Crises of Leadership in the Post-Destruction Apocalypses 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch

Shayna Sheinfeld

Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University, Montréal

May 2015

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

© Shayna Sheinfeld 2015

Table of Contents

Abstract

This project examines the implications of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* in understanding Jewish leadership in the period following the destruction of the second temple in 70 C.E. Through a literary analysis of each apocalypse, I argue that the ways in which Ezra and Baruch are portrayed as leaders, their interactions with the inscribed communities, and the function of the texts suggest that both texts have specific guidelines about the type of leader the intended audience should follow. *4 Ezra* establishes scriptural interpretation as the dominant attribute in the leader it promotes, as well as a leader who will encourage expectations of the impending end times, while *2 Baruch* anticipates that the eschaton is nearly here and awaits the leadership of the messiah, while encouraging its audience to remain non-militaristic. Both texts are intended to reach a broad and non-sectarian audience. I conclude that these different portrayals of the type of leader to be looked for by the community follows a larger crises of leadership found in other texts and material evidence from around the same period. This analysis of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* offers not just a description of what types of leadership options were available after the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E.; it further provides evidence that in Judaea in the period following the destruction of the temple, there were competing ideals of leadership. The instability of authority figures posed problems to which Jewish communities felt compelled to respond in texts such as *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*.

Résumé

Ce projet explore les implications de *2 Esdras* et *2 Baruch* dans le contexte de la direction de la communauté juive dans la période suivante la destruction du Second Temple à 70 A.D. Par l'entremise d'une analyse littéraire, je demontre que la façon dont Esdras et Baruch sont présentés comme étant des dirigeants, leur interaction avec la communauté et la fonction des textes suggèrent que les deux textes contiennent des précisions concernant le genre d'autorité que l'audience ciblée devrait suivre.

Dans *2 Esdras*, on voit que le rôle principal du dirigeant c'est l'interpretation des Saint-Écritures et d'encourager l'attente de la fin des temps tandis que *2 Baruch* prévoit que l'eschaton est imminent et attend l'arrivée du Messie, tout en encourageant son audience à demeurer non-militarisé. Les deux textes visent un large public. Je conclus ces deux portraits contradictoires mettent en relief la crise du leadership que l'on trouve dans d'autres textes et matériel de la même periode. Cette analyse de *2 Esdras* et *2 Baruch* fournit non seulement une description des différents styles de leadership dans la communauté dans la période suivant la description du Temple; je démontre que pendant cette période, il y avait des modèles du leadership en concurrence et la communauté juive se sentait obligée de l'adresser dans des textes tels que *2 Esdras* et *2 Baruch.*

Acknowledgements

This project has without a doubt been a labour of love which could not have been completed without the support of so many people. I am indebted to the many people who have shaped me as an interpreter of early Jewish texts from my undergraduate years through my graduate education. J. Albert Harrill began me on this journey many years ago at DePaul University in Chicago, when he gave me a copy of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and told me to read it. John Collins, Tal Ilan, Jon Levenson, Shaye Cohen, Lorenzo DiTommaso, Naftali Cohn, Gerbern Oegema, Patricia Kirkpatrick, Ian Henderson, B. Barry Levy, and the late Ellen Bradshaw Aitken have all contributed in so many ways to my understanding of the ancient world. I am especially indebted to my supervisor, Gerbern Oegema, for his unwavering support and encouragement throughout my entire doctoral program and especially during the writing of this dissertation.

In late spring 2010 I approached my colleague Meredith Warren, asking her if she wanted to join me in an academic writing group. That fall she brought in Sara Parks as our third member. I cannot imagine going through this process without the sharp eyes, keen insights, and positive support of my writing group. They have been a constant source of strength, encouragement, constructive criticism, and friendship. There are not enough words to express to both of you how grateful I am.

I would also like to extend my appreciation to Carla Sulzbach, who is always willing to offer constructive feedback and insightful comments, as well as (again) to Meredith Warren for acting as my work BFF. I am grateful for the feedback I have received from the Pseudepigrapha unit at the Society of Biblical Literature, the Jewish History and Culture unit at the Association for Jewish Studies, the American Academy for Jewish Research, and especially the members of the Enoch Seminar. I offer my thanks to Andréa Schnell for assistance with the French translation of the abstract, and to the staff at the Faculty of Religious Studies for their assistance throughout my program.

This last year of writing I have been lucky enough to teach at Colgate University in three collegial and supportive programs: Jewish Studies, the Core, and the Religion Department. I appreciate all the kindness and friendship I gained during this year, but especially the wisdom and guidance of Lesleigh Cushing.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband Ely Sheinfeld, who has been my most ardent supporter in every way imaginable. Ely has been my biggest cheerleader and confidant, always willing to take on some additional task to give me the time to write. I can never say thank you enough, though I will keep trying. To my children, I thank you for your patience and love, despite the many times when I have been in the office writing when you wanted to hang out. You keep me grounded in reality outside the first century, and surrounded by love and humour. I love you all.

Any extended period of time will include the bad as well as the good. From October 2013 through June 2014 my family suffered from the loss of my grandparents-in-law, Meyer and Edith Sheinfeld, and my beloved father-in-law, Stewart Sheinfeld. We miss you every day, Bubbe, Zayde, and Abba. It was also during this time that one of my mentors, Ellen Aitken, passed away

after suffering from cancer. Ellen was my first graduate-level professor at Harvard Divinity School in 2002, and it was she who encouraged me to attend McGill and to work with Gerbern for my Ph.D. Ellen was very influential in my own research and teaching, and perhaps most importantly, she always recognized that I was more than just a scholar. You are sorely missed, Ellen.

Dedicated to the memory of those we have lost so recently.

Meyer Sheinfeld *z"l*

Edith Sheinfeld *z"l*

Stewart Sheinfeld *z"l*

Ellen Bradshaw Aitken

May their memory be for a blessing.

Introduction

Aim of the Present Study

This project examines how leadership is portrayed in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* on a narrative level, and then applies those findings to the larger socio-historical world of Judaea after the destruction of the second temple, roughly in the period between the end of the first revolt in 72 C.E. and the beginning of the Bar Kokhba revolt in 132 C.E.[1] I first analyze how each apocalypse depicts its protagonist as a leader and what role the representation of authority plays in the overarching narrative structure, especially in relation to the inscribed community. Turning from the literary analysis, I examine what the role of the leader in each text could mean for the socio-historical setting in which the text was produced. I consider this at two levels: first, what does it mean for the community who produced and/or received the texts in their first iterations? How might have the authors and the audiences have found meaning and reflection of their current leadership situation through the narratives? Second, I analyze what these conclusions mean in terms of the broader questions regarding the leadership situation in Judaea after the destruction of the second temple—why would these apocalypses, written to address the issue of how to deal with the aftermath of the destruction, portray similar concerns regarding leadership?

My goal is to develop an overarching literary and socio-historical understanding of how *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* responded to questions of authority after the destruction. That they both found the destruction to be discontinuous is clear: both texts utilize pseudonyms and a pseudepigraphic setting drawn from what became biblical literature addressing the destruction of the first temple in order to make sense of the destruction of the second temple. Examining these texts to consider questions of authority is just one step further into a reconstruction of the historical world of this period. Both texts attempt to convince their audience that there is

[1] I discuss dating of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* more precisely in chapters three and five; however I think that the questions mentioned here with concerns about leadership are relevant for a larger period of literature. See the discussion of leadership in chapter two which focuses on the first and last revolts against Rome.

sustainability and viability for Judaism after the destruction of the temple, and this is done through the descriptions of the revelations received by the sage from God. However, in both *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* these revelations between the leader and the divinity are framed in the narrative interaction of the sage and the inscribed community. Central to their relationship is the question of what will happen to the community once Ezra or Baruch are gone—how will the community know what to do? Who will be there to guide them? The answers differ between the texts, but the concerns are the same: the community wants to know how it should handle leadership once there is no longer a prophet to connect them directly with God.

Leadership in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*

Method

This analysis uses a textually inductive perspective, taking at face value that the leader assumed by the text does, in fact, fit the description of a leader in the narrative of each text. Thus, in *4 Ezra*, the narrative situates the protagonist Ezra at the top of the human leadership hierarchy, followed by Paltiel (*4 Ezra* 5:16), and then the community. Similarly, *2 Baruch* assumes that Baruch is the ultimate source of human authority, followed by a more complicated leadership hierarchy with the elders, Baruch's son, and Baruch's friend Gedaliah (*2 Baruch* 44:1), then the remnant community, the Diaspora (*2 Baruch* 77), and finally the "lost" nine-and-a-half tribes (*2 Baruch* 78–87). This inductive analysis of leadership in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* is placed in the context of what is known about the larger socio-historical world of Judaea during this period in order to shed light on leadership in post-destruction Judaism; this analysis helps us better understand the social histories of emergent communities and their leaders. While the

evidence for what may constitute a leader in the post-destruction period is minimal, extant evidence is analyzed in order to discuss the types of authority that *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* endorse.

Narrative Authority versus Historical Authority

4 Ezra and *2 Baruch* present their protagonists, Ezra and Baruch, as the only source of human authority, authority which has access to the divine and to a "correct" understanding of the law and its application to current events. The impending departure of the protagonists in both apocalypses causes the communities to react with grave concern; their fear is that there will be no one left to guide them, no one to explain the law, and no one to act as the interlocutor between them and God. According to the community, there are no viable replacements for the leadership that Ezra and Baruch offer, and thus their deaths are akin to the loss felt with the destruction of the temple.

In the apocalypses, Ezra and Baruch not only stand at the top of the leadership hierarchy but they are depicted as irreplaceable as far as the community is concerned. What the narratives of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* accomplish in terms of authority, I argue, is to define what an ideal leader would look like through the characterization of Ezra and Baruch, and to offer potential alternatives or substitutes through the teachings of these sages. While the main rhetorical purpose of the apocalypses is not to address leadership, both narratives do indeed portray an ideal leader as well as suggest potential solutions to the leadership crisis once those ideal leaders have passed.

4 Ezra and *2 Baruch* promulgate Torah observance and imminent eschatology in the face of the crisis caused by the destruction of the temple.[2] Both texts also discuss issues of leadership

[2] John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (second edition; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 194–225.

that were of concern to the authors and the intended audience, although these concerns are included inadvertently. These slippages[3] can be found in the narrative frames of the apocalypses, where interactions between Ezra and his community and Baruch and his community take place. In this project I propose that this inscribed anxiety about leadership and about the impending loss of leaders is reflective of the historical situation in Judaea in the period following the destruction of the second temple, suggesting a concern that the current leadership was either insufficient or non-existent.[4]

In order to argue for continuity between the authority as portrayed in the literature and historical authority, we must first establish what potential types of leadership models were historically available as a basis of comparison. In a 2013 monograph entitled *Jewish Leadership in Roman Palestine from 70 CE to 135 CE*,[5] Junghwa Choi examines leadership dynamics between the first and last Jewish revolt against Rome in Judaea.[6] Choi identifies seven models of Jewish leadership from the first two centuries C.E. to establish potential models of leadership that would have been available after the first revolt: kingly, priestly, learned, warrior, prophetic,

[3] A "slippage" is a word used by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza to indicate "small kernels of reality indicating the real-life struggle of women that are embedded in an androcentric text." The term has broader implications beyond considering women's history, however, and is applicable to questions of historical reconstruction based on ancient sources, especially if the sources are not meant to serve as history. See Joan Taylor, "The Women 'Priests' of Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa*: Reconstructing the Therapeutae" in *On the Cutting Edge: The Study of Women in Biblical Worlds; Essays in Honor of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza* (Ed. by Jane Schaberg, et al. New York: Continuum, 2004), 102. Note that this definition and my use of the word "slippage" adapts Schüssler Fiorenza's definition to encompass historical reconstruction of all texts, not just those which provide scholars with information on women. This is different from Derrida's usage in his discussion of the signifier and the signified. See J. Derrida, *Of Grammatology* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1976), 144 ff.

[4] Potentially one could argue that, like in both *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, the current leadership was soon to be leaving the community, likely through death, and therefore the inscribed model of leadership is parallel to the historical situation. There is not enough evidence, however, to warrant a literal connection between the situations. Instead, since both texts clearly have rhetorical function, I have taken the more cautious approach to interpretation.

[5] Junghwa Choi, *Jewish Leadership in Roman Palestine from 70 CE to 135 CE* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

[6] The first revolt against Rome lasted from 68–72 C.E., the third (and last) revolt was the Bar Kokhba revolt and lasted from 132–135 C.E. Both of these revolts took place in Judaea, and hence their inclusion in this project. The second revolt against Rome took place in the Diaspora from 115–117 C.E. I do not include the scant details of it in this analysis because of its diasporan provenance, which makes it less relevant for an historical reconstruction of leadership in Judaea and for the discussion of the implications of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*.

messianic, and *nasi*.[7] From these seven models only the prophetic leader seems to lack evidence in post-70 literature, although Choi is quick to point out that lack of evidence does not equate an argument that there were no prophetic-type leaders.[8]

Taking Choi's models as the starting point for our discussion of leadership, there seem to be only two of the seven models that are directly relevant for this project: learned leadership and messianic leadership.[9] These two types of leadership can be summarized as follows:

1. Learned Leadership: Education in antiquity was highly prized due to the high cost of education.[10] The same is true of education for Jews living in Judaea in the first and second centuries C.E., where those with an education and with the ability to interpret the laws of Moses were highly valued. Every known group of Jews in this period before the destruction of the temple emphasized scriptural interpretation as an important element of authority.[11] Choi notes examples primarily from Qumran and

[7] Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 16–17, 32–115. Choi also identifies the five models of political leadership that would have been available to Jews in Judaea under Roman rule, which would also have been potential options for Jewish leadership in Judaea following the destruction. These are city council, village council, client-kingship, *coloniae*, and direct military control. Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 16–17, 118–151. Choi lists two elements of leadership that are essential for his analysis: legitimacy and efficacy. He states that "The strongest leadership could be established when a potential leader had firm grounds for legitimacy and, at the same time, was capable of meeting the goals of his followers" (18). However, as Choi himself has pointed out, the nature of historical evidence makes a judgment on these two elements challenging at best. In terms of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, both protagonists are portrayed as legitimate and effective, so these elements are irrelevant for our analysis.

[8] Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 189–190. Had Choi considered leadership as portrayed in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* in his analysis of literature, he would likely have come to a different conclusion: that it is quite likely there was no prophetic leadership available in the post-destruction period. The concern in both of these apocalypses over the sages' imminent departure and the fact that the potential inscribed leaders are not considered to be valid replacements suggests that there were no prophetic-type leaders available.

[9] While *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* only support these two leadership types, others types of leadership were potential options after the war; see chapter two. As will be shown in sections 2–3, neither *4 Ezra* nor *2 Baruch* highlight a kingly leadership, neither one has an emphasis on the priestly role, *4 Ezra* does not highlight a military/warrior leader and *2 Baruch* is specifically non-militaristic in nature (see chapters 5–6), and neither text mention a *nasi*.

[10] H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (trans. G. Lamb; New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956); R. Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Harry J. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), Alan Millard, *Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus* (New York: New York University Press, 2000).

[11] M. Goodman, "Texts, Scribes and Power in Roman Judaea," in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World* (ed. A. K. Bowman and G. Woolf; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 99–108, here 99. See also Choi, *Jewish Leader*, 83.

the Pharisees from the pre-70 C.E. period.[12] For the period following the destruction, this type of leadership would perhaps have been the easiest to remain intact,[13] since it did not rely on existing political structure such as the temple, but instead on the skill of Torah learning which is easily transferable across time, place, and circumstance. In fact, the circumstances following the destruction may have provided this type of leader with more opportunity to move up the leadership hierarchy, since other types of leaders may no longer have been present or other leadership possibilities may have been defunct, e.g. priestly service in the temple.[14] Additionally they may have been sought after more aggressively than other leader types since those with knowledge of the interpretation of Torah would know better, at least theoretically, how to worship without the temple. Both Ezra and Baruch represent learned leaders, and it is their ability to interpret the learned tradition, with divine assistance, that makes them the ideal leaders. In *4 Ezra* 14, Ezra's revelation of the 94 books, 24 of which are to be shared with all the people and 70 of which are to be kept secret, reinforce the importance of a leadership that is learned in both esoteric and exoteric matters.

2. Messianic Leadership: The word messiah (המשיח or משיחא) means "anointed (one)," and while an expectation of the messiah is common in much of the extant literature from the Second Temple period, there is a wide variation on who or what the messiah will be and even in the literature, the messianic figure varies wildly.[15] While neither

[12] For a description of the Qumran sect see Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 87–89. For a description of learned leadership in the Pharisees see Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 83–87, 89–92.
[13] Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 180.
[14] This is not to say that priests did not exist or identify as priests after the destruction. We know from both the Bar Kokhba evidence and rabbinic materials that priests continued to identify as a group, even up to this day. However, they have not been an inherent leadership category since the temple's destruction. See also chapter two of this project.
[15] Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 102 n. 291. Cf. Gerbern Oegema, *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), Jacob Neusner et al. eds., *Judaisms*

> Ezra nor Baruch are themselves presented as the messiah, both texts contain mention of a messiah figure (*4 Ezra* 12:32, *2 Baruch* 70:9), and *2 Baruch* likely implies that the next leader that the people should expect is the messiah.[16]

While Choi's conclusions are useful, he starts with the theory of leadership, developing the models of Jewish leadership based on biblical and post-biblical literary and material evidence, as well as establishing potential Roman models that could have functioned in Judaea both pre- and post-70 C.E. What I suggest is that letting the literature tell the tale of the leadership is just as essential to developing an historical reconstruction of leadership in Judaea in the period following the destruction. I begin this proposed project with the analysis of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*.[17]

Terminology

Leadership "Crises"

Throughout this project I use the term "crisis" to discuss the nature of leadership and authority that is reflected in the extant materials during the period following the destruction of the second temple. The derivation of my choice of this term is twofold: first, the term derives from the inductive analysis of the literature—the inscribed communities in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* both project great anxiety over the loss of their leader, implying a crisis around the events of Ezra's and Baruch's imminent departures. Second, the socio-historical context in which *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* were composed was rife with anxiety about leadership. While this project focuses predominantly on these two apocalypses, other contemporaneous literature contains similar

---

and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) and J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995).

[16] See section three.

[17] Each text is barely mentioned in Choi's monograph. See *Jewish Leadership*, 169, 190–191.

reflections on leadership,[18] suggesting that leadership in Judaea during this period was at a critical point in terms of competing authority. Likewise, the details about the events leading up to and during the first Jewish revolt suggest that leadership was in fact in dire straits, just as the Bar Kokhba revolt preserves evidence that focuses on a central leader, potentially proposing another solution to the leadership situation during this period.

The historical context in which *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* were composed was therefore rife with anxiety about leadership and authority, which had become destabilized as early as after the destruction of the temple.[19] *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* are two examples that have been under-studied for the purpose of historical reconstruction of this kind. Thus, the project contributes to the reconstruction of historical authority through an examination of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*.

Ezra and Baruch

Following usage common in the scholarship on *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* and Second Temple studies, when I write about the author in these texts I am referring to the implied author;[20] and likewise "the audience" refers to the implied audience. When I discuss characters, I use the names Ezra and Baruch to refer to the protagonists in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. For the sake of ease, when I discuss the character Ezra from the scriptural source that becomes known as Ezra-Nehemiah, or the character Baruch from the scriptural source that becomes known as Jeremiah, I refer to them as "biblical Ezra" and "biblical Baruch." I am aware of the anachronism of the

[18] For instance, the New Testament contains myriad examples of competing claims for authority that come from both within the early Jesus movement and from competing Jewish groups. Similarly, the early rabbis confront leadership in parts of the Mishnah such as *Avot* 1–2 and *Sotah* 9:12–15.
[19] But likely even earlier. See chapter two.
[20] Little can be known about the actual author, although that does not prevent scholars from trying. I do not make claims about the actual author, however, only about what one can conclude from the thoughts and concerns of the implied author based on the texts themselves.

adjective "biblical," and do this only in order to keep clear the distinction between characters with the same name.[21]

Jew and Jewish

Recent scholars of Judaism in antiquity have debated whether scholarship should use the terms "Judaean," "Jew," or leave the word untranslated in ancient sources. Since I argue for a clearly Jewish provenance with theological implications related to Jewish communities,[22] in this project I embrace the use of the term "Jew," and obvious derivations such as "Jewish."[23] Note that when referring to the land, the Roman province, or the people who live there who may or may not be specifically Jewish in terms of religious observance, I use the terms "Judaea" and "Judaean."

Chapter Outline

Part One of this dissertation contains materials that will set the stage for the literary and socio-historical analyses of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. The first chapter considers on the theoretical level the function of genre and pseudepigraphy in the apocalypses. The tailored use of a variety of standardized (sub-)genres by the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* displays the interpretive

[21] The figures of Ezra and Baruch from other sources will be referred to specifically with reference to those sources.
[22] This does not seek to preclude the potential of Jewish-Christian or even Christian usage. However, the texts exhibit no specifically Christian elements, and therefore I do not think that we can assume a Christian provenance. See James R. Davila *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* (Leiden: Brill, 2005). Contra Rivka Nir on *2 Baruch* in *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).
[23] For a discussion of the use of the terms Jewish vs. Judaean, see Marginalia, "Jew and Judean: A Forum on Politics and Historiography in the Translation of Ancient Texts: Have scholars erased the Jews from Antiquity?" *Marginalia Review of Books,* last modified 26 August 2014, accessed January 14, 2015, http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/jew-judean-forum. Cf. Daniel R. Schwartz, *Judeans and Jews: Four Faces of Dichotomy in Ancient Jewish History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014); Shaye J.D. Cohen, "*Ioudaios, Iudaeus,* Judaean, Jew" in *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

choice made by each author. Through the tailoring of the generic categories, one can determine what each author chose to highlight or eliminate, thus providing a window into the matters which the author found important. In this chapter I discuss how genre theory, a categorization of literature, functions to contribute to a reconstruction of the socio-historical world. This chapter also examines the function of pseudepigraphy; both *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* utilize pseudepigraphy by re-establishing and re-assigning authority to their texts through the use of leadership figures from the past who were already known and respected figures, that is, Ezra and Baruch. In addition to building on these precursors, the narratives also build on the traditions associated with other characters, such as Moses, whose traits Ezra and Baruch take on in the narratives. *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* build upon the past traditions of their precursors as well as the additional characters, which then creates a complex protagonist for each apocalypse that is more than the sum of its parts. The figures of Ezra and Baruch are used to not only to establish and assign authority, but also to create an appropriate "solution" to the perceived leadership problems in each text, especially the problem of what to do when all "appropriate" leaders are no longer present in the community. Chapter one concludes by tracing the traditions of the precursors Ezra and Baruch through the variety of known literature and exploring the leadership abilities listed in each text, as well as discussing the role those play in the characterization of Ezra in *4 Ezra* and of Baruch in *2 Baruch*.

