *Taftafyah* in *Shorshei ha-Shemot*, as noted in Ms. Jerusalem 615, fol. 138a:

Taftafyah: this holy name is called 'name of thought,' and he emerges from the last letters of 'Behold, I am sending an angel before you to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place' — until here. The last letters amount to 193, like the number value of this name, and it is said, by mentioning this name: order fear 'upon shield', 'upon armed forces (*tsava*)', both

47 Apparently, there has been some confusion because of Exod. 23:20, which belongs to *parashat Mishpatim*, but the reference should read *parashat Mattot*; see below.

48 On this name cf. the remark in the old collection (sixteenth century) of "practical kabbalah," *Ma'yan ha-Ḥokhmah* (also *Ma'yanot Ḥokhmah*) edited according to a manuscript of Avraham Mamo by Meir Mazuz, Jerusalem 1999: וסוד הבהל'ו [בגמטריא] צב"א וסודו מג"ן כי צבאות של מעלה מבהילים ומפחידים שרו של אדם שלא יקטרג וישחית את ישראל למטה והוא מגן אברהם ומגן דוד וחוקק עליהם השר המגן טפטפיה identified with *Mikha'el*, in charge of *Ḥesed*. p. 231, and on p. 285, *ha-sar ha-gadol* is

49 The gloss was included in the text of *Ofanim* by the scribe of Ms. Moskau, Guenzberg 474, fol. 164b.

50 ועל סוד זה כשמוזכרים שם זה אומרים טפטפיה צוה פחד על מגן על צבא כי כל שתי מלות עולות כשם עצמו צוה פחד בגי' קצ"ג וכן ע"ל מג"ן וכן ע"ל צב"א שכל אחת מהם במספר שם טפטפיה. In *ofen* 119 follows then the reference to the same numerical value of Moses and *El Shaddai*, and an explanation why Moses rejected the company of the angel traditionally identified with Metatron (see Ramban on Exod 23:20, *Perush al ha-Torah*, vol. 1, ed. Charles Chavel, 441–43).

words amount to 193, as well as (the name) כו"ו, filled like this
כך ואו זין ואו...

In addition, Zacuto notes, it is helpful to think about this name while facing enemies, and he added examples he found in *Sefer ha-Ḥesheq*. They explain that the name *Taftafyah* can be used against enemies in the battlefield.⁵¹

The starting point, however, is that the entry and the gloss in the autograph can be traced back to two complementary sources: on the one hand, *Sefer ha-Ḥesheq*, which includes already all the Gematriot presented by Zacuto, as has been elaborated by Moshe Idel in the context of Neḥemia of Erfurt's commentary on the seventy names of Metatron;⁵² and on the other hand, Naftali Herz Treves' supercommentary on Rabbenu Bahya, including a tradition of Me'ir of Rothenburg:

Taftafyah, a name for facing fear, emerges from the verse (Exod 23:20): ‘Behold I am sending an angel before you to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place.’ The last letters amount to the numerical value of *Taftafyah* (i.e. 193). Being on the road, one should say ‘*Taftafyah*, order fear upon the robbers, against armed forces be unto me armed forces, against [armor] shield be my shield (cf. Gen 15:1)’. *Taftafyah*, order fear upon shield, upon armed forces: the numerical value of each word (i.e. ‘shield’ and ‘armed forces’) amounts to 93,⁵³ he should consider [that] in his heart, [as] the thought is [located] there.⁵⁴ It is a tradition of R. Me'ir of Rothenburg to mention [the name]

51 In addition, he copied at the end of the autograph (fol. 173b) an apparently popular amulet including the name *Taftafyah* that assures help in any situation.

52 Cf. Moshe Idel, “ נחמיה בן שלמה הנביא על מגן דוד והשם טפטפיה: ממגיה יהודית, ” in *Ta Shma: Studies in Judaica in Memory of Israel M. Ta-Shma*, vol. 1, ed. Avraham (Rami) Reiner et al. (Allon Shevut: Tvunot Press, 2011), 4f. et passim, and 36f. et passim on שם המחשבה; cf. also Moshe Idel, “One from a Town,” 205.

53 To this the numerical value of “upon (‘al)”, which amounts to one hundred, should be added. In fact, also “order fear” totals one hundred and ninety three.

54 This could also be understood as “he should consider the ‘name of thought’ in his heart,” which is apparently the reading of Zacuto (see above).

Na'aryron in case of scary danger, and this name in combination with *Taftafyah* consists of thirteen letters. May it be [God's] will that I won't fail but succeed in finding out the secret.