Chapter two shifts from theoretical framework to historical concerns, establishing the crises of leadership and authority in the socio-historical environment in which *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* were written. First, using Josephus' historiographical accounts as a base, I show how the structure of authority leading up to and at the time of the destruction of the second temple was a fragile arrangement established by the Romans, who did not take into account previous

constructions of Jewish authority but instead relied upon their own equation of landowners being the default ruling class. However, this arrangement, I argue, was problematic because Jews had never acknowledged wealth as the major contributing factor in deciding social leadership. Along with multiple other factors, this discord among those who held authority contributed to the start of the Jewish revolt against the Romans in 66 C.E., and can be seen to contribute to the failure of the revolt. *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, written about 30 years after the destruction of the second temple, preserve a heightened level of insecurity over effective leadership, and I argue this is a direct result of the leadership crisis leading up to and during the revolt, as portrayed by Josephus.

In the second half of the chapter I consider the material evidence from the Bar Kokhba revolt, which occurred approximately 30 years after *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* were written. While limited, the epistolary and numismatic evidence available for the revolt highlight the leader Shimon Bar Kosiba as a leader who attempted to control all aspects of life during his military campaign, including religious life. This evidence stresses a hierarchical leadership with Bar Kosiba as the dominant leader; that Bar Kosiba actually existed suggests that his style of leadership is one of the potential leadership outcomes from the crisis in Judaea following the destruction. Leadership as presented by Bar Kosiba is not the type of leadership endorsed by *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, however, both apocalypses emphasize leaders who are learned in Torah and look toward the imminent eschaton, and *2 Baruch* at least purports a non-militaristic approach to life.

Part Two of this project shifts into the analysis of *4 Ezra*. In chapter three, I conduct a literary analysis of leadership as portrayed in *4 Ezra*, with emphasis on the figure of Ezra. Focusing especially on *4 Ezra* 5:16–20a, 12:40–50, and the entirety of chapter 14, I show how the interactions of Ezra with the people translate his revelations to experiences from which the

entire inscribed community can benefit. Ezra's role as leader in *4 Ezra* is to act predominantly as the interlocutor with God, often via the angel Uriel, in order to seek out answers and direction for the community as a whole. While the community fears Ezra's absence, they also recognize his ability to receive revelations that will assist them in their own current crisis. Chapter 14 serves as the climax to the narrative, where Ezra is finally able to share his learned knowledge with the people through the passing along of public and secret books. Ezra's translation to heaven takes place only after he has left them with these written guidelines, as well as with encouragement to follow the wise who are able to understand the secret books.

Chapter five takes the literary conclusions drawn from chapter four and applies them to the socio-historical world in which *4 Ezra* was written. I show first how *4 Ezra* was not written in a sectarian environment nor was it written for a sectarian audience, and therefore its emphasis on leadership is meant to reach a broader Jewish audience. This argument suggests that the more popular understanding of "the wise" (*4 Ezra* 14:45–46) as a sectarian group who serves as the intended audience is an incorrect reading. Instead, the use of the terminology of "the wise" is meant to lend legitimacy to the pseudepigraphic text of *4 Ezra*. Thus, with its emphasis on imminent eschatology and Torah observance, *4 Ezra* promotes a leader type who supports these ideas and thus one who maintains the correct interpretation of scripture.

In Part Three I turn to an analysis of *2 Baruch*. Chapter five contains a literary analysis of the apocalypse. During Baruch's career as told in *2 Baruch* there are three times when Baruch instructs the community (31:1–34:1, 44:1–47:2, 77:1–26), each time with the size of the audience increasing. The narrative ends with the mention of two epistles, one written to the Babylonian exiles, and the other written to the lost nine-and-a-half tribes. In the course of *2 Baruch*, then, Baruch acts as leader to *all* Jews regardless of where they are in space and time. Baruch's

leadership skills are stressed not only by his interaction with the people, but also within one of the sub-sections of the narrative which contains an apocalypse and interpretation in the guise of the review of the history of Israel. Here, good and bad leaders from Israel's past are discussed, highlighting attributes that are both found in Baruch himself and emphasized as the ideal attributes of any subsequent leader.

As in *4 Ezra*, a large concern of the narrative frame is the replacement of Baruch once he has gone from the midst of the community. I show that the text is ambivalent about who will follow in Baruch's footsteps as leader of the community: if it is a human leader, it is no one that currently resides in the community. However, it may be that the next leader is the messiah; *2 Baruch* is not clear on its expectations or timeline in this regard.

Chapter six considers the intended audience of *2 Baruch*, arguing that the movement of Baruch's audience from a select few elders to the entire Diaspora in the epistle of Baruch suggests that the author of *2 Baruch* intended to reach a broad audience of Jews, not limited by location. The message in the narrative indicates that the leadership attributes which *2 Baruch* promotes are not to be found in any current leader besides Baruch. Instead, the intended audience should look toward the impending eschaton for the leadership of the messiah. This focus on the messiah is tied up with what I argue is *2 Baruch*'s non-militaristic agenda, encouraging its readers to await the messiah for the punishment of those who have destroyed Zion, rather than taking violent action against the enemies of Israel. Thus, with the broad intended audience and the focus on the messiah and the eschaton, *2 Baruch* attempts to persuade its reader to avoid armed conflict with the Romans and look to the leadership of the messiah, who will arrive soon, to punish the wicked; any human leader who promoted physical violence against the Roman would thus not be a good leader, according to *2 Baruch*.

Finally, in my conclusion, I show how my project contributes to the discussion of post-destruction Judaism by offering a careful reading of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, both of which have been primarily ignored in the reconstruction of the social and historical worlds in this period.[24] My analysis offers not just a description of what types of leadership options were available after the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E.,[25] but provides evidence that in Judaea in this period, there were competing ideals of leadership which posed problems to which Jewish communities felt compelled to respond in texts such as *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*.

[24] For instance, Choi only mentions the apocalypses in two places and does not utilize them for his descriptions of leadership options after the destruction; *Jewish Leadership*, 169, 190–191. Similarly, Schwartz (*Imperialism and Jewish Society*) barely references either book in his consideration of imperial dominion over Jewish society in Judaea, and even then it is primarily in the footnotes.
[25] As per Choi's thesis in *Jewish Leadership*.

Part One: Theoretical and Historical Framework

Chapter One

The Function of Genre and Pseudepigraphy in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*

1.1 Introduction

I now turn to a discussion of the theoretical approaches to the texts that this project will utilize: this chapter will examine the function of genre and pseudepigraphy in terms of how leadership is portrayed in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. Since I argue that, based on the extant evidence, leadership in Judaea during the time that these texts were written was in crisis, and that one, perhaps unintentional, feature of the apocalypses is an interpretation of and solution to the contemporaneous conflict surrounding authority, then the analysis must begin with how these texts can be used in the reconstruction of leadership in the late first/early second centuries C.E. in Judaea. This is not so much a discussion of why the authors[1] of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* chose what they chose in terms of genre and pseudepigraphy; after all, one cannot do more than make an educated guess as to the original intentions of the author. Instead, I will consider the function of the choices made.

The use of genre, in terms of the broader category of apocalypse as well as sub-genres found throughout *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* such as the "summary of the history of Israel," is in each case an interpretive choice made by the author and thus each choice offers insight, however small, into the social and historical worldview in which the text was produced. These slippages of information can often be gleaned from how the use of a particular generic category differs from other usages in related texts.[2] The analysis of how *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* participate in a

[1] Since my literary analyses approach *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* as complete texts arranged as we currently have them, I address the author of each as an individual, thus using the term "author." This does not preclude the possibility that they drew upon multiple sources, or that multiple rewritings and redactions over a period of time occurred, which may mean that there was in fact more than one author.

[2] Thus is the nature of genre; texts which can be identified as a specific literary type both participate in the genre and maintain differences: "As a form of ideology, genre is also never fully identical with itself, nor are texts fully identical with their genres," T. O. Beebee, *The Ideology of Genre: A Comparative Study of Generic Instability* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994), 19.

given generic category will serve especially in my analysis of the reconstruction of the socio-historical world in terms of the perception of authority and leadership.

In the texts under discussion, pseudepigraphy functions on multiple levels: both *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* portray their protagonists as leaders by drawing on multiple previous traditions. First, building upon the biblical namesake, the use of the monikers "Ezra" and "Baruch" create a connection to the life of the figures as reflected in the biblical narrative[3] as well as the time in which they lived, temporally near the destruction of the first temple. Second, the additional discourses tied to these figures, as found through writings from the Septuagint, Dead Sea Scrolls, Josephus, etc., contribute to the characters' complexity and highlight specific authoritative features while downplaying others. Last, while still maintaining their identity as Ezra or Baruch, these pseudepigraphical characters simultaneously absorb leadership qualities of the other ancient figures they emulate, most especially Moses, but also Daniel, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and Job. In both *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, pseudepigraphy not only lends authority to the apocalypses, but also serves to create a unique and authoritative protagonist that guides the community to salvation after the destruction of the temple. An exploration of the namesake of each leader serves to highlight the complex roles that Ezra and Baruch play in the apocalypses, building upon the traditionary processes associated with their monikers.

This chapter will cover the theoretical issues related to genre and pseudepigraphy. In the first section I will discuss how genre, or in the case of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, sub-genres, can relay historical slippages through the content choice made by the authors while still participating in a generic form. The second section of this chapter will discuss how pseudepigraphy functions

[3] While admittedly anachronistic, for simplicity sake and in order to differentiate between the characters of Ezra and Baruch in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* and the character of Ezra in the books Ezra and Nehemiah, and the character of Baruch in the book of Jeremiah, I use the adjective "biblical" to describe the latter, e.g. biblical Ezra. The term is meant to be descriptive for the reader, not prescriptive of canonization. See the introduction for issues of terminology.

in terms of the use of the figures of Ezra and Baruch and the traditions associated with these figures, as well as other precursors that *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* draw upon. Finally, I will explore the specific traditions associated with the characters of Ezra and Baruch in order to highlight the leadership characteristics found in earlier Ezrean and Baruchian discourses that are emphasized in the apocalypses. This examination will set the stage for the literary analysis conducted in chapters three and five.

1.2 Genre

That *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* fall under the generic category "apocalypse" is not disputed. Both fit to varying degrees with John Collins' definition of apocalypse.[4] Collins lays out a descriptive definition of what has become the framework for literary analyses of ancient apocalypses:

> Apocalypse is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.[5]

While Collins' definition has not been without its detractors, no subsequent definition has been adopted to replace it.[6] Limitations of this definition are cited even within the *Semeia* volume itself:

> [This definition] is not intended as a complete or adequate description of the constituent works […] the social functions and implied attitudes of this literature present highly complex problems which lie beyond the range of the present study […] An adequate discussion of these matters can only be achieved through the detailed analysis of individual apocalypses and the examination of the precise ways in which the various elements function.[7]

---

[4] J. J. Collins, "Introduction: Toward the Morphology of a Genre" in *Apocalypse The Morphology of a Genre* (Semeia 14, ed. by J. J. Collins. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979).
[5] Collins, *Morphology of a Genre*, 9.
[6] For an overview of the discussion see Carol A. Newsom, "Spying out the Land: A Report from Genology" in *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies* (Semeia Studies 63, Ed. by R. Boer. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007).
[7] Collins, *Morphology of a Genre*, 10, 12.

The subsequent dissatisfaction by some scholars with the definition offered by Collins corresponds to an increasing dissatisfaction in the area of genre studies on the approach of defining genres by means of their features.[8] Jacques Derrida argues that a text should not belong to a genre but instead should be considered a participant in it: "a taking part without being part of, without having membership in a set."[9] Following this lead, Newsom argues that genre should be considered a focus of the rhetorical orientation of the text "rather than referring to texts as belonging to genres one might think of texts as participating in them, invoking them, gesturing to them, playing in and out of them, and in doing so, continually changing them."[10] The concept of texts participating in a genre is perhaps more relevant to a discussion about the sub-genres[11] present throughout *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, rather than their identification as apocalypses. It is through literary analysis of some of the sub-genres in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* that much of the social and historical information about the text can be determined. The analyses of these sub-genres will take place at the relevant points during the literary analyses in chapters 3–6; for the purpose of an introduction to the application of the method, one example here should suffice in order to show how the variations present in the participation of generic categories can offer socio-historical information that is relevant for the discussion of leadership in the post-Second Temple period.

The genre summary/review of the history of Israel exists as a sub-genre in both *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, and is abundant in both biblical and Second Temple literature as well.[12] The genre

[8] Newsom, "Spying out the Land," 20.
[9] Jacques Derrida, "The Law of Genre" in *Modern Genre Theory* (Ed. by David Duff. Harlow, UK: Longman, 2000), 230.
[10] Newsom, "Spying out the Land," 21.
[11] I use the term sub-genre here to indicate that the genres under discussion exists within the larger narrative, which has been identified generically as an apocalypse.
[12] Such as Deut. 26, Josh. 24, 1 Sam. 12, Josephus' *Jewish War* 5, Acts 7:2b–53, 1 Enoch 89:10–53, etc. See in its entirety J. Jeska, *Die Geschichte Israels in der Sicht des Lukas: Apg 7, 2b–53 und 13, 17–25 im Kontext antik-jüdischer Summarien der Geschichte Israels* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001).

could be defined as a review of the history of Israel based in general on the historical accounts of Israel dated earlier than the text where the review appears. This would include texts that came to be known from the Hebrew Bible, as well as texts that may be found in the Septuagint, the Apocrypha, or were never canonized. It is difficult to place an exact time frame around the narratives that participate in this genre; as an example, some may begin their review of history at the point of creation, while others may only begin after Enoch or after the Flood. The level of detail varies considerably from one text to another, and the variations depend on the agenda of the author(s). According to Joachim Jeska, there is a certain canon of events from the history of Israel from which the authors choose, although no author uses all of the events present in this canon.[13] Within the genre "summary/review of the history of Israel," elements such as reduction, expansion, modification, substitution, and omission all speak to intentional adaptations made by the author.[14] Gerbern Oegema sums it up well:

> most of the 'summaries of the history of Israel' in fact contain actualizations of history rather than historical reports or accounts, whether in the form of evaluative comments on past events or in the form of a continuation or finalization of the past, largely in order to make a connection between Israel's history and the narrative context of the author's work and to interpret the present and future of the author and his audience.[15]

While the reason for the variations cannot easily be ascertained, they can provide insight into the agenda of the narrative. For instance, the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 Enoch 83–90) is in its entirety a

[13] Jeska, *Die Geschichte Israels*, 115–118 and 254; See also Gerbern S. Oegema *Apocalyptic Interpretations of the Bible: Apocalypticism and Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism, the Apostle Paul, the Historical Jesus, and their Reception History* (London: T&T Clark, 2012), 60.

[14] These elements are discussed in genre theory. See, for instance, Vladimir Propp who notes a number of ways that element(s) may change within the expected structure of the genre of fairy tales without disrupting its participation in the generic category. Propp notes the following as possible changes of a single element: reduction, expansion, contamination, inversion, intensification, attenuation, externally motivated substitutions, confessional substitutions, substitution by superstition, archaic substitution, literary substitutions, modification, substitutions of unknown origin, internally motivated assimilations, externally motivated assimilations, assimilation via superstition, literary assimilations, and archaic assimilations. Similar principles can be seen when applied to the various sub-genres that will be analyzed in this project. V. Propp, "Fairy Tale Transformations" in *Modern Genre Theory* (ed. D. Duff; Essex: Pearson Education Limited, 2000; Reprinted from *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Third edition. Edited by Ladislav Matejka and Krystyna Pomorska. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1971, 94–114. First published as 'Transformacii volshebnyx skazok' in *Poetika*, 4 [1928]: 70–89. Translated by C.H. Severens), 59–67.

[15] Oegema, *Apocalyptic Interpretations*, 60.

summary/review of the history of Israel.[16] The choices of which events were included certainly reflect on the agenda put forth by the text. For instance, while the second temple and priestly cult is mentioned, the latter is only referred to with negative criticism:

> And they began to build again as at first, and they raised up that tower, and it was called the tall tower. And they began again to place a table before the tower, but all the bread that was upon it was polluted, and it was not pure (*Animal Apocalypse*, 89:73).[17]

The author of the *Animal Apocalypse* chose to include the physical building of the second temple, here referred to as "the tall tower," which is mentioned without any judgment attached. However, the choice to include not only the "bread," that is, the priestly cult,[18] which was put upon the table, but to label it as polluted and impure, shows that the issue the author had with the second temple was not the building per se, but with the temple cult. This type of analysis of sub-genres, including the summary/review of the history of Israel, within *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra* will assist in the reconstruction of leadership and leadership ideas as found in the texts.

1.3 Pseudepigraphy

Pseudepigraphy is the act of writing in the name of another person. In the case of Jewish texts from around Second Temple period, each pseudepigraphic text was ascribed to a significant figure from the historical/biblical past. While the term 'pseudepigraphy' was previously used by scholars to describe texts falsely attributed to an authoritative author, this meaning has fallen out of usage.[19] In terms of the time period and provenance of the texts, the word instead should first

---

[16] The text is generally dated to the Maccabean revolt. See Patrick A. Tiller *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature: 1993), 61–79.
[17] Translation by Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 336.
[18] Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 39, 340; See also Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "'Reading the Present' in the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch* 85–90)" in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by means of Scriptural Interpretations* (ed. K. De Troyer and A. Lange; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 98.
[19] S. Sheinfeld, "Pseudepigrapha in Current Research" (*Religion Compass* 7/5 [2013]), 149. It is important to note that current academic scholarship lacks negative judgment on the modern collection known as the Pseudepigrapha,

be considered descriptive: a pseudepigraphon is a text written by an unknown author in the name of an authority figure from Israel's past. While the act of pseudepigraphy conceals the actual author from identification by the reader, the lack of identifying author does not preclude using the text as a source of historical information.[20] Even a text that is attributed to a pseudepigraphic author can provide information on the social-historical setting of the text itself because it reflects, at the very least, nuggets of information about the setting in which it was written, as has been explored above in the discussion of genre. It is my assertion that *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* not only do this, but that these writings do so in regard to and in response to the leadership crises in Judaea following the destruction of the second temple.

In a pseudepigraphon, the choice of the pseudonym by the author connects the work to earlier traditions associated with that particular name: since multiple texts were often ascribed to one name, there were often multiple traditions connected with the pseudonym. Likewise, the pseudonym connects the current text with the authority and concerns of the previous traditions. Shortly I will explore in detail how this is significant for *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. In the case of texts from the Second Temple period, the "appeal to antiquity was inextricably linked to an ongoing attempt to recover the loss of the First Temple period."[21] The First Temple period, as perceived by the later writers, was idealized in multiple ways including through political and religious leadership.[22] In order to deal with the aftermath of the destruction of the second temple, authors used the destruction of the first temple as the basis for their memory of and solution to

---

although this change has happened only recently in the history of scholarship. There is still discussion around alternative name options for the fluid group of texts that are now known as the Pseudepigrapha, but no scholarly consensus has been reached.

[20] For a discussion of the development of authorship, see Michel Foucault, "What is an Author?" in *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology* (ed. J. D. Faubion; trans. R. Hurley; 2 vols. New York: The New Press, 1998), 205–222.

[21] Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 14–15.

[22] Hindy Najman, "How Should We Contextualize Pseudepigrapha? Imitation and Emulation in *4 Ezra*," in *Past Renewals, Interpretative Authority, Renewed Revelation and the Quest for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity* (JSJSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 238.

the trauma caused by the destruction of the second temple; pseudepigraphy provided a way through which authors could reach to the past in order to interpret the events of the present. Goodman notes that:

> some general reactions were more or less universal within Jewish society. One such well-attested response to near-chaos was a search for a new unambiguous authority to provide certainty in a shifting world. The best evidence for this attitude lies in the fact that much of the literature produced by Jews in this period is pseudepigraphic. The literary form was not new in the Jewish tradition, but its popularity at this time is best explained by the social function of invented authorities as particularly credible when the actual leaders of society were all discredited for one reason or another. Attribution of a text to a pseudonymous author was not intended to fool or mislead the audience, and the Greek notion that such action is dishonest is wholly alien to Jewish thought, but it did enhance the claims of a text to represent divine inspiration unsullied by the political and social divisions of the day.[23]

As Goodman argues, one way that pseudepigraphy can be explained is through the creation of credible authorities when current options are less than ideal. Both *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* utilize pseudepigraphy in this way, by re-establishing and re-assigning authority to contemporary texts through the use of leadership figures from the past who were already known and respected. Thus one of the functions of pseudepigraphy is to utilize a name of the past as a marker of authority.[24] In our texts, the figures of Ezra and Baruch are used not only to establish and assign authority, but to create an appropriate "solution" to the perceived leadership problems in each text, especially the problem of what to do when all "appropriate" leaders are no longer present in the community. I am not arguing in this project that the primary function of the writings *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* is the proffered solutions to leadership; the texts serve multiple functions. While the issue of authority is not a primary concern in our texts, the concern with authority after the destruction of the Temple, especially with a *lack of acceptable authority*, is present in the text, and it is this idea that is analyzed in this project. Part of the solution offered by the text lies specifically with the choice of Ezra or Baruch as the leader of the remnant community. Indeed,

[23] Martin Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome A.D. 66–70* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 77–78.
[24] Sheinfeld, "Pseudepigrapha," 150.

how pseudepigraphy works in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* is the discussion of this research project and will be explored in detail in subsequent chapters.

1.3.1 Discourses Tied to Founders and Traditionary Processes[25]

4 Ezra and *2 Baruch* are pseudepigraphic in that their respective authors not only drew upon the biblical characters of Baruch and Ezra, but also upon the multiple traditions already associated with those foundational characters through both biblical and later Second Temple literature.[26] The images of Baruch and Ezra in these texts reflect specific leadership attributes that the authors wished to emphasize to their audiences, built up from previous traditions.[27] When later authors draw upon the earlier narratives of the characters and their trajectories, the characters are referred to as *founders*,[28] and any discussion of such text includes an analysis of not only the foundational story associated with the founder—in our case the biblical book of Ezra for Ezra and the book of Jeremiah for Baruch—but must also examine the additional traditions associated with the founder.[29] This type of examination is called the discourse tied to a founder, and can be credited initially to Hindy Najman in her 2003 monograph, *Seconding Sinai*.[30] In this book, Najman discusses the use of Mosaic discourse in literature throughout the Second Temple period, beginning with the Deuteronomic History, and ranging through such examples as *Jubilees* and 11QTemple.[31] As defined by Najman, Mosaic discourse comprises both the foundational story and the later traditions and interpretations that are tied to Moses: laws

[25] This terminology derives from Najman's work on the function of pseudepigraphy. See specifically *Seconding Sinai* and "Traditionary Processes and Textual Unity in *4 Ezra*" in *Four Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall* (Ed. M. Henze and G. Boccaccini. Leiden: Brill, 2013), 99–114.
[26] For a review of the history of scholarship as related to this project on *4 Ezra*, see chapter 3. For *2 Baruch*, see chapter 5.
[27] Note that I am not arguing for a straight chronological progression between any given texts and traditions.
[28] Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 12–13.
[29] I do this below in section 1.4.
[30] Najman, *Seconding Sinai*.
[31] Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 41–69.

are expanded upon and augmented and then included in the Torah of Moses, while the person of Moses becomes centralized and is affiliated with various types of leadership.[32] This discourse serves as an act of interpretation, developing the new text "in a way that one claims to be an authentic expression of the law already accepted as authoritatively Mosaic."[33] Accordingly, Mosaic discourse develops because Second Temple conceptions of authority would need to be embedded in the pre-exilic period,[34] in these cases associated with the specific authoritative figure of Moses.