שם של פחד והוא טפטפיה יוצא מפסוק [שמות כג, כ] הנה אנכי שולח מלאך לפניך בדרך לשמרך ולהביא"ך אל המקום, סופי אותיות גימטריא טפטפיה. וכשהוא על הדרך יאמר טפטפיה צוה פחד על הלסטים, על צבא תהיה לי לצבא, על מגן תהיה לי למגן. טפטפיה צוה פחד על מגן על צבא, כל אחד עולה גימטריא תשעים ושלוש ויחשוב בלבו שם המחשבה. קבלה ממחר'ים בסכנת פחד להזכיר נעיריון ושם זה ושל טפטפיה הם שלש עשרה אותיות. יהי רצון שלא אכשול ושזכה למצא הסוד.⁵⁵

Divine names are not captured in their original context. Here, they are linked because of Rabbenu Bahya's comments on Numbers 32:32, which is one of the eleven verses beginning and ending with the letter *Nun*.⁵⁶ These biblical verses are characterized in such a way that the *shem ha-mephorash* emanates from them, and one who mentions them will be without fear. *Taftafyah* and *Na'aryron* can easily be connected to this function. For the author of *Ofanim* it is an aside, as he focuses mainly on the implementation of *Taftafyah* within the divine structures reaching the World of *Yetsirah*. But in Zacuto's eyes the magic application was deemed worthy to be added, if only for the sake of extending knowledge and at the same time bridging between the concepts of theoretical and practical kabbalah.

55 Cf. Naftali Herz Treves, *Sefer Naftali* (supercommentary on *Bahya ben Asher's* commentary, first edition *Naftulei Elohim Niftalti*, Hedderneim 1546), (Jerusalem: Yerid ha-Sefarim, 2011), 424 (*sitrei Rabbenu Bahya* on Num 32:32); this tradition was adapted in Yom Tov Lipmann Heller's commentary *Tuv Ta'am* on Numbers 32:32 (*Rabbenu Bahya 'al ha-Torah 'im sefer tuv ta'am*, vol. 3 [Bne Brak: Avraham Shmuel ha-Levi Heller, 1992], 194), but reading נעוריה"ן; cf. the variations of this name in Claudia Rohrbacher-Sticker, "Die Namen Gottes und die Namen Metatrons," *FJB* 19 (1991/92), e.g. נעוריה"ן (p. 121, note 116); and her reference to נעורירין (AdRA [A]), "womit ein deutlicher Bezug zu Meṭatron gegeben ist" (120f.). Cf. also Idel, "ר' נחמיה," 17, note 54, and 41, note 204.

56 See the added references in Gershom Scholem, "מקור למסורת: עקיבא דר' הבדלה דר' עקיבא: מקור למסורת," in *Devils, Demons, and Souls: Essays on Demonology* by Gershom Scholem, ed. Esther Liebes (Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute for the Study of Jewish Communities in the East, 2004), 168f., note 95.

Concluding Remarks

Lurianic conceptions provided new contexts for divine names. Some resulted from innovative readings like those of Eldad and Medad, which belong to a preliminary state of divine emanation, just before the first *Tiqqun* took place, representing the demonic condition of this process. Others supported reinterpretations of old traditions, as was the case with *Taftafyah*. This name in particular shows that practical and theoretical kabbalah merged into each other from the high Middle Ages onward.

Zacuto’s exceptional autograph Ms. Jerusalem 615 contains by and large three different parts: the famous magical collection, the treatise *Ofanim*, and his own Lurianic notes from various sources. Evidently, these three fields of kabbalistic exercise do not represent different stages (neither in a hierarchical nor in a chronological sense), but have been jointly cultivated by Zacuto, his later preference of Vital’s (and Tsemaḥ’s) redaction work notwithstanding. In any case, he abided by his synergetic approach towards theoretical and practical kabbalah. As for the treatise *Ofanim*, certain issues still have to be clarified, yet its affinity to a late layer of the Saruq school of thought is beyond question. It seems reasonable to assume an Ashkenazi provenience, since it shares Lurianic sources on Gen 36 that point in this direction. In addition, at least one example affiliated to magic and commented on by Zacuto — though definitely no specific interest in magic can be found in *Ofanim* — reveals that esoteric traditions concerning the names of Metatron (as for the pair of *Na’aryron* and *Taftafyah*) cannot exclusively be traced back to the circle of Neḥemia of Erfurt. Rather, these traditions have been more prevalent, probably as a result of the widely spread material associated with *hekhlot*-literature since Gaonic times. Aside from the magic tradition, some concepts in *Ofanim*, especially when their Saruqian implementation can be understood in a broader Cordoverian context, surfaced again in Zacuto’s own collection of Lurianic notes in this manuscript and thus made their way into his posthumously printed work *Em la-Binah*.