The assertion that pseudepigraphic texts claim authority through the use of the name of an authority figure from the past is not new, but Najman's argument that a discourse is developed and built around a specific figure and that the "only passable roads to textual authority led through the past" is innovative. Najman takes this argument beyond the discourse tied to a founder when discussing *4 Ezra* in her later work. She claims that because the apocalypse contains multiple sub-genres[35] as well as draws from older, pre-established traditions, it signifies that the text is not simply tied to the authority of the biblical Ezra, but that it is also tied to discourses related to Moses, Job, Ezekiel, and Daniel.[36] This multiplicity of connections move the text beyond a discourse tied to a single founder, although the fact that the author chose[37] Ezra as his appellation rather than any other founder is certainly significant. Instead, Najman argues that *4 Ezra* reconfigures the character of Ezra, taking into account the traditions associated with the myriad other figures that are subsequently connected with Ezra throughout the text. This

[32] "…for example, as prophet, as lawgiver, as divine amanuensis, as king and as divine man," Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 10–11.
[33] Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 13.
[34] With the rare exception being Ben Sira; Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 14–15 n. 29.
[35] See my previous section on generic considerations.
[36] Najman, "Traditionary Processes."
[37] Or was inspired to choose; I make no judgment here on whether or not the text was intentionally constructed or inspired. See Michael E. Stone, "A Reconsideration of Apocalyptic Visions," *HTR* 96/2 (2003), 167–180, for a discussion of actual visionary experiences (and possible objections) in relation to *4 Ezra*.

supplements the protagonist of Ezra in *4 Ezra* with the discourses of these additional characters, creating a new, more complex view of Ezra, where the figure of Ezra is built not only on Ezrean traditions, but also on the traditions associated with the additional characters. For instance, Ezra becomes an Ezekiel-type prophet in the introduction to *4 Ezra*:

> In the thirtieth year after the destruction of our city, I, Salathiel, who am also called Ezra, was in Babylon. I was troubled as I lay upon my bed, and my thoughts welled up in my heart, because I saw the desolation of Zion and the wealth of those who lived in Babylon. My spirit was greatly agitated, and I began to speak anxious words to the Most High…(3:1–3)[38]

While this passage has been used in an attempt to date *4 Ezra*, it should instead be noted that the language is reminiscent of Ezekiel 1:1:

> In the thirtieth year, in the fourth month, on the fifth day of the month, as I was among the exiles by the river Chebar, the heavens were opened, and I saw visions of God.[39]

Rather than acting as an internal source for dating the document, the reference in *4 Ezra* to the "thirtieth year" serves to draw an immediate connection for the audience between the figure of Ezra and the beginnings of Ezekiel's prophetic call, thus placing Ezra in the same prophetic line as the prophet Ezekiel.[40]

Adapting the character of Ezra in this way also emphasizes features and traditions from earlier texts associated with Ezra[41] which may not have stood out in the earliest textual narratives. This creates precursors or "members of a tradition *that would not exist if not for its late exemplar*," in this case as found in *4 Ezra*.[42] For instance, the biblical Ezra is not a prophet but a scribe and a priest who teaches the law to the people. However, the Ezra in *4 Ezra* draws

---

[38] All translations of *4 Ezra* are taken from Michael E. Stone. *Fourth Ezra* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), unless otherwise stated. As I note in chapter three, text critical issues are not relevant for the present discussion because the text is not in dispute. I will note major differences in order to distinguish between editions.
[38] See below for a discussion of the dating of *4 Ezra*.
[39] Quotes from the Bible are from the NRSV unless otherwise noted.
[40] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 55. See also Najman, "Traditionary Processes," 113–114 and "Pseudonymous Attribution," 314–315.
[41] For specific texts, see my discussion on the textual traditions associated with Ezra below.
[42] Najman, "Traditionary Processes," 109. Italics in original.

out these leadership attributes and adds to them the role of prophet as one who not only teaches the law, but also receives it as divine revelation.[43] Thus to speak of an Ezrean discourse in the case of *4 Ezra* is misleading; we should note that Ezra simultaneously holds some of the authority that the precursors Moses, Job, Ezekiel, and Daniel (and their subsequent discourses) each carry, as well as the authority tied to the discourse of Ezra.[44] Therefore the character of Ezra in *4 Ezra* comes to hold the various leadership characteristics that are reflected in the precursors as well as the earlier traditions associated with Ezra.

Something similar happens to Baruch in *2 Baruch*; multiple personalities and discourses are associated with him. Not only does his character represent a development of the scribe of Baruch as presented in the Bible, but our Baruch also draws upon traditions associated with Moses, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Abraham. Matthias Henze notes the intricacy of the situation:

> In other words, instead of thinking of Baruch in *2Bar* as the result of a linear development of a biblical hero that begins in the Bible, continues to grow in the apocrypha, and finally flows directly into this early pseudepigraphon, *Baruch is an amalgam that resides at the intersection of multiple discourses, each tied to a founder*. These multiple discourses come together in the figure of Baruch in *2Bar*, with each of these founders contributing a crucial set of characteristics.[45]

What is occurring in *4 Ezra* with the character Ezra as described above is also occurring with the character Baruch in *2 Baruch*: these characters are simultaneously their own individual character (Ezra, Baruch) as well as the various characters with whom they are also identified. Baruch is

---

[43] This idea will be explored in more detail later in this chapter as well as in chapter 3.

[44] Najman discusses issues of emulation and imitation, whereas in the case of *4 Ezra* the character Ezra could be said to emulate the biblical Ezra, that is, he should not only be identified with the biblical Ezra but also with indeterminate and indefinite ideas of what that Ezra may represent. On the flip side of this, Ezra imitates the various other characters, such as Moses, Job, Daniel, etc. He is not identified outright with them per se, but likened to them and their experiences. Najman, "How Should We Contextualize Pseudepigrapha?," 534–5. While Najman's terminology here helps for clarification purposes, I think it simplifies the relationship between Ezra and the other precursors; it is true that in some cases the text explicitly creates a connection, such as in *4 Ezra* 12:10–12 and 14:3 (although note that they both occur in direct addresses from God to Ezra), however, the identification of Ezra with the discourses associated with the other characters happens throughout the narrative, often in subtle ways. Thus more than just imitation is occurring. Instead, as just argued, the figure of Ezra can be simultaneously portrayed as Ezra, while also maintaining identifying features from other precursors even beyond that of imitation. See also H. Najman, "Configuring the Text in Biblical Studies," in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* (Ed. E. F. Mason et al. Leiden: Brill, 2012), especially pages 17–21.

[45] Matthias Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading 'Second Baruch' in Context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 100, italics in original.

simultaneously channeling Moses, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Abraham and the traditions associated with these figures.[46]

This discussion on the function of pseudepigraphy relates to leadership in the post-destruction period because the amalgamations of these characters—of Ezra with Moses, Job, Ezekiel, and Daniel, and of Baruch with Moses, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Abraham—reflect specific attributes of authority that our authors wished to portray to their audience. However, the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* chose the figures of Ezra and Baruch as the main characters for their narratives rather than any other figure, and therefore it is essential to carefully examine the precursors in order to fully understand the choice, especially in relation to their leadership skills.

1.4 Leaders in the Textual Tradition

In this section I will trace the history of the figures of Ezra and Baruch, looking specifically at leadership attributes that are drawn upon by the post-destruction apocalypses. The leadership qualities that are emphasized in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* are teased out specifically in the narrative as the attributes that the inscribed audience fears losing most; thus it is essential to explore the development of the discourse associated with each figure.

1.4.1 Ezra in textual tradition

1.4.1.a Why Ezra?

Ezra is an exemplary leader for use in a post-destruction apocalypse. The biblical Ezra is temporally located after the destruction of the first temple: he is associated with a return from exile and, perhaps most importantly, a return to the law of Moses. Ezra is seen, at least in the

[46] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 101–113 explores the connections in *2 Baruch* between Baruch, Ezekiel, Moses, and Jeremiah.

later literature, as a kind of second Moses.[47] In fact, rabbinic literature portrays Ezra as being worthy to receive the Torah *even if* Moses had not come before him. For instance, *t. Sanh.* 4.7 reads:

> R. Yose said, "Ezra was worthy that the Torah be given through him, but Moses anticipated him. Of Moses, the term 'ascent' is used and of Ezra, the term 'ascent' is used. Of Moses, as it is said "And Moses ascended to God" (Exod 19:3); of Ezra—"He, Ezra came up [i.e. ascended] from Babylon" (Ezra 7:6).[48]

This passage and its corollaries suggest that had Moses not preceded Ezra, Ezra would have received and transmitted the Torah to Israel, and in fact the parallels between Ezra and Moses in *4 Ezra* 14 emphasize the connections between the two. Ezra is likened to Moses in three main ways: first, in his authority as leader of the people; second, as a prophet of God; and third in his ability to receive divine revelation through the re-giving of the Torah. Like Moses, Ezra will then teach the community to observe God's law.

The choice of Ezra as the protagonist of *4 Ezra* is logical because Ezra is associated with the destruction of the first temple, and is seen as a harbinger of Torah observance. *4 Ezra* is concerned with the status of Israel after the destruction of the second temple, and thus the choice of a biblical authority figure who assisted the Jewish community with the transition of life after the destruction of the first temple creates a continuity between the two events. Since the authority of biblical Ezra brought the Jews back to Torah observance and since he was connected with the beginnings of the Second Temple, the use of the moniker "Ezra" might have also provided both solace and hope that Torah observance would bring about the rebuilding of the temple—in the case of *4 Ezra*, the eschatological Temple. This next section traces the character of Ezra from the

[47] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 411.
[48] See similar traditions related to the re-giving of the Torah to Ezra in Aramaic in *b. Sanh*. 21b and *y. Meg.* 1.71b; Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 411.

biblical text through the post-biblical period, emphasizing key attributes that highlight Ezra as a leader.

1.4.1.b Ezra in the Hebrew Bible

The biblical book that bears Ezra's name does not mention the character until more than halfway through the book in chapter 7. Ezra is called a scribe and a priest at the outset:

> Ezra son of Seraiah son of Azariah son of Hilkiah son of Shallum son of Zadok son of Ahitub son of Amariah son of Meraioth son of Zerahiah son of Uzzi son of Bukki son of Abishua son of Phineas son of Eleazar son of Aaron the chief priest—that Ezra came up from Babylon, a scribe expert in the Teaching of Moses which the Lord God of Israel had given (Ez 7:1b–6a).

Ezra's long genealogy associates him with priests of the highest rank, those of the direct line of Aaron.[49] However, while his priestly genealogy proves his excellent pedigree, it is his job as a "scribe expert in the Teaching of Moses" (7:6) that is of import for his forthcoming career as leader to the Jews. In fact, in these few verses we have the foundation for Ezra's role as leader among the returned exiles and among those Jews who remained in (or had already returned to) Judaea.

There already exist subtle undertones of Ezra being portrayed as a new Moses in this section. Like Moses, Ezra is leading his people on an exodus, this time from Babylon:

> On the first day of the first month the journey up from Babylon was begun, and on the first day of the fifth month he came to Jerusalem, for the gracious hand of his God was upon him. For Ezra had set his heart to study the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach the statutes and ordinances in Israel (7:9–10).

The dating of the departure from Babylon was fixed by Ezra to begin two days before Passover. Thus, the holiday that marks the original exodus and freedom from foreign bondage also begins Ezra's journey from Babylon to Judah.[50] Similarly, the arrival of Ezra and his entourage

[49] Jacob M. Myers, *Ezra-Nehemiah* (AB 14; Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, 1965), 60.
[50] J. Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1988), 138–9.

mentioned in 7:10, followed by the narrative in Nehemiah of Ezra re-giving the Torah to the people, loosely parallels Moses receiving the Torah after the exodus from Egypt.

Through the grace of the Persian king Artaxerxes, Ezra is granted permission to re-establish the cult of worship in Jerusalem (Ezra 7:12–14). Artaxerxes also funds this project (Ezra 7:15–24). Ezra is placed in charge of the resources, both financial and logistical. It is clear from the narrative that Ezra's leadership role is both political and religious.[51] After the mention of Ezra's political connections, Ezra's actions focus on his religious authority, which is accomplished through Ezra's piety as shown through his prayers in 7:27–28 and 9:3–15, as well as his fasts in 8:21 and 10:6. The last of these prayers focuses on the issue of intermarriage for which the character of Ezra is perhaps best known. Once the issue of intermarriage with the locals who do not worship the God of the Israelites is brought to his attention, Ezra acts quickly to mourn, pray, and fast, as well as to order the Israelites to expel these foreign women and their children from the community (Ezra 10). Ezra's role is as a leader both in the realm of the temple and for the entire remnant community; his position in the temple is not only as a priest, but also as a political guide, where he serves as the liaison between local cult and repentant community.

Ezra also appears in Nehemiah 7:72b–10:40.[52] Here Ezra's portrayal as a scribe is emphasized. Ezra reads the "scroll of the Teaching of Moses" (Neh 8:1) while standing above the Israelites, surrounded by priests and Levites. Ezra begins by opening the scroll in sight of the entire congregation (8:5), then blessing the Lord after which the assembly responds "Amen, Amen" (8:6). While the people stand listening, Ezra reads from the Torah, after which Ezra, the

[51] Myers, *Ezra. Nehemiah*, "The whole portion reflects a combination of religion and government characteristics of the postexilic period and, indeed, of the Chronicler" (61).
[52] It should be noted at the outset that the narratives found in the biblical Ezra and Nehemiah are closely linked and should be read in tandem. See T. A. Bergren, "Ezra and Nehemiah Square off in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha" in *Biblical Figures outside the Bible* (ed. M. E. Stone. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 340–365; esp. 350.

priests, and the Levites "helped the people to understand the law," likely through interpretation (8:7–8). Ezra's authority in Nehemiah is emphasized in his, and only his, ability to read the scroll of Moses, and in his and the other leaders' ability to interpret the laws for the congregation. Thus Ezra is seen as a conveyer of the law through both reading and interpreting, and as an interlocutor between God, via the book of Moses, and the community.

The narrative continues, emphasizing the people's newfound observance of the holiday of Sukkot based on Ezra's teaching:

> And all the assembly of those who had returned from the captivity made booths and lived in them; for from the days of Joshua son of Nun to that day the people of Israel had not done so. And there was great rejoicing. And day by day, from the first day to the last day, he read from the book of the law of God. They kept the festival seven days; and on the eight day there was a solemn assembly, according to the ordinance (Neh 8:17–18).

Ezra here institutes the observance of a holiday that has not been celebrated since the "days of Joshua son of Nun." Joshua was Moses' political successor as the leader of the Israelites (Deut 34:9), and also the prophetic successor as the one who communicates God's will to the people. Implied here in the text is an analogy between Ezra, who reinstates the observance of the law around Sukkot, and Joshua, who was the last leader of the Israelites to enforce observance of this holiday.[53] The connection between Ezra and Joshua through the celebration of Sukkot also contributes to Ezra's associations with Moses. Myers notes that:

> The observation that such a celebration of the Festival of Booths had not taken place since the days of Joshua recalls similar statements on other occasions (II Kings xxiii 22; II Chron xxx 26, xxxv 18). But there may be more to it than appears on the surface. To recall the time of Joshua is to associate the Festival of Booths with the wilderness period when Yahweh dwelt in the Tabernacle and the people in booths (Lev xxiii 43; Hos xii 9), and to dissociate it from the vintage customs related to the agricultural festivals that proved to be so attractive to Israel. The celebration with all its implications went back to the law of Moses.[54]

Ezra's implementation of Sukkot not only re-establishes the holiday as holy, but also offers a reinterpretation of it as a holiday relating to the Israelites' time in the wilderness when, according

[53] Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 290.
[54] Myers, *Ezra. Nehemiah*, 157. Cf. Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 292.

to the Torah, the Lord dwelt among them, rather than as a holiday based upon the local Canaanite agricultural calendar. Thus Ezra's authority derives from multiple sources: his association with Joshua and, by extension, Moses, as well as the revelation of the law and Ezra's ability to reinterpret it for the Jewish community.

1.4.1.c Ezra in the Apocrypha: 1 Esdras (Greek Ezra)

1 Esdras traces the kingdom of Judah from the time of King Josiah until the return of the exiles from Babylon. The material parallels the narratives found in 2 Chron. 35:1–36:23, sections of Ezra, and Neh 7:73–8:12. The overlap of the Ezra material is in both form and content, and thus there are no new comments to be made on the portrayal of Ezra as leader in 1 Esdras.[55]

1.4.1.d Ezra in Josephus

Josephus, in *Antiquities* 11.120–158, tells the narrative concerning Esdras. However, his only source seems to be 1 Esdras, so beyond basic embellishments to the story, the portrayal of Ezra is equivalent to that as in 1 Esdras.

1.4.1.e Ezra in *4 Ezra*

The figure of Ezra is clearly associated with exile and return, which may have assisted in the choice of Ezra as the protagonist for the apocalypse.[56] Ezra leads a remnant back from Babylon to Jerusalem, where he then reintroduces Torah observance to the people. As a priest with a solid lineage, Ezra is well positioned to act with authority during this time of distress,

[55] At this point it should be noted that Ezra does not appear in Ben Sira's list of ideal figures (44–50), although his counterpart Nehemiah does. Similarly, the two letters prefixed to the beginning of 2 Macc (1:10–2:18) mention Nehemiah in association with the building and dedication of the Second Temple. For a discussion of the Ezra and Nehemiah materials, see Bergren, "Ezra and Nehemiah Square off."
[56] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 37.

especially when introducing old-but-forgotten laws that the people must now follow—laws that, at least in the biblical book of Ezra and in 1 Esdras, include the expulsion of foreign wives and any children born to them. What is lacking development from this earlier material, however, is a view of Ezra as prophet. While Ezra's connections to Moses and Joshua son of Nun as seen in Nehemiah 8 open the possibility of Ezra being "full of the spirit of wisdom" just as Joshua was after Moses laid his hands on him (Deut 34:9), in the narratives utilizing Ezra before *4 Ezra* this characteristic is not pursued. As I will show in chapter three, the prophetic nature of the figure of Ezra seems to be a unique feature of the authority that Ezra embodies in *4 Ezra*.

1.4.2 Baruch in the textual tradition

1.4.2.a Why Baruch?

The author's choice of Baruch as the character imparting the wisdom to the remnant community is a curious one. On the one hand, a character with more obvious authority, such as Moses or Jeremiah, would make more sense. After all, who else holds more authority when it comes to the observance of Torah than Moses? Or with the destruction of the temple being the key component, Jeremiah with his message of sin, destruction, and repentance, would be ideal. On the other hand, Baruch holds a place in the textual tradition close to the prophet Jeremiah, but with fewer set traditions attributed to him, which allows for more flexibility in how the character is developed. Baruch's temporal location near the destruction of the first temple allows for more direct allusions to the destruction of the second temple. And as we will examine shortly, Baruch receives, through Jeremiah, an ambiguous oracle from God that is quite peculiar, which, I argue, sets Baruch up to be the successor of Jeremiah. *2 Baruch* builds upon the traditions associated with Baruch in the biblical book of Jeremiah as well as the apocryphal Book of Baruch, and

attributes new traditions to him as well. However, the character of Baruch in *2 Baruch* also takes on attributes from additional biblical figures, mainly Moses, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and to a lesser extent, Abraham. The textual traditions associated with Baruch showcase key features that suggest leadership qualities that are then emphasized in *2 Baruch*.

1.4.2.b Baruch in the Hebrew Bible

Baruch ben Neriah appears first in the Hebrew Bible as the scribe and companion of the prophet Jeremiah. In Jer 32:12–14 and 32:16, Baruch assists Jeremiah as he purchases land in Judaea from his cousin based on God's order. Jeremiah gives the deeds of purchase—one sealed and one open—to Baruch, and Jeremiah tells Baruch to put the documents in an earthen jar to help extend their life because "thus said the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel: 'Houses, fields, and vineyards shall again be purchased in this land'" (Jer 32:15). While the text does not explicitly say that Baruch draws up and seals the deed, this is indeed one of the jobs of a scribe, and so it is likely that Baruch acts as legal aid and scribe in addition to storing the document.[57]

While in Jer 32 Baruch's role is to assist Jeremiah as a scribe, his role shifts in Jer 36. At the beginning of the chapter, God commands Jeremiah to write down all the words which God has spoken to Jeremiah since the beginning. Jeremiah turns to the scribe Baruch:

> So Jeremiah called Baruch son of Neriah; and Baruch wrote down in the scroll, at Jeremiah's dictation, all the words which the Lord had spoken to him. Jeremiah instructed Baruch, "I am in hiding; I cannot go to the House of the Lord. But you go and read aloud the words of the Lord from the scroll which you wrote at my dictation, to all the people in the House of the Lord on a fast day; thus you will also be reading them to all the Judeans who come in from the towns. Perhaps their entreaty will be accepted by the Lord, if they turn back from their wicked ways. For great is the anger and wrath with which the Lord has threatened this people."
>
> Baruch son of Neriah did just as the prophet Jeremiah had instructed him, about reading the words of the Lord from the scroll in the House of the Lord. […] It was then that Baruch—in the

[57]A recent find of a clay bulla that was thought to come from Jerusalem and which had been initially dated to around the seventh or sixth centuries B.C.E contained the inscription "belonging to Berekhyahu son of Nehriyahu, the scribe" (Avigad, *Hebrew Bullae from the Time of Jeremiah: Remnants of a Burnt Archive* [Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1986]). However, this bulla has been proven to be a modern forgery. See Y. Goren and E. Arie, "The Authenticity of the Bullae of Berekhyahu son of Neriyahu the Scribe," *BASOR* (2014): 147–158.

> chamber of Gemariah son of Shaphan the scribe, in the upper court, near the new gateway of the House of the Lord—read the words of Jeremiah from the scroll to all the people in the House of the Lord.
>
> […]Then all the officials sent Jehudi son of Nethaniah son of Shelemiah son of Cushi to say to Baruch, "Take that scroll from which you read to the people, and come along!" and Baruch took the scroll and came to them. They said, "Sit down and read it to us." And Baruch read it to them. When they heard all these words, they turned to each other in fear; and they said to Baruch, "We must report all this to the king." And they questioned Baruch further, "Tell us how you wrote down all these words that he spoke." He answered them, "He himself recited all those words to me, and I would write them down in the scroll in ink." The officials said to Baruch, "Go into hiding, you and Jeremiah. Let no man know where you are!" And they went out the king in the court, after leaving the scroll in the chamber of the scribe Elishama. And they reported all these matters to the king.
>
> [The king then burns the scroll.]
>
> The word of the Lord came to Jeremiah after the king had burned the scroll containing the words that Baruch had written at Jeremiah's dictation: Get yourself another scroll, and write upon it the same words that were in the first scroll that was burned by King Jehoiakim of Judah.
>
> […] So Jeremiah got another scroll and gave it to the scribe Baruch son of Neriah. And at Jeremiah's dictation, he wrote in it the whole text of the scroll that King Jehoiakim of Judah had burned; and more of the like was added (Jer 36:4–32).

Baruch serves as Jeremiah's scribe through the writing of the scroll; he also acts as a kind of subordinate partner to Jeremiah's ministry by agreeing to take the scroll and to read it in the public space of the House of the Lord. Wright draws particular attention to the hierarchical language present here:

> The telling phrase occurs in the editor's remarks at 36:8: "Baruch son of Neriah did all that the prophet Jeremiah commanded him regarding the reading of the words of Yahweh from the scroll in the temple of Yahweh." The phrase "he did all that God commanded him" and slight variations on it typically describe how righteous people, especially Moses, respond to God's instructions […] Similar phraseology indicates how people faithfully follow instructions given by their leaders, and here, too, one of the most common [*sic*] describes how people follow the commands given by God to Moses. […] The phraseology in Jeremiah 36:8, therefore, suggests that Baruch was loyally obeying Jeremiah's instructions and was not simply fulfilling a task as some hired hand.[58]

Henze notes a similar usage, stating that "Baruch serves as Jeremiah's private scribe and as his public face […] but [Baruch's] character is not further developed, and as a character in the book [of Jeremiah] he does remain quite unrealized."[59] Baruch's authority in chapter 36 derives specifically from Jeremiah: he is important enough to Jeremiah's mission to be mentioned

[58] J. Edward Wright, *Baruch Ben Neriah: From Biblical Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 16.
[59] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 91.

numerous times as Jeremiah's associate and assistant, but never important enough to be associated with the word of God directly.

In Jer 43:1–7, Baruch is accused of inciting Jeremiah against those who planned to escape to Egypt rather than being exiled to Babylon; the escapers then take Jeremiah and Baruch to Egypt against their will. Baruch remains passive throughout this pericope. However, the passage does suggest that Baruch is known to have the ear of Jeremiah—rather than just acting as Jeremiah's agent, as in chapter 36, Baruch is thought to be able to influence Jeremiah's agenda.[60] This suggests a more authoritative position, at least in the eyes of those who complain to Jeremiah.

Baruch makes one last appearance in the book of Jeremiah when he receives an oracle from God via Jeremiah:

> The word which the prophet Jeremiah spoke to Baruch son of Neriah, when he was writing these words in a scroll at Jeremiah's dictation, in the fourth year of King Jehoiakim son of Josiah of Judah: Thus said the Lord, the God of Israel, concerning you, Baruch: You say, "Woe is me! The Lord has added grief to my pain. I am worn out with groaning, and I have found no rest." Thus shall you speak to him: "Thus said the Lord: I am going to overthrow what I have built, and uproot what I have planted—this applies to the whole land. And do you expect great things for yourself? Don't expect them. For I am going to bring disaster upon all flesh—declares the Lord—but I will at least grant you your life in all the places where you may go." (Jer 45:1–5)

Here, Baruch is promised protection by the Lord, just as Jeremiah was in Jer 1:19. Wright argues that through this passage Baruch is also told by the Lord not to expect great things—גדולות— and it is just these גדולות that Jeremiah receives from the Lord in 33:3: "Call to Me, and I will answer you, and I will tell you wondrous things (גדולות), secrets you have not known."[61] In the book of Jeremiah, Wright contends that גדולות is specifically associated with prophetic activity and thus

[60] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 91 and Wright, *Baruch Ben Neriah*, 25–26. Both emphasize the political lines upon which Baruch operated, but do not acknowledge the additional authority which this passage attributes to Baruch. Cf. Walter Brueggemann, "The 'Baruch Connection: Reflections on Jer 43:1–7," *JBL* 113:3 (1994): 409–12.

[61] Wright, *Baruch Ben Neriah*, 32.

Baruch's complaint, and the Lord's subsequent response telling Baruch not to expect גדולות, is in fact God's refusal to give the prophetic spirit to Baruch.[62]

However, I contend that Baruch is indeed set up as Jeremiah's successor in the biblical narrative: while Jeremiah is the primary receiver of God's revelation throughout the book, Baruch is mentioned at key points in the book of Jeremiah, specifically in relation to the situation of the remnant left in Judaea after 597 B.C.E., as well as in association with Jeremiah's forced departure to Egypt.[63] These points establish via "verbal echoes and deliberate allusions"[64] Baruch as Jeremiah's prophetic successor. While Baruch does not himself become a prophetic figure in the book of Jeremiah, chapter 45 "tentatively hints at the reversal of their roles: it is Baruch, not Jeremiah, who receives the divine oracle, and it is Jeremiah, not Baruch, who serves as its transmitter."[65] In fact, the placement of Baruch's oracle immediately following the message of disaster in chapter 44 suggests that the hope will follow Baruch.[66]

While it is clear that Baruch does not take on the role of prophet in the book of Jeremiah, it is also clear that Baruch's role, while certainly encompassing that of the scribe, grows from Jeremiah's assistant to a close confidant of the prophet. Baruch, as he is portrayed in the book, gains authority as the narrative progresses. This authority, as well as the parallels established between Baruch and the prophet Jeremiah, sets the stage for later interpreters to imbue Baruch with additional authority.

1.4.2.c Baruch in the Apocrypha: Book of Baruch (1 Baruch)

[62] Wright, *Baruch Ben Neriah*, 32.
[63] See also Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 91–94.
[64] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 93. Henze notes specifically the correlation between Jer 1:10 and 45:4, and 36:4 and 45:1.
[65] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 93.
[66] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 94. Cf. Wright, *Baruch Ben Neriah*, 36–37.

The apocryphal book of Baruch is the earliest post-biblical mention of Baruch ben Neriah. While dating for the book remains uncertain, it is usually dated sometime between the Maccabean revolt and the mid-1st century B.C.E.[67] The character of Baruch plays a minimal role in the book, and in fact was likely added by a redactor at a later point to tie the book together. The name Baruch appears only in the narrative frame (1:1–14),[68] starting with 1:1: "These are the words of the book which Baruch the son of Neriah, son of Mahseiah, son of Zedekiah, son of Hasadiah, son of Hilkiah wrote in Babylon."[69] This introduction is reminiscent of Jer 29:1: "These are the words of the letter that the prophet Jeremiah sent from Jerusalem to the remaining elders among the exiles," suggesting a similar prophetic role for Baruch. In 1:3 Baruch again appears: "And Baruch read the words of this book in the hearing of Jeconiah the son of Jehoiakim, the king of Judah, and in the hearing of all the people who came to hear the book." Again, this verse is reminiscent of a section from Jeremiah, in this case Jer 36. Thus, the opening of the apocryphal book of Baruch intentionally connects itself to the book of Jeremiah.[70] In fact, as early as Origen, Baruch 1–5 was read as being part of the book of Jeremiah.[71] Baruch's name is not mentioned again in the book, although because of his mention in the narrative frame it is to him that the other portions of the book are assigned.

The character that develops through the next sections, however, while unnamed, is developed well beyond the man who was the scribe of Jeremiah; Baruch becomes a pious sage and prophet. The prayer in 1:15–3:8 contains small portions of the prayer from Daniel 9.[72] These

[67] Harrington, "Baruch, First Book of," *EDEJ* 425.
[68] The NRSV adds in Baruch's name in 1:8 in order to help make sense of the difficult verse. The name does not appear in the manuscripts. Wright, *Baruch Ben Neriah*, 141 n16.
[69] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 96.
[70] Wright, *Baruch Ben Neriah*, 49.
[71] Pierre Bogaert, "Le personage de Baruch et l'histoire du livre de Jérémie: Aux origins du livre de Baruch." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 7 (1974): 19–21.
[72] Emanuel Tov, ed. and trans., *The Book of Baruch*, Texts and Translations 8 (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975), 15–27. See also Wright, *Baruch Ben Neriah*, 53.

mimetic pieces help portray Baruch as a pious person similar to Daniel, someone who is concerned for the welfare of his people in exile as well as the holy city of Jerusalem, even though the name of Baruch is not mentioned outright. Baruch's persona is further expanded in the wisdom poem of 3:9–4:4, which equates wisdom with obedience to the Torah. Here Baruch takes on the characteristics of a sage who encourages fidelity to the Torah of Moses. Finally, Baruch 4:5–5:9 reviews the reason for the suffering of the people and also comforts them with words of hope from the viewpoint of a personified mother Jerusalem:

> Take courage, my children, and cry to God, for you will be remembered by him who brought this upon you. For just as you purposed to go astray from God, return with tenfold zeal to seek him. For he who brought these calamities upon you will bring you everlasting joy with your salvation. (Baruch 4:27–29)

Through the message of consolation, Baruch reminds the exiles that just as it was their actions which brought out the current crisis, so too could their actions bring them salvation.

The figure of Baruch in the Book of Baruch functions as the leader of a group of exiled Jews located in Babylon.[73] Baruch's social location grows from the supporting scribe in the book of Jeremiah to the role of leader—albeit mostly through insinuation, since his name is only mentioned at the beginning of the Book of Baruch—where Baruch takes on the additional characteristics of pious man, wise sage, and consoler of the community.

1.4.2.d Baruch's Mention in the *Damascus Document*

It should also be noted that Baruch is mentioned in the *Damascus Document*, which was first discovered in the Cairo Geniza and then later found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Baruch's mention here is brief, but noteworthy:

> And like this judgment will be that of all who reject God's precepts and forsake them and move aside in the stubbornness of their heart. This is the word which Jeremiah spoke to Baruch, son of

[73] Note that there is no other literary evidence that Baruch was ever in Babylon, and in fact in *2 Baruch* Baruch remains in Judaea while it is Jeremiah who is sent with the exiles to Babylon (*2 Baruch* 10:2–3).

> Neriah, and Elishah to Gehazi his servant. All the men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus... (8:18–20)[74]

This quotation confirms the continued interest in Jeremiah and Baruch in the Second Temple period, an interest shared even among Jews known for their apocalyptic outlook and eschatological speculation. This confirms Baruch as a continuously realized candidate for a leadership role because, as this sample shows, Jewish sects were indeed talking about him.

1.4.2.e Baruch in Josephus

The portrayal of Baruch in Josephus's *Antiquities* 10.88–95 is akin to that of Baruch in the Hebrew Bible, where Baruch is a scribe who is also the companion to the prophet Jeremiah. While Josephus does not portray Baruch with leadership beyond what is found in the biblical text, it is clear from the narrative that, like in the Hebrew Bible, Baruch progressively gains more authority as the narrative proceeds. This indicates that Baruch is certainly present in the first-century *Zeitgeist* in discussions of Jewish leaders.

1.4.2.f Baruch in *2 Baruch*

The leadership characteristics of Baruch that are hinted at in the book of Jeremiah and in the Book of Baruch become realized in *2 Baruch*. Baruch moves from being Jeremiah's assistant and confidant who complains about not being worthy to receive divine revelation to being the sole receiver of revelation, as is initially set up in Jer 45 when Jeremiah becomes the transmitter and Baruch becomes the receiver of divine revelation. Indeed, in *2 Baruch* it is Baruch who passes to Jeremiah the revelation of God: "This, then, I have said to you that you may say to Jeremiah and all those who are like you that you may retire from this city" (2:1). Baruch's role as

[74] Unless otherwise noted, translation from the Dead Sea Scrolls are taken from Florentino G. Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vol. Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998), 563.

a pious sage is further exemplified in *2 Baruch*, where Baruch acts as the ultimate consoler, not only of the community in which he is leader, but also for Jews throughout the Diaspora and across time. Baruch's attributes as prophet, sage, and consoler in *2 Baruch* is a natural outgrowth of the traditions that derive especially from the apocryphal book of Baruch in the Septuagint. Baruch thus becomes a clear choice for an authority figure in *2 Baruch* through the growth of his traditions and his association with the destruction of the temple.

1.5 Conclusion

The literary analysis of sub-genres in the apocalypses *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* may provide fruitful information on the social and historical settings from which the text derived. One such example of this type of conclusion is through the analysis of the genre of summary/review of the history of Israel. This genre, which offers an overview of key points in the history of Israel drawn from a canon of events but not necessarily including them all, can be analyzed for variations that are made, intentionally or not, by the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, and may contain social, political, and/or historical nuggets of information that assist in historical reconstruction. As I will show in chapter five, for instance, the review of the history of Israel as found in *2 Baruch* 53–74 through the so-called Apocalypse of the Cloud reflects leadership preferences through the choice of the event or person from Israel's history that is emphasized in the alternating good (bright waters) or bad (black waters) periods in time. In this example, the choice of events made from the canon typically available for the summary of the history of Israel genre, and the language with which they are presented reflects the author's interpretation of past events as well as an understanding of the present, especially as portrayed in the personage of Baruch and the subsequent leader who will follow in his footsteps. A literary analysis of the use

of genres in situations such as the example just given provides access to the interpretation of what makes a leader, according to both the text and the socio-historical evidence derived from the variations in the known genres utilized by the author.

The use of pseudepigraphy in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* is multifaceted. For the purposes of this project, the choice of the protagonist is essential for analyzing the leadership qualities that are emphasized in the apocalypses. However, the choice is not limited to the portrayal of the character in the biblical books: while Ezra in *4 Ezra* is certainly based upon the figure of Ezra in Ezra-Nehemiah, and Baruch is similarly based upon the figure of Baruch in the book of Jeremiah, the multiplicity of discourses tied to these characters, as found in chronologically later works such as the Septuagint, Dead Sea Scrolls, Josephus, and even those later works such as rabbinic traditions which may contain earlier legends, must be taken into account when developing a functioning view of the leader as portrayed in the apocalypse. In addition, the other figures that Ezra and Baruch emulate—Daniel, Ezekiel, Moses, Jeremiah, Job, Abraham—all contain attributes of authority that are then applied to the characters of Ezra and Baruch; these additional features associated with the authority from these other figures, which are not found in the earlier discourses associated with Ezra and Baruch, then become features of the characters of Ezra and Baruch in the apocalypses.

Chapter Two

A History of Jewish Leadership in Judaea in the 1st and 2nd Centuries C.E.

2.1 Introduction

This chapter moves from the theoretical and methodological concerns covered in chapter one to analyze leadership and authority in the social-historical environment in which *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* were produced. While I am not attempting to reconstruct a full history of leadership during this period,[1] this chapter considers authority and leadership as they were found at the time leading up to the destruction of the second temple in Jerusalem in 70 C.E., as well as during the Bar Kokhba revolt, through an analysis of extant literary and material evidence in order to contextualize the leadership concerns in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. I argue that things were far from simple in terms of leadership during the time of our texts, and in fact there were competing authorities because of the disruption in life caused by the destruction of the Second Temple, even as late as 60 years later around the time of the Bar Kokhba revolt. The destabilized social world in which *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* were produced, I argue, is reflected in the literary portrayal of the leaders Ezra and Baruch in the texts.[2]

First, using Josephus' historiographical accounts as a base, I will establish that the authority structure at the time of the destruction was built on a Roman framework of leadership, which, while fragile since its inception, subsequently fell apart in Judaea at the onset of the Jewish revolt in 66 C.E. The uncertainty and fluidity of leadership following the destruction carried into the period in which *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* were written. These apocalypses preserve social-historical concerns about the leadership in Judaea at the time of their writing, about 30

[1] See the monograph by Junghwa Choi, *Jewish Leadership in Roman Palestine from 70 CE to 135 CE* (Leiden: Brill, 2013) for a reconstruction of the types of leadership available both before and after the destruction of the second temple. Choi does not use *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* in his analysis, however.
[2] The literary analyses of the texts will take place in chapters three and five.

years after the war:[3] both apocalypses treat the topic of leadership in a way that can be demonstrably associated with the real-life insecurity of leadership at the time of the destruction.

Following a discussion of leadership at the time of the first revolt will be an analysis of the letters and coins found from the Bar Kokhba revolt,[4] which are dated to a period after *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* were written. The letters of Shimon Bar Kosiba emphasize a leader who attempted to control all aspects of life during his military campaign, while the numismatic evidence shows priestly support for his movement, suggesting that Bar Kosiba did not intend to fulfill the leadership role of a priest once his goal of recapturing Jerusalem was achieved. The epistolary and numismatic evidence, taken together, point to a hierarchical leadership, with Bar Kosiba as military head and a priest as supporting leader, at least for the period during the war. This data supports one trajectory which leadership could have taken, a way not encouraged by either *4 Ezra* or *2 Baruch*. I argue that the evidence from the Bar Kokhba revolt represents an alternative answer to the problems facing Jews in Judaea after the destruction of the second temple than the solutions promoted by *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, that of Torah obedience and belief in the imminent eschaton.

2.2 Leadership at the time of the First Revolt (66–72 C.E.)

Evidence for leadership from the first century comes almost exclusively from the Jewish historian Josephus. Unlike the texts under analysis in this project, the texts Josephus wrote are histories, which purport to offer a more direct sense of what life was like and what actually happened. Unfortunately for the modern historian, all modern reconstructions of this period must

[3] For a discussion of the dating of our apocalypses, see chapter three for *4 Ezra* and chapter five for *2 Baruch*.
[4] The revolt itself is referred to as the "Bar Kokhba revolt" which is a play on the name of Shimon Bar Kosiba (see below for a discussion of terminology). When I refer to the revolt by name, I use this phrase, as is standard in scholarship. When discussing the personage, I use the name Bar Kosiba.

rely heavily on Josephus' historical perspective.[5] With Josephus as our only witness, one must approach the examination with a caveat: Josephus himself participated in the war against Rome, eventually surrendering directly to Rome and becoming a client of the Flavian dynasty—the very Flavians who had led the Roman military against the Jews and who later won the political struggle and took over the imperial dynasty in Rome. Josephus had his own agenda in writing the history of the war, and historians must be wary of his purpose when examining his writing for clues about leadership at the time of the war.[6]

In *Jewish War*, Josephus writes about the events leading up to the revolt and about the revolt itself. Josephus' account describes the internal Jewish politics of Judaea and thus is a treasure trove for information on leadership during the period of the revolt.[7] According to Josephus, in 6 C.E. after the end of the Herodian dynasty and following the Roman census,[8] Rome established a new ruling class over the Judaean populace under the authority of the Syrian Consul. This new ruling class consisted of wealthy landowners many of whom likely had little claim to authority over the population before Rome's institution of their power.[9] Martin

---

[5] James S. McLaren, *Turbulent Times? Josephus and Scholarship on Judaea in the First Century C.E.* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), addresses this issue throughout.

[6] That the Flavians were patrons to Josephus is accepted in current scholarship; however, how much that patronage influenced Josephus' own writings is open to debate, and varies among scholars. For a skeptical view, see Shaye J. D. Cohen, *Josephus in the Galilee and Rome: his Vita and Development as a Historian* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 232–242. For a more generous approach see Tessa Rajak, *Josephus, the Historian and his Society* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 185–222. Uriel Rappaport has a very careful analysis of Josephus' motives for writing: "The Jewish Leadership in Jerusalem in the First Part of the Great Revolt (66–68 CE)," in *The Ancient Period* (ed. I. Gafni; vol. 1 of *The Congregation of Israel: Jewish Independent Rule in its Generations*; Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 2001), 75–83.

[7] Taking in to account, of course, the caveat just mentioned. See Goodman, *Ruling Class*, especially chapters five and six.

[8] "The census marked out those who deserved honours (Ovid, *Amores* 3.8.55) because nothing in human affairs shows up a man's virtues more clearly than wealth (Seneca, *Controv.* 2.1.17)," Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 125.

[9] Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 29–50, especially 40. In this chapter Goodman lays out the guidelines based on comparative evidence for how Rome established local administration in the provinces. The local elite was selected based on the Roman understanding of aristocracy as reflected in their own culture:

> "In Rome a clearly defined status group, the senators, monopolized control of military, legal and religious affairs. According to the senators' own self-image, membership of that status group depended primarily on good birth and high morals, but one other criterion was in fact so basic to

Goodman, in his monograph *The Ruling Class of Judaea*, has argued that those who were put in positions of authority were those who held the majority of wealth in the land—a typically Roman worldview of power:

> The problem can be summarized as follows. Judaea had been ruled for nearly a century and a half by monarchs in the Hellenistic mould. When the institutions of monarchy naturally disappeared with the deposition of Archaelaus [in 6 C.E.], the Romans looked for alternative native institutions to replace them. They were drawn to promote high priesthood to the leadership of the nation only because that position was clearly both ancient and venerated by the Jews. When [the Romans] realized that the High Priest's function did not in itself fit him for secular government, the Romans were forced to invent an 'aristocracy' to act under his supervision.[10]

Unlike the Romans, Jews had never acknowledged wealth as being the major element in their own society as a determining factor in social leadership.[11] It is possible that the de-emphasis on wealth derives from the prophets, where meekness and humility are virtues of the poor, and both are the virtues needed to serve God.[12] Some Second Temple writers also reflect similar ideas. This can be found, for instance, in the Dead Sea Scrolls, such as in 4QInstruction,[13] as well as in the beatitudes in Luke 6:20–21.[14] While poverty may not have been a desired circumstance, the amount of wealth that a person or family had was not the only determining factor to social status in Judaean society.[15] Goodman argues that this indifference "was sufficient to account for the

---

> senatorial status that it did not even need to be stressed. All senators had to be rich. Loss of wealth led to loss of eligibility for office" (34).

These same guidelines—especially that of wealth—was used to establish ruling classes in the provinces.

[10] Goodman, *Ruling Class,* 109–110; Cf. Josephus *Antiquities*, 20.251. Most scholars agree with Goodman's assessment of the situation, to varying degrees. The biggest critique seems to be his statement that the failed ruling class was the cause of the war, although he later retracts this by claiming that was not his intent (see note 19 below for more). Goodman is also critiqued for his inconsistent use of Josephus, claiming that sometimes Josephus is reporting history and other times that Josephus's report belies his agenda. See Horsley, "Power vacuum," 107 n5.

[11] Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 35, 124–5.

[12] Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 130.

[13] See Benjamin G. Wright III, *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), chapter three, for a discussion of the rich and poor in Qumran literature, especially in 4QInstruction.

[14] Although this is certainly not the case for all Second Temple literature. For instance, in Mark 10:23–4 and parallels, Jesus' disciples are surprised that the rich will have difficulty entering the kingdom of God. Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* 5.73) makes a point to note that the Essenes did not use money. This would then be in contrast to most of Jewish society for whom the use of money was unremarkable, which suggests that an indifference to wealth was rare.

[15] Priests could be poor or rich, the same with Pharisees and other Torah scholars: "When the ruling class chose to stress their priestly origins and Torah scholarship, their compatriots were more inclined to accept their claims to

denigration by Jews of those whose only claim to power in Judaea rested on the fact that they had been singled out by Rome or the Herodian dynasty for special attention entirely because of their wealth."[16] Thus, Rome's decision to create a local aristocracy in this way did not lend itself to acceptance with the local population,[17] which created, in effect, an inept ruling class who could not offer leadership to the Jewish population, but also could not fulfill their responsibilities to Rome, such as collecting the tribute, which was in arrears.[18]

The resultant revolt should not be blamed entirely on the establishment of this new ruling class, however;[19] the revolt was a reaction to a complex socio-political situation and emphasis of any one particular explanation as being the superior reason for the revolt would be unsatisfactory.[20] The major causes of the revolt can be summed up as follows: first, Josephus acknowledges the incompetence of the current Roman governors,[21] including their oppressive rule which can be traced back over a century to the conquering of Judaea by Pompey in 63

---

high authority, but both of these criteria for status could and did cut across class lines, and any prestige the ruling class claimed on such grounds would have to be shared with them by many poor Judaeans who were excluded from power by Rome" (Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 124–5). Both of these groups of people seem to have held at least some authority in the first century C.E.

[16] Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 131.

[17] Goodman, *Ruling Class,* 37. See also Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 37 n12, where Goodman comments on the idea of a secular aristocracy based on land ownership. He argues that this idea is derived from assumptions about the authorship of surviving texts such as Judith rather than on hard evidence. Cf. M. Smith, "Jewish Life in the Persian Period" in *The Cambridge History of Judaism Volume 1: The Persian Period* (ed. W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 248–56 and M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the early Hellenistic Period* (London: SCM Press, 1974), 49–50.

[18] *Jewish War* 2.405; See also R. A. Horsley, "Power Vacuum and Power Struggle in 66–7 C.E." in *The First Jewish Revolt: Archaeology, History, and Ideology* (eds. A. M. Berlin and J. A. Overman. London: Routledge, 2002), 103.

[19] Note that this is contra Goodman's argument in *Ruling Class* (19), who does not accept that "an amalgam of all these causes was responsible" for the revolt, but instead argues that it was the power struggle of the ruling class that ultimately served the fodder that led to the revolt. Goodman later retracts this argument; see Goodman, "Current Scholarship," 17. I disagree with the idea that any one specific thing was the cause of the revolt; it is clear from Josephus that the situation in Judaea was complex and that it was a combination of factors that led to the revolt. See also McLaren, *Turbulent Times?*, 158.

[20] See the above caveat about Josephus; not only was the revolt complex but Josephus is our only extant source that details the revolt, and thus it is unlikely that we have all the information.

[21] A reason for the revolt which is echoed in Roman literature by Tacitus *Hist*. 5.12. See E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule: from Pompey to Diocletian* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), especially chapters VII and XI.

B.C.E.[22] Second, cultural tensions between Jews and Greeks in Judaea contributed to the unease in the period leading up to the revolt. These tensions derive from the second and first centuries B.C.E., when the Hasmoneans conquered the Hellenistic coastal cities and forced the resident non-Jews in these cities into cultural submission under the guise of attacks on Jewish observance.[23] Third, internally, class tension among Jews played a role in the revolt.[24] Josephus' own descriptions of the events of the revolt emphasize the disillusionment of the lower classes with the aristocracy, another key factor in the lack of power which this Roman-selected aristocracy had over the general populace. This is especially clear in his descriptions of the Sicarii and brigands, who attacked the wealthy and destroyed their property, and whose actions emphasized the internal warfare rather than the fighting between the Jews and the Romans.[25] The

[22] Smallwood, *Jews*, 1–59; see also Goodman, *Ruling Class,* 9–11.

[23] Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 11–14. Goodman argues this based on the evidence in Josephus that the coastal cities hailed Pompey as their liberator and in fact counted new eras from his liberation, however, Zeev Safrai, among others, has shown that in fact Josephus was probably using a pro-Roman source for this, and the material evidence does not show a rehabilitation of the cities; likely the choice to restart the cities' calendars was a political maneuver. See Z. Safrai, "The Gentile Cities of Judea: Between Hasmonean Occupation and the Roman Liberation" in *Studies in Historical Geography and Biblical Historiography: Presented to Zecharia Kallai* (ed. by G. Galil and M. Weinfeld, Boston: Brill, 2000), 63–90; Doron Mendels, *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), especially chapters two and six. U. Rappaport, who also argues that the final straw that set off the revolt was the conflict between Jews and Greeks residing in Judaea, "Jewish-Pagan Relations and the Revolt Against Rome in 66–70 CE," *The Jerusalem Cathedra: Studies in the History, Archaeology, Geography and Ethnography of the Land of Israel* (ed. L.I. Levine; Volume I; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi Institute, 1981), I, 81–95; A. Kasher, *Jews and Hellenistic Cities in Eretz-Israel: Relations of the Jews in Eretz-Israel with the Hellenistic Cities during the Second Temple Period (332 BCE–70 CE)* (*TSAJ* 21; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990). Likewise Mendels emphasizes the conflict between the Jews and Greeks but does not lay the emphasis for the revolt on this clash of ideologies but instead on the loss of the temple as a national symbol after 44 C.E. Mendels, *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 251–2, 280, 302, 356.

[24] Brunt argues that the revolt was caused primarily by the class tensions between the aristocracy and the general populace. P.A. Brunt, "Josephus on Social Conflicts in Roman Judaea" (*Klio* 59 [1977]). Note that Brunt disagrees with Goodman's position by arguing that there is no evidence in Josephus for any involvement of the aristocracy in the war. See Brunt's Addendum in *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990). Cf. Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 12–13, 18, with regards to whether class tension was a cause of the revolt, or simply an aspect of Jewish society before the revolt. Goodman here disagrees with the current scholarly consensus because if the revolt started simply because of class tensions, he would not be able to make the argument in his monograph for the ruling class. However, he is simplifying the discussion of class tension, and in actuality, Josephus' descriptions of the conflict between the classes could bolster Goodman's argument. I reiterate my statement that an emphasis on any one single reason for the revolt is over-simplified and therefore inaccurate.

[25] For the main causes of the war, Bilde focuses on the Jewish war "party" and the Fourth Philosophy mentioned by Josephus, as well as noting the issues with the Roman administration and the difficulties between the Jews and Greeks. P. Bilde, "The Causes of the Jewish War According to Josephus" (*JSJ* 10 [1979]), 187–190.

most obvious example of this friction between social classes from Josephus is the burning of the public records office in 66 C.E., which was a deliberate attempt by the rebels to win the support of the poor, since the debt archives were stored there:

> The eighth day was the feast of wood-carrying, when it was customary for all to bring wood for the altar, in order that there might be an unfailing supply of fuel for the flames which are always kept burning. The Jews in the Temple excluded their opponents from this ceremony, but along with some feebler folk numbers of the *sicarii*—so they called the brigands who carried a dagger in their bosom—forced their way in; these they enlisted in their service and pressed their attack more bolder than before. The royalists, now outmatched in numbers and audacity, were forced to evacuate the upper city. The victors burst in and set fire to the house of Ananias the high-priest and to the palaces of Agrippa and Bernice; they next carried their combustibles to the public archives, eager to destroy the money-lenders bonds and to prevent the recovery of debts, in order to win over a host of grateful debtors and to cause a rising of the poor against the rich, sure of impunity. The keepers of the Record Office having fled, they set light to the building (Josephus, *Jewish War* 2.425–427).

Josephus indicates that the culprits in the burning of the archives, as well as the house of the high priest and palaces belonging to royalty, were people who wished to erase not only their debts, but also the debt of the lower class in order to win them over to the cause of the rebels. This act was done to level the differences between the classes, at least symbolically. Wealth, or the lack thereof, was clearly a part of the class tensions that contributed to the revolt, and this wealth belonged at least in part to the new ruling class established by Rome.

The revolt, therefore, resulted from numerous conflicts, both internal and external. The lack of accepted authority and standardized leadership can be seen not only through the problems associated with the Roman-installed ruling class, as per Goodman, but also through the different causes of the revolt that have been discussed: the Roman governors were acknowledged, both by Josephus and Tacitus, to have been inept; the forced conversion of the non-Jews in the Hellenistic coastal cities by the Hasmoneans when they were rulers in the land, along with the constant cultural tensions between Jews and non-Jews; and the widening gap between the aristocracy and the lower classes. Competing authority figures, including those belonging to

groups of bandits[26] and to leaders who were fighting on both sides of the revolt,[27] all contributed to the causes and eventual results of the war in Judaea.[28] This situation did not improve after the destruction of the Temple and the end of the war, when many Jews were displaced from Jerusalem. The Jewish ruling class which was initially established by the Romans, faded into oblivion.[29] The change in Roman policy over the territory of Judaea following the revolt supports this claim; the Romans replaced the obviously defunct aristocratic-based rule in Judaea with direct military rule as well as Gentile city councils and *coloniae*.[30]

This is not to say that following the destruction there were no forms of leadership to be found in Jewish communities. However, many of the social positions that seemed to produce leaders during the war—from the priesthood, the aristocratic class, and those Josephus identifies as bandits—seem to have disappeared following the destruction,[31] and many individual leaders seem to have been captured or killed following the destruction of the second temple and subsequent capture of Masada and Herodian. Thus, the revolt created a reshuffling of the current authoritative order. Given the situation following the destruction, leaders were most likely to come from one of several social situations:

1. Some of the types of leaders that were known before the war remained viable leadership

[26] Such as John of Gischala (*War* 2.585–9) and Simon b. Gioras (*War* 4.503–8).
[27] For instance, Eleazar b. Ananias, captain of the Temple and son of the high priest and head of his own faction during the war, who decided to stop the sacrifices made at the Temple for Rome. See *War* 2.409. Eleazar b. Ananias was subsequently murdered by other, competing leaders in the revolt, *War* 2.426–29.
[28] Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 169ff, argues that the ruling class was part of the revolt from the beginning: "The revolt was thus led from the start by the ruling class in a desperate attempt to keep their prominence in Jewish society after the Roman backing, on which they had previously relied, was withdrawn." The situation is not as clear-cut as that, however. Note that many of the ruling class, especially those related to the Herodians, maintained a good relationship with Rome and continued to rule, albeit not in Judaea, after the war, see Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 157–9. It can be concluded, then, that only some of the aristocracy participated in the revolt. Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 174–5.
[29] Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 231.
[30] Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 213–215.
[31] Priests will be discussed in more detail below.

options in the war's aftermath.[32] The types of leadership that were available before the war and may have still been active after the war are:[33] priests (but not high priests),[34] warrior leaders, learned leaders, and possibly messianic leadership.[35]

a. Priests: While priests may have lost the main locale of their work, it is essential to remember that many priests only served in the temple for a short period of time each year and thus would already have an alternative living and working arrangement in place following the destruction; thus, priests still continued to exist and be identified as coming from priestly lineage, even if they were not functioning in the temple. It is clear from multiple sources that the priestly lineage was still maintained: first, the coins from first year of the Bar Kokhba revolt designate a priest on them, "Eleazar HaKohen," suggesting the importance of a priestly leader who was seen as being imperative for the legitimacy of the revolt.[36] Second, rabbinic texts highlight a continued interest in priestly lineage. One example will suffice from *b. Qidd*. 30b: "From the day that the Temple was destroyed, the *kohanim* have become very particular about themselves […] they have become very fastidious about the purity of their priestly lineage." This text from the Babylonian Talmud suggests that priests (*kohanim*) are careful about maintaining the status of their lineage. The implication is that once the temple is rebuilt, the priests will be immediately available to serve. This late text combined with the interest in having priestly support during the Bar Kokhba

[32] These leaders were unlikely to be the rebels who held authority in the war against Rome; Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 233.
[33] The list of those leadership roles available before the war is 1) kings as leaders, 2) priests and high priests, 3) warrior leadership, 4) learned leadership, 5) prophetic leadership, 6) messianic leadership, and 7) Nasi. However, not all would have been viable options after the war. Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 31–116, 153–211.
[34] While priests still could claim legitimacy for their authority in society, the high priest, without the Holy of Holies, had no purpose. See also Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 173–6.
[35] See Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 153–211 for a detailed discussion of the viability and legitimacy of each option after the destruction of the Second Temple.
[36] See my discussion of evidence from the Bar Kokhba revolt below.

revolt suggests that priests maintained a distinct identity and would have been available to act in a potential leadership position.

b. Warrior and Messianic Leaders: The most obvious evidence of warrior and messianic leaders in Judaea comes from the popularity of Shimon Bar Kosiba and the initial success of the Bar Kokhba revolt.[37] However, beyond the Bar Kokhba revolt we have no literary or material evidence of any warrior or messianic leaders during our period.

c. Learned Leaders: This leadership type was a viable option as a source of authority in the post-destruction period.[38] The place of the learned leader in Jewish society before the destruction could have been, theoretically, from almost any social location, and thus their social position was not necessarily affected during the war. In addition, learned Jews may have been relied upon even more heavily after the war in order to interpret the law now that the Temple no longer stood and Jews could not atone through sacrifice.[39]

2. There was a dearth of leaders, and new people had to step up to take charge. While this option is the most likely—many leaders from the revolt were either killed, sold into slavery, or taken back to Rome for punishment—it is also possible that this overlaps with the previous option. Some pre-destruction leaders are likely to have survived the war and escaped enslavement and to have remained leaders within their communities. It is also

[37] Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 176–179. There are many issues and concerns with viewing Bar Kokhba as a messianic leadership figure. Choi provides a nice summary, although he is inclined toward the minority scholarly opinion that Bar Kokhba should indeed be viewed as a messianic figure. Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 193–200.

[38] Learned leaders should be interpreted as those with an access to education in Torah (oral and/or written), who were then sought out to proffer guidance about questions related to Jewish law and history. These leaders may not fall into any specific "sect" or group, and as such should not automatically be identified with Pharisees or the Rabbis, although the members of these groups may have participated as such; see Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 179–189. Neither *4 Ezra* nor *2 Baruch* make claims to belong to any particular group, so while we may draw some conclusions about which groups they seem to agree with theologically and halakhically, it would be unwise to draw a firm conclusion.

[39] Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 180.

possible that given the new reality in Judaea, previously unknown people stepped up to become leaders. This situation, however, would create a further opportunity for disagreement among community members,[40] challenges to new leaders, and confusion over what was best for the community at large. It is this situation, I argue, that we find in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*.[41]

2.3 Excursus: Leaders in Other Jewish Literary Tradition: Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* as an Example

While the literary material extant from which to build a picture of the leadership situation is miniscule compared to what materials were likely produced, an analysis that excluded writings beyond the historiography of Josephus and the material evidence of the Bar Kokhba revolt would create a false portrayal of authority at the time of the writing of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. However, the myriad sources that could contribute to the reconstruction of the historical situation, however small comparatively, is still huge: a complete analysis of all the literature that may contribute to our understanding is not a feasible task in this project focused on an analysis of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. Thus this chapter focuses on the evidence that can, in a more direct manner, contribute to the historical reconstruction. This excursus will look briefly at one of the many possible literary sources that, with a careful analysis, can further contribute and help complicate our understanding of leadership in the period in which our apocalypses were written.[42]

---

[40] Just as there was disagreement before the war. See M. Goodman, "Religious Varieties and the Temple in the Late Second Temple Period and its Aftermath" *JJS* 60.2 (2009): 202–213.

[41] It is not my goal to recreate actual historical figures that represent the leaders of Ezra in *4 Ezra* and Baruch in *2 Baruch*. However, I will argue that based on a literary and socio-historical analysis, the leaders as portrayed by Ezra and by Baruch in the apocalypses functions as a model of the ideal leader, one whose concerns for Torah observance and the imminent eschaton match those same concerns as they are portrayed in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. Likewise, these models serve to represent the type of leader that the actual audience of the apocalypses should look toward.

[42] I chose Pseudo-Philo's *LAB* over and above the many other possible literary sources because of its emphasis on leadership in its retelling of the biblical narratives. Clearly, much of the New Testament is concerned with establishing authority and therefore could be fruitful for this analysis. See for instance Wiard Popkes, "Leadership: James, Paul, and their Contemporary Background" in *The Missions of James, Peter, and Paul: Tensions in Early*

Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*LAB*), which retells Israelite history from Adam to the death of Saul, was likely written at some point during the first century C.E. in Judaea,[43] and provides representations of both good and bad leaders. In *LAB*, good leaders are defined based on their interactions with other individuals, groups, or the nation, their obedience to the covenantal laws, their bold deeds, and their rhetoric.[44] In some cases, such as the character of Moses (*LAB* 10–19), few changes need to be made to the biblical prototype. Moses in *LAB* is considered the leader *par excellence* and serves as the ideal to which other leaders might be compared. Moses' portrayal as leader offers only slight alterations and embellishments to the story as found in Exodus:[45] for example, God sends Moses special revelations before his death, indicating Moses' continued selection as God's chosen one, even while not being allowed to enter into the promised land.

Christianity (eds. B. Chilton and C. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 2005), 323–354. Likewise texts such as the Mishnah may reflect on the establishment of rabbinic authority; see for instance Naftali S. Cohn, *The Memory of the Temple and the Making of the Rabbis* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

[43] I concur with F. J. Murphy's dating of the text to sometime in the first century C.E., "Biblical Antiquities (Pseudo-Philo)," *DEJ* 440. Scholars have posited dates ranging from as early as the second century B.C.E. into the second century C.E. See Howard Jacobson, who dates the text between 50 C.E. and 150 C.E. (*A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 2 vols. [Leiden: Brill, 1996], 199–210), or Daniel J. Harrington, who dates it between 135 B.C.E. and 100 C.E. ("Pseudo-Philo: A New Translation and Introduction," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. II [Ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985], 299). The larger question tends to be whether *LAB* was written before or after the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. There is no scholarly consensus on this question; arguments made in both directions are persuasive, and, in my opinion, the question as it stands cannot be settled. See Jacobson, *Commentary on Pseudo-Philo*, 199–210 for a review of arguments regarding dating. Virtually all scholars agree with a Judaean provenance; see Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," 299–300, Cf. Cheryl Ann Brown, *No Longer Be Silent: First Century Jewish Portraits of Biblical Women* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 216, who places the provenance in Syria.

[44] G. W. E. Nickelsburg "Good and Bad Leaders in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*" in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (ed. J. J. Collins and G. W.E. Nickelsburg; Ann Arbor, Michigan: Scholars Press, 1980), 50–51. Nickelsburg systematically explores the leaders as portrayed in *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* in order to develop this list of what makes a good (and subsequently also what makes a bad) leader according to Pseudo-Philo. I have selected only a few here to exhibit the portrayal of leadership.

[45] Scholars have recently questioned the scriptural sources the author of *LAB* used: Harrington argued that *LAB* had a Palestinian text type (Harrington, "Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." *CBQ* 33 [1971]: 1–17), whereas Jacobson argues for no set scriptural source due to the variance in quotations, and instead argues for an oral origin for *LAB* and therefore that the biblical quotations are likely quoted from memory, which would account for their variations (Jacobson, *Commentary on Pseudo-Philo*, 254–256).

Another example of a leader is Deborah (*LAB* 30–33).[46] Like the other figures in *LAB* adapted from the book of Judges, Deborah is sent to Israel by the Lord. Unlike in Judges, however, here Deborah speaks publicly to the people rather than privately discussing her plans with Barak.[47] Deborah reminds the people of the promises that they made to the Lord in the past, and how the Lord provided them with prophets and leaders to teach the people so that that they followed the commandments. The people, however, do not follow the laws or keep the commandments if there is not someone in charge to make sure they do. God is faithful to Israel not because of Israel, but on behalf of those leaders and figures in Israel's past that were faithful, such as Moses and Joshua. Through Deborah's leadership, the Israelites attack the armies of Sisera, which are defeated.[48] Deborah leads the people in a hymn of praise to God, which reviews the patriarchal history of Israel beginning with Abraham, including the Akedah,[49] and then turns to the war against Sisera. Pseudo-Philo's depiction of Deborah adapts her into a public figure who calls on God in order to defeat the enemies of Israel.

Both Moses and Deborah, as examples of the good leaders as represented in Pseudo-Philo are paradigmatic in their presentation—they are meant to serve as models to be imitated. Nickelsburg describes all of Pseudo-Philo's good leaders as those who implement God's purpose in the public sphere, making speeches and engaging boldly in deeds while the others are seen in a state of "inaction, fidgeting, or avoidance or responsibility."[50] *LAB*'s portrayal of leaders takes their professed trust in God's ability to right what is going wrong for Israel to the public through

[46] Murphy does not include Deborah in his list of leaders in Pseudo-Philo based on language, but does so in his description of leaders. See Frederick James Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 234–5, 237.
[47] Nickelsburg, "Good and Bad Leaders," 55.
[48] In *LAB* Jael's actions in the killing of Sisera are not attributed to any particular leader, but come directly from Jael's prayers and her subsequent interpretation of those prayers as being messages form God.
[49] Which is missing earlier in the narrative in the section on Abraham, where one might expect it to be.
[50] Nickelsburg, "Good and Bad Leaders," 61. Murphy disagrees with the view of the Other, *Pseudo-Philo*, 234.

their actions and speeches as well as their observance of the Torah.[51] Through the literary depictions of the good leaders, the author of Pseudo-Philo is offering social commentary on what leaders *should* be doing and how they should be doing it; the critique could be applicable before or during the first Jewish revolt against Rome, when, as we have seen from Josephus, leadership was weak and often fleeting; likewise, the critique could offer a post-war message of the type of leader needed to support the community left after the revolt—it is this same message that we see, albeit with different emphasis, in *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra*.

2.4 Leadership at the time of the Bar Kokhba Revolt (132–135 C.E.)[52]

The Bar Kokhba revolt took place in Judaea from 132–135 C.E. and was led by Shimon Bar Kosiba, more commonly known as Bar Kokhba.[53] The evidence of the revolt is extant in both material and literary form: material evidence is made up of letters and coins, while literary evidence exists in later rabbinic, Roman, and Christian literature. This section will analyze the material finds from the Bar Kokhba revolt to develop a portrayal of Bar Kosiba as a leader.[54] I will show that the letters depict him as an authority figure who attempts to control all aspects of life, including military, religious, and economic. The numismatic evidence, I argue, is intended to present Bar Kosiba as an undisputed leader who retains the support of the now-defunct, but still respected, priesthood, and whose authority should be connected with the biblical heritage, hearkening back to the first temple times, even reaching as far back as the authority of Joshua, Moses' successor. The evidence presents Bar Kokhba as a controlling commander who

[51] Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 234, 264, 265.
[52] The research on the leadership of Bar Kokhba was initially presented at the annual AJS conference, Boston, MA, December 2013. I offer thanks to the session organizers and the members of the audience for their feedback.
[53] Bar Kokhba is a play on the name Bar Kosiba, with Bar Kokhba meaning "son of a star" and having messianic overtones based on Numbers 24:17.
[54] Considering the late dating of the literary evidence, I will not include it in my analysis here.

attempted to rally the people toward a common goal of self-rule with the hope of a restored Jerusalem. This evidence, produced just a few generations after the destruction of the second temple, suggests that the socio-historical situation was ripe for the rise of a Jewish leader who would attempt to unite the remaining Jews in Judaea for the common goal of the restoration of Jerusalem. For the war, this person was found in the military and religious leadership of Bar Kosiba; however, his leadership was only one of several responses to the leadership situation in Judaea during the post-destruction period.

2.4.1 Numismatic Evidence

The numismatic evidence from the Bar Kokhba revolt is identified as such because the coins bear bar Kosiba's first name, *Shimon*.[55] However, many also bear the name of an individual named *Eleazar the Priest*. The inclusion of a priest on some of the coins suggests plans to recapture Jerusalem and to restore the Temple cult. Additional language on the coins is suggestive of this goal as well; the phrases "to/for the freedom of Jerusalem" and "to/for the redemption of Jerusalem" are both slogans found on the coins. The distinction in meaning, if any, between "freedom" (גארלה) and "redemption"(חרות) is unclear; this phrasing has led some scholars to argue that Bar Kosiba held Jerusalem for at least part of the war, although it is more likely that this was a goal rather than an actuality.[56]

The name *Eleazar the Priest* intimates direct priestly involvement in the war, which implies that at least some priests, although no longer active in the temple cult, were still present as figurative leaders in Israel. The listing of a priest on the coins also suggests two things: 1) in

[55] For a review of the coinage found from the Bar Kokhba revolt, see Leo Mildenberg, *The Coinage of the Bar Kokhba War* (Aarau, Frankfurt: Verlag Sauerländer, 1984).
[56] Recent scholarship views the phrasing "to/for the freedom of Jerusalem" and "to/for the redemption of Jerusalem" as a slogan rather than part of a date formula. See Goodblatt, *Jewish Nationalism*, 130. No proof exists for the actual capturing and holding of Jerusalem.

any imagining of a recapturing of Jerusalem and a rebuilding of the Temple, Bar Kosiba must have had the support of at least some priests for this goal, and 2) Bar Kosiba did not himself have priestly heritage and had no intention of forcing himself upon this particular leadership position. Enlisting the public support of the priesthood, as portrayed through the listing of the name *Eleazar the Priest* (אלעזר הכהן) on the coins, may have been an intentional choice set up in contrast to the leadership of the Hasmoneans, which eventually combined the priestly and monarchical duties,[57] and the Herodian rulers, who set up puppet high priests that were tied tightly to the current ruler and replaced with any change in leadership.[58]

The date formulae on the coins are also relevant for a discussion of leadership. The formulae from the first two years of the revolt reads "year one [or two] of the redemption of Israel," and suggests strong nationalist tendencies.[59] This nationalism, which is akin to what was seen in coinage during the revolt in 66 C.E., emphasizes the terminology of "Israel," rather than "Judah/Judaea" or even "Zion." Goodblatt argues that the use of Israel is in intentional contrast with the Jewish state of the Herodians and Hasmoneans;[60] the choice of Israel is thus a political statement, harkening back to the days before the Babylonian Exile during the time of the first temple. The choice of the terminology of Israel, and the "biblical" nationalism that one finds representative in the coins, contributes to Bar Kosiba's authority by suggesting that he saw his rule as a continuation of the history of Israel, that is, it was given by and supported directly by God, and was not corrupt like the rulers from the Second Temple period.

[57] Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 174. Cf. Goodblatt, *Jewish Nationalism*, 136–7.
[58] See Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 40 ff.
[59] Goodblatt, *Jewish Nationalism*, 108–139.
[60] See (below) also the use of the term "Nasi" by Bar Kosiba as a way to differentiate himself and his leadership from that of the Hasmonean priestly monarch. Goodblatt, *Jewish Nationalism*, 137; Goodblatt, *Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 6–76.

2.4.2 Epistolary Evidence

The letters from the Bar Kokhba revolt help highlight the persona of Bar Kosiba. The letters themselves were found in caves[61] in the Judaean desert between 1950 and 1965. The letters are extant in Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek; of the approximately twenty-six found, twenty-five were sent by Bar Kosiba or his scribes and lieutenants to subordinate leaders of the revolt. Many of the letters are addressed to Yehonatan son of Ba'yan and Masabalah, son of Shimon, both of whom seem to have been leaders at Ein Gedi under Bar Kosiba. Only one letter was sent from a subordinate to Bar Kosiba. One additional extant letter was sent between two participants of the revolt and was not addressed to or sent from Bar Kosiba. The letters follow typical Hellenistic epistolary form; that is, regardless of the language in which they were written, they include both an opening and closing salutation in the Hellenistic convention used during that period.[62] The actual scribe for the letters is often different from the sender, as was the practice in the Hellenistic world; Shimon bar Kosiba, it seems, did not write his own letters.

The matters addressed in the letters do not, much to the dismay of historians, discuss the details of the war. Instead, daily matters relating to military supply, discipline, instruction, and observance of Jewish law are addressed. While this material is not useful for a reconstruction of the last Jewish revolt against the Romans, it is fruitful for analysis about the person known as Bar Kosiba. It is essential to remember in any analysis of the material the limited quantity and quality of the evidence; that is, we have only one small stash of letters in this collection, representing the correspondence focused around a few select individuals, namely Yehonatan and Masabalah, and limited mainly to the location of Ein Gedi. Any image we paint of Bar Kosiba from the letters will be an incomplete picture of the actual person and leader. However, based on

[61] Not all of the letters were found *in situ* by archaeologists; approximately half of the twenty-six letters were found on the antiquities market due to illicit foraging. See Michael O. Wise, "Bar Kokhba Letters" DEJ, 418–421.
[62] Wise, "Bar Kokhba Letters" DEJ, 420.

the extant material, the image that is portrayed is of a controlling military leader who uses threats and punishments to see his will done. The following sections will address the most relevant themes for establishing the authority of Bar Kosiba as found in the letters.

2.4.2.a Jewish Holiday Observance

Numerous letters emphasize the importance of Torah observance for Shimon Bar Kosiba. Specifically, this section will consider how the letters approach the Sabbath and the holiday of Sukkot. While the letters focus on these holidays, we should not conclude that Bar Kosiba did not find other holidays or observances important. In fact, that these are represented in the little evidence that is extant suggests that other observances of Jewish holidays were likely just as important to Bar Kosiba.

Concerns about observance of Sukkot can be seen in several letters. The first, perhaps most well-known reference (P.Yadin 57), is a letter from Bar Kosiba to Yehudah son of Menashe:

> [1] Shimon to Yehudah, son of Menashe, at Qiryat ʻArabayyah: I have delivered to you two donkeys (in order) that you dispatch
> [2] along with them two men to Yehonatan, son of Ba'yan, and to Masabalahh (in order) that they pack up
> [3] and deliver to the camp, to you, palm branches and citrons. And you are to send additional persons from your place
> [4] and let them bring you myrtle branches and willows. And prepare them, and deliver them to the camp, because
> [5] the (or: its) population is large. Fare well![63]

As reported in the missive, accompanying the letter were two donkeys, which were to be used for the transportation of palm branches and citrons, two of the four species used in ritual observance of the holiday of Sukkot. According to the commands on the letter, the donkeys were to carry the two species from Ein Gedi to Bar Kosiba's camp. In addition, Bar Kosiba informs Yehudah son

[63] Yigal Yadin et al., eds. *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters: Hebrew, Aramaic and Nabatean-Aramaic Papyri* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002), 326.

of Menashe that he is to send additional people from his camp with the remaining two species, that is, the myrtle and willow branches.

A second letter (P.Yadin 52), written in Greek, also concerns the holiday of Sukkot:

[1] Soumaios to Yonathes
[2] son of Beianos and to
[3] Masabalah greetings.
[4] Since I have sent you
[5] Agrippa, hurry
[6] to send me
[7] wands and citrons,
[8] as much as you will be able to,
[9] for the camp of the
[10] Jews, and do not do
[11] otherwise. It [the letter] was written
[12] in Greek because
[13] of our inability
[14] [to write?] in Hebrew letters.
[15] Release him [Agrippa]
[16] more quickly
[17] on account of the festival,
[18] and do not do
[19] otherwise.
[20] Soumaios
[21] Farewell.

The sender, Soumaios, requests that Yehonatan and Masabalah, captains from Ein Gedi, send "wands and citrons…for the camp of the Jews" in order to correctly observe the holiday of Sukkot. Soumaios urges them to act with haste because the festival is beginning soon, and these ritual objects are necessary for the holiday.[64] This example, and the one above quoted in P.Yadin 57, highlight that proper ritual observance of the holiday of Sukkot was important to Bar Kosiba and at least some of his followers, even without the temple.

Sabbath observance, too, is highlighted as an important commandment to Bar Kosiba. In one letter (P.Yadin [5/6 Hev] 50) addressed to the same Yehonatan and Masabalah, Bar Kosiba

[64] Hannah Cotton has argued that this letter was written by a Nabatean—not a Jew—named Soumaios, and that the phrase "because of our inability [to write?] in Hebrew" actually means their inability to write in the Hebrew script, not necessarily their lack of knowledge of Aramaic. This, Cotton argues, proves that there were non-Jewish participants in the revolt. See H. Cotton, "The Bar Kokhba Revolt and the Documents from the Judaean Desert: Nabataean Participation in the Revolt (*P.Yadin* 52)" in *The Bar Kokhba Revolt Reconsidered* (Ed. by P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 133–152.

demands that one Eleazar son of Hatah be delivered to him "before the Sabbath."[65] This letter has traditionally been interpreted to express concern for Sabbath observance by Bar Kosiba, an interpretation that I agree is correct.[66] However, I would propose that there are additional factors that should be considered: first, is Bar Kosiba simply in a hurry to have Eleazar with him? If so, then the phrase "before the Sabbath" is a slip that informs historians of the importance of the Sabbath at least in terms of dating the week. It is possible that this phrase does not definitively mean that Bar Kosiba and his followers observed the Sabbath but simply that the Sabbath was used as a weekly calendrical marker. This interpretation, that the reference to the Sabbath is only a calendrical feature, is unlikely, however, based on other documents found in the Judaean desert. B. M. Schreiber has shown that in the twenty-one documents found in the Judaean desert caves which use the Roman calendar,[67] none of them were prepared on the Sabbath.[68] According to Schreiber, it is statistically more likely that there was a reason there are no extant documents dated to the Sabbath (that is, because of Sabbath observance) than that the documents analyzed just do not contain that particular date.[69] This indication of lack of legal documents prepared on

---

[65] P.Yadin 50 text (Yadin, *Documents*, 290):
[1] Shimon, son of Kosiba
[2] to Yehonatan, son of Bayan
[3] and to Masabalah, son of Shimon
[4] You are to deliver to me Eleazar
[5] son of KhHTH, immediately, before
[6] the Sabbath. And exercise care with his products,
[7] and the remainder of his fruit. And whoever
[8] raises a clamor against you on this sort of matter
[9] dispatch him to my side, and I will exact punishment.
[10] And (as regards) the cattle—they must not destroy the
[11] trees. And should anyone raise a clamor—punishment
[12] will be exacted from you, in great (measure). And as regards the *ladanum*/spice (garden)
[13] let no person come near it.
[14] Shimon son of Yehuda;
[15] he wrote it.

[66] Yadin, *Documents*, 291–2.

[67] And it is therefore easier to figure out their dating.

[68] B. M. Schreiber, "The Week and Sabbath in Judaean Desert Documents" *Scripta Classica Israelica* 17 (1998), 102–114.

[69] Schreiber, "The Week and Sabbath," 112–113, which contain the statistical analysis.

the Sabbath makes it unlikely that the mention of the Sabbath in the first letter is *just* used for calendrical purposes.[70] Bar Kosiba's demand seems to be at least partially a concern for not breaking the Sabbath, but may simply indicate to his generals that they should hurry to follow his orders.

This leads into the second factor that should be considered in a discussion of the Sabbath: Bar Kosiba's emphasis on delivery of Eleazar before the Sabbath could suggest that others in his army were more lax about Sabbath observance. The premise for this idea can be seen in other literary examples, where insistence on or repetition of a particular topic belies that what is being protested in fact happens regularly.[71] Certainly in this case one example does not produce evidence of "too much" but neither can it be used to confirm strict Sabbath observance by all members of Bar Kosiba's army. The mention of the keeping of the Sabbath in both letters does, however, show that Bar Kosiba himself was concerned with the Sabbath observance, and his insistence to his followers that they, too, keep the Sabbath and Sukkot contributes to the image of him as a controlling leader in the area of religious observance.

2.4.2.b Discipline

Bar Kosiba expected his commands to be followed swiftly, and stipulated exacting punishments if they were not. For instance, in P.Yadin 50, mentioned above,[72] Bar Kosiba insists that Eleazar is sent to him before the Sabbath, and that "whoever raises a clamor against you on

[70] Although, of course, the Sabbath was used for that as well. See Schreiber, "The Week and Sabbath," 107.
[71] For instance, See Chrysostom's anti-Jewish rhetoric in *Adversus Judaeos* as proof of Christians in 4th century Antioch taking part in Jewish life and festivities. Chrysostom's language and insistence that Christians do not participate in such events merely highlights the extent to which at least some Christians did participate. See W. A. Meeks and R. L. Wilken, *Jewish and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Comman Era* (Missoula: MT: Scholars Press, 1978).
[72] See footnote 52, above.

this sort of matter, dispatch him to my side, and I will exact punishment."[73] In this same letter, Bar Kosiba announced that neither cattle nor the residents of Ein Gedi must destroy the trees or spice gardens[74] otherwise "punishment will be exacted from you, in great measure." The expectation that is portrayed in this letter is that Bar Kosiba's threat will be enough to curb whatever behaviour he was criticizing, suggesting that he was in fact known for carrying through on his threats.[75]

The relationship between Bar Kosiba and some people from Tekoa also highlights his controlling nature in terms of discipline. P.Yadin 61, which is difficult to use due to its very fragmentary nature, was sent by Bar Kosiba to the people of Tekoa. Besides the sender and addressees, the only other part of the letter that can be made out is a few words which say something about payment due from them to him.[76] The nature of the payment is unclear, however, it is certain that Bar Kosiba thought that the Tekoans owed him something. The relationship continues in a second letter (P.Yadin 55), where Yehonatan and Masabalah are ordered to deliver immediately to Bar Kosiba any Tekoans who are currently in Ein Gedi:

[1] Shimon, son of Kosiba, to Yehonatan
[2] and to Masabalah: A letter (To the effect) that any
[3] person from Tekoa, or from any other place,
[4] who is with you—you are to dispatch them to me
[5] right a[wa]y. And if
[6] you do not dispatch them, may it be known
[7] to you that from you I will exact
[8] punishment. [And] … shall be of the hou-

[73] Yadin, *Documents*, 290.
[74] See Deuteronomy 20:19–20.
[75] An alternative, although less likely, view would be that Bar Kosiba was a weak leader who had to threaten and cajole in order to get his commanders to listen to him at all; however, considering the success of the revolt, this viewpoint is unlikely. Thanks to Lawrence Schiffman for pointing out this possibility.
[76] P.Yadin 61 (Yadin, *Documents*, 338):

[1] From Shimon, son of [Kosiba to the people of Te]koa.
[2] […]
[3] […]
[4] […] that you are to pay me
[5] […]
[6] […]
[7] […]

[9] -ses[77]

Bar Kosiba does not state why he expects the people of Tekoa to be sent to him, although I posit that it could be that it relates to the "payment" from the previous letter. A third reference to the Tekoans occurs in P.Yadin 54,[78] again addressed to Yehonatan and Masabalah at Ein Gedi. The beginning of the second column reads: "And any Tekoan man who is found with you—let the houses that they reside in burn down, and from you I shall exact punishment." While this letter is still not clear as to what the situation is between Bar Kosiba and the Tekoans, the correspondence implies that burning Tekoan places of residence is within reason for whatever ill they have committed. This leads to certain questions: Were the Tekoans staying with the people from Ein Gedi? Does this punishment, then, extend to them? Bar Kosiba says outright that if any Tekoans are in Ein Gedi, then Yehonatan and Masabalah will be punished, which does indeed suggest that at least some of the people of Ein Gedi—Yehonatan and Masabalah—were to be punished for harbouring the Tekoans. While the letters do not tell us the entire story of what happened between Bar Kosiba and the Tekoans, their presence in more than one letter, and the discipline that Bar Kosiba commands be inflicted upon them and upon the people of Ein Gedi *because of them* highlights his controlling persona and the strict discipline he attempted to impose on his followers.

P.Yadin 54 contains further disciplinary instructions to Yehonatan and Masabalah at Ein Gedi:

> Column 1:
> [1] Shimon, son of Kosiba, the Premier over Israel,
> [2] to Yehonatan, and to Masabalah: Peace! You are (ordered) to examine
> [3] and (to) seize the wheat that he brought, (namely) Hannun/Hannin
> [4] son of Yishmael, and ship them to me (weighed) precisely (or: on time/here),
> [5] one seah. And place them under guard
> [6] because they were found to have been stolen. And if you do not

[77] Yadin, *Documents*, 314.
[78] The letter is reproduced in full below.

[7] do accordingly, (know) that from you, punishment
[8] will be exacted. And the man—you are to deliver to me
[9] under guard.

Column 2:
[10] And any Tekoan man who is found
[11] with you—let the houses that they reside
[12] in them burn down, and from you I shall exact
[13] punishment. And Yeshua,
[14] son of the Palmyrene, you are to seize for dispatch
[15] to me under guard. And do not fail
[16] to seize the sword that is on him. Send it!
[17] Shmuel, son of Ammi[79]

This particular letter, written in Aramaic, is very well preserved, and addresses issues relating specifically to discipline.[80] In column 1, Bar Kosiba is addressing a situation where some wheat seems to have been stolen by one Hannun (or Hannin),[81] and demands that the thieves as well as some of the wheat be delivered to him. If this is not carried out, Bar Kosiba threatens to punish Yehonatan and Masabalah (lines 7–8). Column 2 has the mention of the Tekoans, as well as Yeshua son of the Palmyrene who is under guard for some unknown reason. Not only does Bar Kosiba demand that Yeshua, too, be sent to him, but he also reminds his captains at Ein Gedi to take away Yeshua's sword![82] It hardly seems possible that Bar Kosiba has so little faith in his captains as to think they would forget to take away the sword of a man under arrest; either way, it is evidence of Bar Kosiba attempting to keep tight control over every aspect of the war.[83]

In these letters, Bar Kosiba's attempted control over his followers as well as his threat of swift discipline stand out as severe. The extant letters are brief and expect results; the rhetoric of the letters is designed to reflect the exacting nature of the demands. The result is a window into

[79] Yadin, *Documents*, 308.
[80] As well as terminology; Bar Kosiba refers to himself as "הנסי" here. Issues of terminology will be addressed in the next section.
[81] The handwriting is sloppy and smeared at times, and in this case it is difficult to know if the third consonant should be a י or a ו.
[82] Bar Kosiba also demands that the sword be forwarded on to him as well.
[83] Likewise, Bar Kosiba makes demands concerning animals, trees, and the spice garden at Ein Gedi. See P.Yadin 50 above.

the leadership of the person who was Bar Kosiba, and his attempt to exert his authority over the participants in the revolt.

2.4.2.c Terminology

There is, of course, also the issue of terminology. Out of all the letters extant, only one exists that was written by a follower to Bar Kosiba himself.[84] This letter begins as the others, in typical epistolary format, and then greets Bar Kosiba as "beloved father." This title is atypical for military address[85] and suggests a more intimate relationship between Bar Kosiba and this follower.[86] In combination with later rabbinic and patristic sources, scholars have used the title "beloved father" from this letter to argue claims made about Bar Kosiba as a messianic figure; this concept is further supported by the reference to him not by his name but under the nickname "Bar Kokhba" (son of a star) which seems to imply a messianic interpretation of Numbers 24:17: "A star will come out of Jacob, and a scepter will rise out of Israel."[87] However, a popular leader, even one who is fulfilling what came to be known as prophecy, does not necessarily have to be considered a messiah by his followers. In fact, there is no contemporaneous evidence to suggest that this was the case.[88] Clearly, with a title like "beloved father," Bar Kosiba was either well respected or feared by his followers, or both. This in and of itself certainly argues for dynamic leadership; it does not need to suggest that he was seen as a messiah figure by his followers.

The use of the title "father" by a follower coincides with the term "brothers" used in letters to refer to comrades-in-arms. While this should not preclude an interpretation of a

[84] As the myriad examples above show, most of the letters were sent by Bar Kosiba.
[85] See, for instance, S. E. Phang, "Military Documents, Languages, and Literary," in *A Companion to the Roman Army* (ed. P. Erdkamp; Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 286–305.
[86] DEJ, 420.
[87] DEJ, 420.
[88] It is of course possible that if we had more extant evidence we would find that it was indeed the case, as the (considerably later) literary evidence suggests. However, we should not make an argument out of silence.

dynamic leader, it may be that this is an insider view of how those combined in the act of revolt against the Roman Empire may have referred to one another and saw one another as a close-knit family. The use of this terminology may also reflect Bar Kosiba as the *paterfamilias* of the revolt, controlling the religious and military workings of this exclusive family.

Bar Kosiba used the title "nasi" (נשיא) on some coins as well as in some of the letters. The title itself hearkens back to scripture, where it is a role differentiated from kingship; for instance, in 1 Kgs 11:34–37 where Solomon is told to be nasi while Jeroboam will be king over Israel, and in Ezek 7:27 where the nasi is a leader clearly distinguished from kings.[89] Choi notes that in the Septuagint, the title "nasi" in Greek is rendered ἄρχων whereas king is rendered βασιλέυς.[90] The title "nasi" is also distinguished from the king in the Dead Sea Scrolls, for instance in 11QT[a] lvii 12–14, the nesi'im join with twelve priests and twelve levites in order to sit with an ideal king; the nasi at Qumran is generally described as a military leader.[91] While the nasi is differentiated from a king and other types of authority (e.g. priests) in comparative literature, the nasi is still portrayed as an influential leader who may even serve to temper the authority of a king.[92]

Bar Kosiba may have chosen the title "nasi" for himself in order to recall the days before the first temple. Choi argues that the use of nasi by Bar Kosiba may be an intentional reference to Numbers 34:17–18: "These are the names of the men who shall apportion the land to you for inheritance: the priest Eleazar (*Eleazar the Priest*) and Joshua son of Nun. You shall take one

[89] Among others, see also Ezra 1:8, where Cyrus is named the Persian King while Sheshbazzar is to be the nasi over Judah, and 2 Chr 1:2, which contains a list of the people Solomon summoned, including the nasi over all Israel.
[90] Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 111.
[91] See J. J. Collins, "'He shall not judge by what his eyes see': Messianic Authority in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995), 153–55. See also Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 112.
[92] For instance, in 11QT[a] lvii 11–15 where the ideal king should not do anything without the nesi'im, priests, and levites. Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 112.

leader (*nasi*) of every tribe to apportion the land for inheritance."[93] Recall that *Eleazar the Priest* appears on one side of the coins—this Eleazar the Priest and Bar Kosiba may indeed have been appealing to pre-temple times, basing the legitimacy of their authority on a scriptural paradigm. This is further supported if one considers that Bar Kosiba did not list himself as both leader and a priest, thus also intentionally choosing *not* to emulate the leadership model of the Hasmoneans, who combined monarchic rule with the priestly role.[94] Thus the choice of nasi for Bar Kosiba was likely an intentional title of leadership that hearkened back to the biblical precedent, connecting him directly with the line and authority of Moses and Joshua, and simultaneously distinguishing himself from the leadership of the Hasmoneans.

2.5 Conclusion

The overview of leadership leading up to and including the first revolt against Rome, as well as during the Bar Kokhba revolt, provides a social and historical context for the following chapters, which will analyze the depiction of leadership in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* and then apply these analyses to the broader question of how the leadership as portrayed in these texts reflect in the socio-historical world of the time. According to Josephus, the cause of the first revolt was related (but not limited) to what the populace viewed as invalid leadership in Judaea, implemented by the Romans beginning around 6 C.E. The weak ruling class provided little leadership for the populace of Judaea throughout the first century C.E., and the revolt resulted from a combination of various factors, many of which may have been preventable if the

[93] Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 209.
[94] Goodblatt, *Ancient Jewish Nationalism*, 137. Choi notes that Greek-language literature such as Josephus, Philo, and the New Testament outside of the LXX do not seem to reproduce the leadership category of the nasi. The implications of this are uncertain: does this mean that it is a more theoretical category in Qumran literature, perhaps picking up on terminology from biblical references? Similarly problematic is the use of the title in rabbinic literature, where the nesi'im are said to be leaders of the Sanhedrin, but Josephus and the New Testament both portray the High Priest as head of the Sanhedrin. Choi suggests that the rabbinic use may reflect a later period and use of the title. Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 113, 200–205.

leadership had held actual authority. While there was likely some carry-over of authority figures from the war, there was also the possibility for new leaders to gain power, and thus the established role and the nature of authority, as determined in the pre-revolt period, was challenged. This is clear even into the rabbinic period and can be seen through certain mishnaic texts.[95] In the following chapters I will show how the inscribed communities of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* are concerned about their leadership and their place within the contemporaneous Jewish society once their leader dies.

The image of Bar Kosiba that emerges from the letters is one of a controlling leader. His care of proper observance for holidays suggests that he was a stickler for *halakhah* who also enforced their observance among his army. Bar Kosiba was also a disciplinarian, threatening punishment for those who dared to disobey him. Based on the analysis of the "beloved father" terminology and the title "nasi," and combined with the image of him being meticulous about observance of the commandments as well as a disciplinarian, Bar Kosiba comes across as a manipulative and controlling leader who expected complete obedience from his followers. This image is further supported by the numismatic evidence, which suggests that Bar Kosiba saw himself in the continuation of the ancient history of the Jews, and that his authority derived from God and was connected directly to the authority found in the pre-Second Temple period.

My interest in this analysis is not to determine the type of leadership that is portrayed by the later evidence of the rabbinic, patristic, and Roman sources; these writings contain their own agendas and provide information not about Bar Kosiba as a leader, but about the portrayal of him in the time in which the sources were written. While they may indeed contain slippages of historical truth about the leader as he was during the revolt, their late dating makes them

[95] Naftali S. Cohn focuses on just one aspect of these mishnaic texts in his monograph *The Memory of the Temple and the Makings of the Rabbis* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

unreliable as historical sources. Instead, I argue that Bar Kosiba's leadership style was all-encompassing, including military, religious, and economic. It could be, and it is here where I venture into the realm of uncertainty, that many of the Jews remaining in Judaea rallied around him because other possible leaders were not seeing results in terms of action. While the apocalypses under discussion in the rest of this project proffer Torah praxis and belief in the imminent eschaton as the "solution" to the situation cause by the destruction, their response must have been unsatisfactory for at least some Jews, who found a more capable leader in Bar Kosiba, as someone who could produce results and who offered a vision of the restored earthly Jerusalem and Israel. Thus the analysis of Bar Kosiba as a leader, as well as the examination of leadership at the time of first revolt against Rome, provides the socio-historical background in which I will examine leadership in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, and from which I will argue that the leadership concerns present in the literature can be translated into an indication of the historical reality facing Jews in Judaea in the late first century/early second century C.E.

Part Two: Analysis of *4 Ezra*

Chapter Three

"For in them are the Springs of Understanding" (*4 Ezra* 14:47): Ezra as Leader in *4 Ezra*

3.1 Introduction

Having established the theoretical and historical framework for the apocalypses, this section will turn to an analysis of *4 Ezra*. In this chapter I will conduct a literary analysis of *4 Ezra* focusing especially on the character of Ezra in order to determine the characterization of leadership in the text. *4 Ezra* follows the story of Ezra, beginning with his questioning the actions of the Most High, through his encounter with the mourning-woman-turned-Zion, onto the eschatological visions, and climaxing with his revelation of scripture and secret books. As the protagonist, Ezra stands firm in the role of prophetic leadership among his people, and as such engages with the divine through the angel Uriel, and directly with God in the climax of the narrative in chapter 14.[1] Within this storyline is a narrative frame that situates Ezra as the leader of a community of Jews who are dealing with the destruction of the temple. This narrative frame, consisting of 5:16–20a, 12:40–50, and the entirety of chapter 14, serves as a guide post for the narrative as a whole; without it, Ezra's experiences are only meaningful for him as an individual, but with the frame, his experiences can be translated as relevant for an entire community. As a whole, scholars have not seriously analyzed this narrative frame where Ezra interacts with the people, as they have been caught up in the not-inconsequential theological debate between Ezra and Uriel, and the transformation that the woman and Ezra undergo in episode four. However, it is to these points of community interaction in the narrative that I will turn in this chapter.

The plot of *4 Ezra* emphasizes Ezra as a leader of the people, the one who is sought out for guidance and comfort by the community. While Ezra's interaction with the community happens in relatively few locations, in the first two of these interactions the people of the community are fearful that Ezra will leave them without a prophet—especially since he keeps

[1] Benjamin E. Reynolds, "The otherworldly mediators in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*: a Comparison with Angelic Mediators in Ascent Apocalypses and in Daniel, Ezekiel, and Zechariah," in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall* (ed. M. Henze, G. Boccaccini; Boston: Brill, 2013), 176–193.

removing himself to solitary locations in order to speak with Uriel or to receive visions—and they request that Ezra re-engage with the community members. It is only in the final episode in chapter 14 where Ezra finally returns to address the community members. After receiving a call from God, Ezra exhorts the people, and then receives not only 24 public books to pass to the community at large, but also 70 secret books to share only with the wise among the people. Since Ezra's absence is imminent—his translation is predicted in 14:50—Ezra leaves the people with instructions on how to succeed without him: they are to follow the instructions in the revealed books that he shares with them, and to allow guidance by the ones who are wise and thus are capable of understanding the 70 secret books as well. Ezra's leadership consists of revelation and guidance for the people, both before and after his translation.

This chapter will first offer a brief history of the scholarly literature on *4 Ezra* in relation to the question of leadership before turning to the literary analysis. Following the *status quaestionis* of *4 Ezra* research, I will provide a literary analysis of the interaction between the inscribed community and Ezra, focusing on *4 Ezra* 5:16–20a, 12:40–50, and 14:1–48. The larger over-riding narrative of *4 Ezra* reflects an impending crisis of leadership within the community that can be seen through the interactions it has with Ezra. The question of where communal authority should rest after Ezra is gone is central to this crisis. The ultimate solution to this problem, as offered by *4 Ezra,* is an emphasis on continuity with the past and the authority found within scripture, as well as belief in imminent eschatological rewards: this is exemplified through the (re-)giving of the Torah[2] and the hidden books to the people in chapter 14. In the next chapter I will consider questions of the contemporary social-historical world of *4 Ezra* with a specific

[2] I use "Torah" here and throughout this dissertation in the broadest possible sense: Ezra is said in 14:44–45 to have received 24 books that are to be made public and 70 that are to be kept for the wise. In *4 Ezra*, the mention of these 24 books, which I am calling "Torah," is likely the earliest references to what is to become the canonized scripture. Lee M. McDonald notes that while this is the case, *4 Ezra* does not specify *which* books are to be included in this collection (*The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995], 60).

eye toward questions of intended audience and function of the text, and their influence on the question of leadership.

3.2 *Status Quaestionis* of *4 Ezra* research

3.2.1 Dating and Provenance of *4 Ezra*

Through an intricate combination of angelic dialogue and eschatological visions, *4 Ezra* stands apart as a unique representation of apocalyptic literature from the post-destruction period. The narrative itself is set thirty years after the destruction of the first temple. The author claims to be "Salathiel, who [is] also called Ezra"[3] (3:1) who is located with the other exiles in Babylon. This stated time frame, along with the stated author of the text, is pseudepigraphic; it was written not primarily in response to the destruction of the first temple, but instead is a response to the destruction of the second temple, and is usually dated between 70 and 132 C.E., with the most usual date posited around 100 C.E.[4] *4 Ezra* was not written by the biblical Ezra[5] as claimed in the narrative; the actual author[6] is an anonymous Jew attempting to address the theological implications of the destruction. This situates the apocalypse as an ideal candidate for an analysis of the social-historical world of the post-destruction period.

The actual dating for *4 Ezra* comes almost exclusively from internal evidence. The beginning of the narrative states a dating to 30 years after the destruction of the temple: "In the

[3] All translations of *4 Ezra* are taken from Michael E. Stone. *Fourth Ezra* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), unless otherwise stated. Text critical issues, as discussed in detail (Stone, 1–8) and throughout the commentary, are not relevant for the present discussion because the text is not in dispute. Noteworthy variants will be mentioned in footnotes, but they do not alter the literary meaning for which I am arguing in this chapter.
[4] See below for a discussion of the dating of *4 Ezra*.
[5] As stated in chapter one, I use the term "biblical Ezra" in order to differentiate the Ezra of Ezra-Nehemiah from the Ezra of *4 Ezra.* The term is not prescriptive of canon.
[6] There has been much discussion in the secondary literature in an attempt to "identify" the author with either the viewpoint of Ezra or the angel Uriel in the text. This has led to a generally skewed analysis of the text, emphasizing the first 3 episodes and devaluing the apocalyptic visions found in episodes 4–6. See Karina Martin Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution.* (Leiden & Boston: Brill 2008), 2. Cf. Lorenzo DiTommaso, "Who is the 'I' of *4 Ezra*?" in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall* (ed. M. Henze and G. Boccaccini; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 119–133.

thirtieth year after the destruction of our city, I, Salathiel, who am also called Ezra, was in Babylon" (3:1), which would suggest that the text was written 30 years after the destruction of the second temple; that is, around 100 C.E. However, this phrasing is probably borrowed from Ezekiel 1:1, "In the thirtieth year, in the fourth month, on the fifth day of the month, as I was among the exiles by the river Chebar, the heavens were opened and I saw visions of God" and thus should not serve as an indicator of date. Instead the use of such a formula builds the authority of the character Ezra as prophet. The fifth episode (chapters 11–12) is the most likely candidate for internal hints at dating. This episode contains the dream vision of the eagle, which rises from the sea and has numerous heads, wings and little wings: the vision continues with the actions of the various body parts, followed by the destruction of the eagle by the lion. This schematized history, based loosely on Daniel 7, describes current and future events and allows the author of *4 Ezra* to place himself and the historical circumstance in which he finds himself into the narrative of Jewish history. These types of historical recitals are common to early Jewish apocalypses, and are also useful for dating works:[7] at some point in this recitation the author must leave the "prediction" of past and current events and move into the actual realm of prediction, and it is at this point that scholars can often date the text, as predictions begin to go wrong.[8] The eagle vision is useful for pinpointing a more exact date of *4 Ezra*, since it claims that history will end during the days of the third head. The various sizes of wings have been identified with Roman emperors: the second wing is usually associated with Augustus based on its long rule.[9] It is the identification of the three heads that give the best clues as to when *4 Ezra*

[7] Take, for example, the prophecy of Antiochus IV's death in Daniel 11:45. We know from other sources (see Josephus *Antiquities* 12:354–361) that Antiochus IV died from an illness while he was campaigning along his Eastern borders. This allows us to date the writing of Daniel to before the death of Antiochus IV.
[8] Stone, *Fourth Ezra,* 10; John Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* Second Edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 6–7.
[9] Stone, *Fourth Ezra,* 10.

was written. The most widely accepted theory is that the three heads should be associated with the Flavian dynasty—Vespasian (69–79 C.E.), and his two sons Titus (79–81 C.E.) and Domitian (81–96 C.E.).[10] This would place the writing of *4 Ezra* during the reign of Domitian, likely toward the end of his reign.[11]

It is possible that there is a citation of *4 Ezra* in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, which would date *4 Ezra* before 117 C.E.[12] This citation is tenuous[13] at best—it is more likely that the *Epistle of Barnabas* is simply relying on shared traditions than that it is citing *4 Ezra* directly. The earliest unquestionable external citation of *4 Ezra* is in *Stromateis* by Clement of Alexandria, which dates to around the end of the second century C.E. The quotation in *Stromateis* is in Greek, and so *4 Ezra* would have already been translated into Greek by that time.[14] Thus the text would have been around long enough and been established enough to have been translated into Greek by 190 C.E.[15] Between the citation in *Stromateis* and the internal dating based on the Eagle vision, *4 Ezra* should be dated to the last decade of the first century C.E. That *4 Ezra* can be dated to this period makes it an essential text for the study of the socio-historical world of post-destruction Judaism, and one of the few surviving Jewish texts before the editing of the Mishnah in 200 C.E.

The beginning of *4 Ezra* hints that its place of composition might be Babylon in two places: first, in 3:1, "I, Salathiel, who am also called Ezra, was in Babylon," and second in 3:29, "For when I came here [to Babylon…]." However, this seems only to be the narrative setting, as

---

[10] Stone, *Fourth Ezra,* 10; Cf. Lorenzo DiTommaso, "Dating the Eagle Vision of 4 Ezra: a New Look at an Old Theory," *JSP* 10:3 (199), 5.
[11] Stone, *Fourth Ezra,* 10. See also DiTommaso's alternate interpretation, although he ultimately still dates *4 Ezra* to the late first century C.E.
[12] Or possibly 132 C.E. Daniel M. Gurtner, *Second Baruch: A Critical Edition of the Syriac Text* (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 16–17.
[13] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 9.
[14] The oldest citations of *4 Ezra* in Latin, the language in which oldest entire manuscript of *4 Ezra* is extant, is from the fourth century C.E. Christian author Ambrose of Milan; Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 9.
[15] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 9.

external factors, such as the original language and the intimate relationship with *4 Ezra*'s sibling apocalypse *2 Baruch*, which will be discussed in detail in part three, suggest rather that an origin within Judaea is most likely.[16] This provenance is widely accepted in the scholarly community,[17] and supports the importance of the text as a representation of a Jewish community dealing with the aftermath of the destruction of the temple.

3.2.2 Language of *4 Ezra*

4 Ezra was most likely composed in Hebrew.[18] While no fragments of a Hebrew original are extant, Bruno Violet has shown through a list of Hebrew influences on the Latin of *4 Ezra* that an original Hebrew can be assumed.[19] It is quite possible that the Hebrew contained Aramaic influences as well, although this is harder to detect.[20] If the text were indeed composed in Hebrew, this would attest to a nationalistic concern with the preservation of Jewish identity,[21] a concern that I suggest is mirrored through the crisis of leadership literarily portrayed in *4 Ezra*.

The work was likely translated into Greek early in its reception history. In addition to the Greek quotation of *4 Ezra* found in *Stromateis* 1:22 by Clement of Alexandria, other texts seem to have derived inspiration from *4 Ezra*. For instance, in the *Greek Apocalypse of Ezra* (*Esdras*) Ezra fasts for an excessive period of 120 weeks, likely a culmination of the seven one-week fasts found throughout *4 Ezra*.[22] The late text known as the *Apocalypse of Sedrach* draws upon the language and many of the themes found in *4 Ezra*, although important differences exist as well,

---

[16] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 10.
[17] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 10.
[18] Stone, *Fourth Ezra,* 1, 11.
[19] Bruno Violet, *Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt* (GSC 32; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924), xxxiv–xxxvii.
[20] Stone, *Fourth Ezra,* 11; A. Klijn, *Der lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra* (TU 131; Berlin: Akademie, 1983), 9–10.
[21] David Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 49.
[22] M. E. Stone, "Greek Apocalypse of Ezra," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* Volume 1 (ed. by J.H. Charlesworth: New York: Doubleday, 1983), 562.

such as the lack of eschatological concerns in the *Apocalypse of Sedrach*.[23] The oldest extant manuscript of *4 Ezra,* however, is the Latin translation. This version contains several transliterated Greek words, suggesting it was created from a Greek version;[24] G. Mussies conducted a careful study of the Graecisms in the extant Latin manuscript, successfully showing the Greek behind the Latin translation.[25] In addition to the Latin, *4 Ezra* survives in Syriac, Ethiopic, Georgian, Arabic, Armenian, and a fragment in Coptic.[26]

3.2.3 Literary Unity

That *4 Ezra* should be addressed as a literary unity is now accepted.[27] The complexity of the text suggests that it draws upon older traditions, as well as that it underwent multiple reworkings that imply both oral and written revisions.[28] While it is possible that the text had multiple authors or author(s) and redactor(s), based on its extant form which presents a narrative whole, I will discuss the text as if it has just one author, noting here that the complexity of the text could support various alternatives to this theory.[29] Thus any mention of "author" will be in the singular.

---

[23] S. Agourides, "Apocalypse of Sedrach," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* Volume 1 (ed. by J.H. Charlesworth: New York: Doubleday, 1983), 607.
[24] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 1; see also A. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum* (Leipzig: Reisland, 1869), who attempted to reconstruct all of *4 Ezra* in Greek.
[25] G. Mussies "When Do Graecisms Prove that a Latin Text is a Translation?" *Vruchten van de Uithof: H.A. Brongers FS* (Utrecht: Theologisch Instituut, 1984), 100–119.
[26] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 2.
[27] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 11. See also Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 1–35, for an extensive review on the secondary literature of *4 Ezra* including the various source-critical positions.
[28] Matthias Henze, "*4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*: Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First-Century Apocalyptic Literature," *JBL* 131.1 (2012): 181–200.
[29] Note that this is the current reigning theory on both *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, although Henze's model may eventually affect scholarly opinion. See Henze, "Literary Composition," 182–4.

The text can be broken down into seven sub-sections, or "episodes,"[30] logically identified and separated by Uriel's instruction to Ezra on what to eat/not eat (for episodes 1–4 and 6) and a clear delineation in the text between episodes (for episodes 5 and 7). The seven episodes can be further categorized into four types: first, the dialogues between Ezra and Uriel, which comprise episodes 1–3 (3:1–9:25); second, the transitional episode 4 made up of Ezra's dialogue with the mourning woman and her subsequent transformation into Zion (9:26–10:59) as well as episodes 5–6, which contain eschatological visions and relate closely to Ezra's experience of the mourning woman transformed (11:1–13:58); and finally, the concluding episode 7, which depicts the transmission of knowledge from God to Ezra and subsequently to the community (14:1–48). A full breakdown can be seen in the chart below:

Episode Number	**Chapter(s)**	**Type of Episode**
1	3:1–5:20[31]	Dialogue
2	5:21–6:34	Dialogue
3	6:35–9:25	Dialogue
4	9:26–10:59	Dialogue/Eschatological Vision
5	11:1–12:51	Eschatological Vision
6	13:1–13:58	Eschatological Vision
7	14:1–14:48	Climax (Dialogue with God and Community, Revelation)

Throughout this work I will refer to these seven sections as episodes 1–7 based on the delineation in the chart above, or by their chapter and verse.

The dialogues between the angel Uriel and Ezra consist of Ezra asking questions relating to theodicy[32] and Uriel responding with what, to Ezra, are frustrating answers that address

[30] It is my opinion that "vision" is a misnomer in the description of Ezra's experience with the angel in the first three sub-sections. Thus, in order to clearly differentiate these sub-sections from the actual visions that Ezra receives in sub-sections 4–6, this paper will follow Hogan in the use of the word "episodes" over the more common term "visions" favored by Stone and others. For a description of all the episodes as various types of dreams see Frances Flannery-Daily, *Dreams, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras* (Boston: Brill, 2004), 212–220.

[31] Chapters 3–14 make up *4 Ezra*; chapters 1–2 and 15–16 are considered later Christian additions to *4 Ezra*; 2 Esdras, which can be found in the Apocrypha, includes all 16 chapters.

humankind's inability to understand God's ways. Scholars[33] have spent an inordinate amount of time attempting to determine whether the authorial viewpoint is that of Uriel or of Ezra.[34] This, of course, is a complicated endeavour, as claims in either direction cannot be proven conclusively.[35]

In the 1960s German scholar Wolfgang Harnisch, following the work started by Egon Brandenburger,[36] analysed the dialogues between Uriel and Ezra as a historical-theological debate that was taking place between different groups around the time of the writing of *4 Ezra*. Harnisch posits that Uriel's position, which represents an apocalyptic dualism, is the answer to the contemporary historical-theological crisis.[37] First, the dualism emphasizes God's remoteness in history, which makes the observance of the Torah even more important as it becomes the only sign of God's will—the only way for humans to connect with God.[38] Second, Uriel does not accept Ezra's argument that the evil inclination is inevitable in all humans, essentially denying

---

[32] Theodicy defined as "any attempt to explain evil and death in terms of religious legitimations, of whatever degree of sophistication or rationality" (Tom Willett, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989], 12).

[33] The nature of this review emphasizes the possibility of using the content of *4 Ezra* in order to discuss the socio-historical world in which it was written (chapter 5). As will become evident, the scholarly material available for such a project is minimal, with the few scholars who do discuss it focusing more on the theological nature of the text than the actual representation of reality the text may provide. Thus, the review here is minimal. For a recent, thorough review of literature on *4 Ezra*, see Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 1–40.

[34] The overemphasis in scholarship on which character represents the author is addressed in my article, which centers on the possibility that this question is the wrong question to be asking, and that instead, looking with which character the audience of the apocalypse would identify will produce more effective answers if we are to consider the motive of the author. S. Sheinfeld, "Oral Performance and the Function of *4 Ezra*," *Biblical Performance Criticism* last access 12 September 2014, http://www.biblicalperformancecriticism.org/index.php/component/content/article/20-full-text-articles/202-oral-performance-and-the-function-of-4-ezra.

[35] Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 9–14. But note that Hogan, too, considers the question of authorship by proposing that the positions of Uriel and Ezra as portrayed in the first three dialogues represent a fictitious theological debate based on wisdom responses to the destruction of the temple, neither of which provide any answers or satisfaction to the readers. Instead, the author's own view is represented by the "answer" of divine revelation as found in the latter half of the book; it is only through belief in this revelation that the destruction of the temple and the situation that the Jews find themselves in can be dealt with (229).

[36] Egon Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus: Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm 5:12–21 (1 Kor 15*; WMANT 7; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962).

[37] Wolfgang Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung der Geschichte: Untersuchungen zum Zeit- und Geschichtsverständnis im 4 Buch Esra und in der syr. Baruchapokalypse* (FRLANT 97; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 108–109.

[38] Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung der Geschichte,* 245.

that humans have free will. Instead, Uriel, while acknowledging that most humans are indeed evil and will suffer accordingly, supports the idea of free will through the example of the righteous and their ultimate salvation.[39] Harnisch limits his discussion almost exclusively to the first three episodes.[40] Most relevant for the purposes of this project is the conjecture by Harnisch that the dialogues represent actual theological debates taking place at the time of the writing of *4 Ezra*, suggesting that the material reflects the socio-historical reality of post-destruction communities in Judaea. However, in his examination of the first three episodes, Harnisch does not examine the only literary representation of the interaction between the leader Ezra and the community, found in 5:16–20. Thus the narrative framework of the sage and community is ignored in any discussion of the historical circumstances, and instead Harnisch focuses exclusively on the theological content of the debate between Uriel and Ezra.

In an article published in the early 1970s, Earl Breech argues against Harnisch's idea that the points of view of Ezra and Uriel represent an actual theological debate. Instead, Breech emphasizes a "pattern of consolation" based on the form of the book.[41] The dialogues, Breech argues, are inconclusive, and there is no evidence that the position that Ezra takes in the dialogues represents the viewpoint of the author's actual opponents. However the point of view taken by Ezra may very well represent the concerns expressed by the post-destruction community.[42]

---

[39] Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung der Geschichte*, 48–50; 240.
[40] In a later article Harnisch argues that the visions in episodes 5 and 6 are later additions to an otherwise unified text ("Der Prophet als Widerpart und Zeuge der Offenbarung: Erwägungen zur Interdependenz von Form und Sache im Iv. Buch Ezra," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979* [ed. David Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983], 461–493).
[41] Earl Breech, "These Fragments Have I shored against my Ruins: The Form and Function of 4 Ezra," *JBL* 92 (1973): 267–74.
[42] Breech, "These Fragments," 270–71.

In his book on *4 Ezra*, Brandenburger also disagrees with Harnisch's proposal that the viewpoints of Ezra and Uriel represent opposing theological stances.[43] Instead, Brandenburger emphasizes that the historical-theological and literary problems in *4 Ezra* are inseparable, and thus to correctly understand the meaning of the text means to recognize the unity of the work as a whole, including its form and function. Brandenburger's emphasis is on episode 4, a clearly pivotal point in the book where Ezra first becomes the recipient of apocalyptic vision.[44] Ultimately, Brandenburger places the author's viewpoint as that associated with the angel, Ezra's comments to the mourning woman in episode 4, and Ezra's later visions as representative of the author, as did Harnisch. However, rather than placing this in opposition to the views as expressed by Ezra in the dialogues, Brandenburger argues that Ezra's perspective in the dialogue is descriptive of an anti-theology present after the destruction of the temple.[45] This view, he argues, is an actual representation of the concerns of the author's community. Accordingly, through both the dialogues and Ezra's revelatory experiences, the author seeks to correct some of the misconceptions the community has about the fate of Israel and the destruction of the temple.[46] Thus, according to this view, *4 Ezra* was written for a community in order to guide them in their understanding of the current social crisis.

In her comprehensive 2008 study based on her dissertation, Karina Martin Hogan argues for a three-pronged approach to the viewpoints in *4 Ezra*. Neither the viewpoint of Ezra nor that of Uriel represent the author's own viewpoint, but instead represent fictional wisdom theologies that may have been present during the Second Temple period. Ezra's view represents that of

---

[43] Egon Brandenburger, *Die Verborgenheit Gottes im Weltgeschehen: das literarische und theologische Problem des 4. Esrabuches*. (ATANT 68. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981).
[44] Brandenburger, *Verborgenheit Gottes*, 72; Cf. Breech, "These Fragments," 270, who also argues strongly for the centrality of the fourth episode to the understanding of the form and function of *4 Ezra*.
[45] Brandenburger, *Verborgenheit Gottes*, 157–60; Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 20.
[46] Brandenburger, *Verborgenheit Gottes*, 44–48.

covenantal wisdom, such as the type that can be found in the books of Ben Sira and Baruch.[47] Uriel's view, on the other hand, represents eschatological wisdom that can be represented by *4QInstruction* from Qumran.[48] These two views are set against one another in the first three episodes in order to show their weaknesses and inadequacies in light of the destruction of the temple. The viewpoint of the author of *4 Ezra* is present by way of the visions (episodes 4–6) and the concluding episode (episode 7), and offers a solution to the present historical quandary by way of visions and faith.[49] Hogan's greatest weakness is that she divides the material into strict schools of thought that were in competition with one another, an idea which may overemphasize the divisions in post-destruction Judaism.[50]

3.3 Literary Analysis of *4 Ezra*

3.3.1 *4 Ezra* 5:16–20a

> Now on the second night Paltiel, a chief of the people, came to me and said, "Where have you been? And why is your face sad? Or do you not know that Israel has been entrusted to you in the land of their exile? Rise therefore and eat some bread, so that you may not forsake us, like a shepherd who leaves his flock in the power of cruel wolves."
>
> Then I said to him, "Depart from me and do not come near me for seven days, and then you may come to me and I will tell you the matter."
>
> He heard what I said and left me.

The first instance within *4 Ezra* where Ezra interacts with any members of the community happens, relatively speaking, late in the narrative. The book begins with Ezra lamenting on behalf of Israel, and it is these laments that bring about his conversation with the divine. The narrative frame, where Ezra interacts with the community, first happens at the transition between the first and second episodes. The placement of Ezra's first interaction with the community after

[47] Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict,* 71–100.
[48] Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 41–70.
[49] Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 229.
[50] Matthias Henze, "Review of K. M. Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution*" (*Journal of Religion* 90 [2010]), 66.

the first episode suggests two important aspects to this narrative frame: First, the frame is not meant to be the focus of the book. Unlike some other narratives from the same period, such as *2 Baruch* where the focus is placed more heavily on the interaction between the sage and the community, the concern of the author of *4 Ezra* is focused almost exclusively on questions of theodicy. This does not invalidate the importance of the narrative framework—the author of *4 Ezra* clearly thought that the interaction between Ezra and the community was essential. This becomes especially clear in the examination of episode 7, below.

Second, the interactions between Ezra and the community do not happen between every episode, highlighting the narrative frame's secondary role in the text. Michael Stone notes that in the course of the text there are literary markers that separate each of the episodes, although the only time these literary separators are interactions between Ezra and the community is here between episodes 1 and 2, and again between episodes 5 and 6.[51] Stone argues that the placement of the narrative frame at these locations is very specific: it places Ezra's interaction with the narrative community after the initial dialogue in episode 1 and then again after the initial vision in episode 5.[52] However, Stone's placement does not group the fourth episode of the mourning woman into either the dialogues (episodes 1–3) or the visions (episodes 5–6). While this makes some sense, as the fourth episode contains characteristics of both dialogue and vision, considering the careful layout of the text, one can argue for a level of symmetry within the episodes of *4 Ezra*.[53] If this is indeed the case, then either episode 4 or episode 7 needs to be grouped with the visions. Neither offers an ideal solution; episode 4 offers a bridge between dialogue and vision by maintaining features of both while episode 7 offers the ultimate solution to the problems addressed by *4 Ezra*. Most frequently, episode 4 is considered distinct from both

[51] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 116.
[52] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 116.
[53] See the chart and explanation above in the *4 Ezra Status Quaestionis* section.

the dialogues and the visions, while episode 7 is considered something of an "epilogue."[54] While episode 4 does indeed maintain characteristics of both the dialogues and the visions, I would argue that it should be associated with the visions in episodes 5 and 6, while episode 7 is considerably more important to the narrative of *4 Ezra* than to be deemed an "epilogue,"[55] and should in fact be considered the climax of the narrative. Overall, Stone's location of the interactions between Ezra and the community is correct; however, I argue that the location itself is not of great importance: as long as the interaction between Ezra and the community happens with enough frequency to act as a narrative frame—in this case, at least once during the dialogues and at least once during the visions—then the purpose of the narrative frame is served. These interactions set the stage for the all-important episode 7 and they assist in guiding the narrative to this culmination of events.

3.3.1.a Paltiel and Leadership Hierarchy

While Ezra is clearly the protagonist in the narrative, in 5:16–20a he is approached by Paltiel, "a chief of the people." This title suggests that he maintains a leadership role in the community. Paltiel, however, makes reference to Ezra's absence as "a shepherd who leaves his flock in the power of cruel wolves." While Paltiel may be titled a chief, his main concern is over Ezra's absence from the community, an absence that in and of itself infers a more important position in the community than Paltiel's position as chief. That Paltiel, a chief, is seeking the guidance of Ezra on behalf of the community implies that there is a hierarchical status of

[54] See below for details on chapter 14 for the various interpretations and explanations.
[55] I am not the first person to make this argument. See later in this chapter where I analyze chapter 14.

community leaders, with Ezra's own position being at the top of the hierarchy and Paltiel's falling beneath Ezra, but above the community-at-large.[56]

This hierarchy, with Paltiel as a leader, does not negate Ezra's authority. Unlike Ezra, Paltiel lacks access to divine revelation and thus authority, which within *4 Ezra* is the attribute that places Ezra at the top of the leadership hierarchy. This access to the divine is what makes Ezra's message to the people relevant—Ezra is leading the people as the mouthpiece of God. It is only through Ezra that the people can continue to know and to follow God's laws. This hierarchy is why, when Ezra sends him away, Paltiel does as he is told without argument; in fact, when Ezra tells him to leave for seven days, even though Paltiel is there specifically to petition Ezra not to remain absent from the community, Paltiel does not question the command. Paltiel understands this command to be one coming from a place of access to divine revelation. Paltiel's abilities as chief therefore must not include the direction of the community. The hierarchy of leadership in the community places Ezra, as interlocutor between the divine and the community, firmly in the position of head leader of the community. Paltiel, while called a chief, may in fact just be a representative voice of the people.

3.3.1.b "The Shepherd who leaves his Flock"

Paltiel requests that Ezra arise and eat so that he will "not forsake us, like a shepherd who leaves his flock in the power of cruel wolves." Paltiel's request that Ezra eat is so that he will regain his strength in order that he does not abandon the community. The phrase "like a shepherd who leaves his flock" is a metaphor between leader and shepherd, and between community and

[56] This hierarchy will become more obvious when we consider *2 Baruch*, but it is important to note that it is also present here in *4 Ezra*.

flock, and is common in both the Hebrew Bible and second temple literature.[57] For instance, in Ezek 34 Israel's kings are symbolized as the shepherds who are supposed to guard the people (i.e. God's sheep). Similarly, in Zech 11:4–17 Zechariah is commissioned as a shepherd for the "flock doomed to slaughter."[58] There are parallels in second temple literature as well, such as in *1 Enoch* 89 where angelic rulers are the shepherds and Israel is represented as the sheep. New Testament parallels also abound, including in the Synoptic Gospels (see Matt 10:16 and parallels) and Acts 20:29. Ginzberg, in *Legends of the Jews*, notes an interesting parallel from Targum 2 of Esther 1:2 that is worth quoting:

> Where it is said that Pelatiah the son of Benaiah […] remonstrated with Nebuchadnezzar on account of his cruelty to the Jews. He said to him: "When one delivers his flock to a shepherd and a bear comes and snatches away a sheep, of whom will it be required?" The king answered: "From the shepherd will it be required." Whereupon Pelatiah rejoined: "Let thine ears hear what thy mouth has uttered."[59]

Stone notes the obvious parallels between the name of Pelatiah in the Targum and Paltiel in *4 Ezra*, and proposes that they may derive from the same tradition.[60] Of course, in *4 Ezra* it is Ezra and not Nebuchadnezzar who is aligned as the shepherd of the people, and the frequency with which this analogy is used in the literature intimates that it is the analogy that spans across time and provenance. Each time, however, it is used as an analogy between a leader and his followers.

Ezra offers no words of consolation to Paltiel for the people, but only sends the chief away in order to deal with the people's concern. Stone has argued, following Egon Brandenburger, that in this earliest scene where Ezra interacts with a community member, Ezra

---

[57] Pierre van Hecke, "Pastoral metaphors in the Hebrew Bible and in its ancient Near Eastern context" in *The Old Testament in its world: Papers Read at the Winter Meeting, January 2003, the Society for Old Testament Study and at the Joint Meeting, July 2003, the Society for Old Testament Study and het Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland en België* (eds. R. P. Gordon and J. C. de Moor; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 200–217. Cf. Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 116–117, see also n4.

[58] Interestingly, even here in Zechariah there is a hierarchical structure of shepherds/leaders: "So, on behalf of the sheep merchants, I became the shepherd of the flock doomed to slaughter…In one month I disposed of the three shepherds, for I had become impatient with them, and they also detested me…" Zech 11:7–8.

[59] L. Ginzberg and D. Stern, *Legends of the Jews*, Volumes 1 and 2 (2nd Edition) (Dulles, VA, USA: Jewish Publication Society, 2003; Accessed September 23, 2014, ProQuest ebrary), 1067.

[60] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 117.

has not yet accepted his role as prophet to the people.[61] According to Stone, this becomes clearer upon examination of 12:40–50, where the people call Ezra a prophet and he does not challenge them, and again in chapter 14 where Ezra has fully accepted his prophetic role as seen through his request to God to be granted the law to give to the people. This argument, however, downplays the interaction between Paltiel and Ezra. Paltiel seeks out Ezra for consolation and direction, and leaves him when commanded. This seeking out does not represent Ezra's abandonment of the people, nor is it his refusal to accept a prophetic role as per Stone, but it follows along a typical period of reluctance for a prophet, paralleling many of the experiences described in the prophetic tradition.[62] Thus Ezra's refusal to deal with Paltiel—and by extension the people— at this point is not a denial of the role of prophet, but instead is a demand for more time to receive divine revelation before attempting to lead the people. I argue that this is why Paltiel does not question Ezra's command to leave him: Paltiel approaches Ezra out of concern both for Ezra ("Where have you been? And why is your face sad?" 5:16) and for the community at large ("Rise therefore and eat some bread, so that you may not forsake us" 5:18), but is easily turned aside from his task when Ezra commands him to give him more time to dwell on the situation ("Depart from me and do not come near me for seven days, and then you may come to me and I will tell you the matter" 5:19). Ezra is still out seeking explanation and revelation, and is not yet ready to confront the people. Thus, Ezra is serving as a leader of the community even while he is removed from them.

3.3.2 *4 Ezra* 12:40–50

[61] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 377, 412; following on Brandenburger, *Verborgenheit Gottes*, 118–20.
[62] See, for instance, Stevens, Marty E. *Leadership Roles in the Old Testament: King, Prophet, Priest, and Sage* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2012), 44–47.

> When all the people heard that the seven days were past and I had not returned to the city, they all gathered together, from the least to the greatest, and came to me and spoke to me, saying "How have we offended you, and what harm have we done you, that you have forsaken us and sit in this place? For of all the prophets you alone are left to us, like a cluster of grapes from the vintage, and like a lamp in a dark place, and like a haven for a ship saved from a storm. Are not the evils which have befallen us sufficient, that you also forsake us? Therefore if you also forsake us, how much better it would have been for us if we had been consumed in the burning of Zion! For we are no better than those who died there." And they wept with a loud voice.
>
> Then I answered them and said, Take courage, O Israel; and do not be sorrowful, O house of Jacob; for the Most High has you in remembrance, and the Mighty One has not forgotten you forever.
>
> "As for me, I have neither forsaken you nor withdrawn from you; but I have come to this place to pray on account of the desolation of Zion, and to seek mercy on account of the humiliation of our sanctuary. Now go, everyone of you to his house, and after these days I will come to you." So the people went into the city, as I told them to do.

This pericope introduces the second point in *4 Ezra* where the community and Ezra interact. Unlike the previous section, here the entire community seeks Ezra out. If Paltiel's interaction with Ezra in 5:16–20a can be seen as an initial inquiry by the community, through its chief, then 12:40–50 should be viewed as an escalation of concerns by the community. There is power in numbers, and here it is not just with one person that Ezra needs to engage, but with the entire group who are all concerned about being left without direction in their world where the locus of their traditions—that is, the temple—has been destroyed. This section can be broken down as follows:[63]

- Introduction, which includes the reason for the interaction between Ezra and the community, 12:40.
- Community address, 12:41–45a.
- Ezra's response, including first a response from the Most High and then a response from Ezra, 12:45b–48.
- Conclusion of the Narrative, 12:49–50.

3.3.2.a Introduction 12:40

This section begins just after Ezra's vision of an eagle. The eagle vision is the first episode where Ezra is the recipient of a vision where he does not engage in dialogue—as

[63] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 375–376, has a similar breakdown of this section.

opposed to episode 4, which combines dialogue with the vision of the woman's transformation. As noted above, this interaction comes immediately following the first vision episode while the interaction between Ezra and Paltiel in 5:16–20a follows after the first dialogue episode. Hogan asserts that the placement of this pericope should be considered in terms of the timeline presented by Ezra to Paltiel the chief in 5:19, "Then [Ezra] said to [Paltiel], 'Depart from me and do not come near me for seven days, and then you may come to me and I will tell you the matter."[64] According to Hogan the people fear abandonment because the time frame given by Ezra in 5:19 has already passed and they have not yet heard from him. At the beginning of 12:40 the people gather in order to state their concerns to Ezra: "When all the people heard that the seven days were past and I had not returned to the city […] they came to me." Thus, the reference in 12:40 to the seven days does not refer to a set period of waiting between each episode, as per Brandenburger and Stone,[65] but to the time frame presented by Ezra to Paltiel—and by extension, the people.[66]

This expression of anxiety is important: it is clear that Paltiel's earlier outreach to Ezra did not satisfy the community, at least not once the time frame that Ezra requested had passed. In this pericope it is not just the chief who is sent; the concern has spread to such an extent that the entire community "from the least to the greatest" comes out to seek Ezra. This phrasing, "from the least to the greatest," is a biblical merism, found in places such as Gen 19:11, and means that the entire people assembled.[67] That everyone assembled, "from the least to the greatest," just reconfirms Ezra's place atop of the hierarchy of leadership, since it includes the whole of the people, including others in positions of authority such as the chief Paltiel. That Ezra does not

[64] Hogan, 170 n24.
[65] Brandenburger, *Verborgenheit Gotes*, 112; Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 373–4; 378.
[66] Rather than a literary allusion to Moses and the receiving of the Torah (Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 374).
[67] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 378. *2 Baruch* 77:1 has similar language as well.

argue his place at the top of the hierarchy, either here or earlier in 5:16–20a, supports my previously stated assertion that Ezra accepts his role as prophet from the very first, and it is in fact part of his job as leader of the community. That is, Ezra has been on the top of the leadership hierarchy from the beginning of *4 Ezra*.

3.3.2.b Community Address 12:41–45a

In verses 41 and 43 the community proposes several questions to Ezra: "How have we offended you, and what harm have we done you, that you have forsaken us and sit in this place? [...] Are not the evils which have befallen us sufficient, that you also forsake us?" The questions that the community asks Ezra reflect several concerns. Initially the people wonder how they themselves have caused their abandonment by Ezra: why has he left them, and why has he not returned to offer them guidance or consolation? Stone argues that this question arises from the people's concern that they have somehow offended Ezra.[68] However, the people's questions are more likely rhetorical and should be considered as an introduction to the problem at hand: that the people are without the guidance of their leader. This is clear when one notes that when Ezra responds beginning in 12:46 he does not address the question of his offense at them, but instead offers an explanation for his absence and promises his return to the community in 12:50.

For the first time in the text Ezra is referred to as "prophet" in 12:42. As mentioned above under 5:16–20a, this reference should not come as a surprise, since Ezra has been interacting with the divine since the beginning of the narrative, and is clearly established as leader in 5:16–20a. Stone argues at this point when the people refer to Ezra as prophet and he does not dispute the title is the culmination of Ezra's conversion process.[69] However, while the character of Ezra

[68] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 379.
[69] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 377.

certainly works through some of the problems that he himself presents in the dialogues, this narrative space between two visions, and before the culmination of the narrative in chapter 14 of the (re-)receiving of the Torah is not the culmination of any internal processes. The explicit reference to Ezra as prophet in 12:42 does not suddenly refer to a role that Ezra only now accepts,[70] but is a title of authority used by the community here, based on a role that Ezra has played all along, as interlocutor between the divine and the people. Thus, reference to Ezra's role as prophet serves to reinforce his leadership role for the community.

Following the reference to Ezra as prophet, the people use three similes that reflect on Ezra's leadership and authority, further supporting this notion that he was always a prophet. The similes can be found in verse 42: "For of all the prophets you alone are left to us, like a cluster of grapes from the vintage, and like a lamp in a dark place, and like a haven for a ship saved from a storm." The first of the three similes associates Ezra with a cluster of grapes from the vintage. According to Stone, the grape simile refers to the election of Israel.[71] While not explicit here in 12:42, the reference is clearer in other verses from *4* Ezra such as 5:23–27:

> And I [Ezra] said, "O sovereign Lord, from all the forests of the earth and from its trees, thou hast chosen for thyself one vine, and from all the lands of the world, thou hast chosen for thyself one region, and from all the flowers of the world, thou hast chosen for thyself one lily, and from all the depths of the sea, thou hast filled for thyself one river, and from all the cities that have been built, thou hast consecrated Zion for thyself, and from all the birds that have been created, thou hast named for thyself one dove, and from all the flocks that have been made, thou hast accepted for thyself one sheep, and from all the multitude of peoples, thou hast gotten for thyself one people; and to this people whom thou hast loved, thou hast given the Torah which is approved by all.

This example provides a list of those items chosen by God as being special and set apart, leading to the election of Israel and the Torah as a gift to those elected. Another grape reference appears in 9:20–22:

---

[70] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 376.

[71] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 127. For more on the election of Israel in *4 Ezra*, see John J. Collins "The Idea of Election in *4 Ezra*" *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 16 (2009): 83–96; S. Sheinfeld, "Who is the Righteous Remnant in Romans 9–11?: The Concept of Remnant in Early Jewish Literature and Paul's Letter to the Romans." In *Paul the Jew: A Conversation between Pauline and Second Temple Scholars* (eds. Carlos A. Segovia and Gabriele Boccaccini; Philadelphia: Fortress, *forthcoming*).

> So I considered my world, and behold it was lost, and my earth, and behold it was in peril because of the devices of those who had come into it. And I saw and spared some with great difficulty, and saved for myself one grape out of a cluster, and one plant out of a great forest. So let the multitude perish which has been born in vain, but let my grape and my plant be saved, because with much labor have I perfected them.

Here the idea of election is prevalent in the simile of the grape, as well as of the plant, which will be saved over and against the multitude of people. The botanical images of the grape and the plant draw from the imagery often found in the prophetic books, such as Isaiah 17:6 and Amos 3:12.[72] The sparing of a select few (i.e. the one grape and the one plant) is also reminiscent of the saving of the righteous Noah from his generation in Genesis.[73] While the grape imagery appears earlier in *4 Ezra* 5:23 and again in the verses under discussion in this section, the plant imagery exists in both earlier and contemporaneous sources such as the prophets and other second temple literature such as Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls.[74] However, there are multiple interpretations of the grape/vine imagery;[75] Stone notes that:

> at the most, however, this sort of background may have determined the selection of the figure of speech. Here the language that originally described Israel is probably used to refer to the eschatological survivors, an idea found repeatedly in 4 Ezra.[76]

While it is quite possible that the idea of election referred to here specifically applies to Ezra,[77] because this statement derives from the mouths of the community such an application is unlikely. Nowhere else in *4 Ezra* does the community suggest that it is not somehow the remnant, and thus the elect, that survives. Here, then, the community's reference to Ezra's own election is to that of a leader of the remnant community, one without whom the community itself would be lost. In

[72] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 300; Henze, 262.
[73] See also *4 Ezra* 3:11; Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 300.
[74] See, for instance, *Biblical Antiquities* 28:4 and 1QH 6:15.
[75] For instance to discuss plentitude of wine (*1 Enoch* 10:19), as a description of the fruit from the tree of wisdom in the Garden of Eden (*1 Enoch* 32:4), as a comparison between Israel and the vine (*LAB* 12:8–9, 18:10–11, 23:12–13, 28:4), etc. See also Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 262; Gary Porton, "The Grape-Cluster in Jewish Literature and Art of Late Antiquity" *JJS* 27 (1976): 159–76; R. C. T. Hayward, "The Vine and Its Products as Theological Symbols in First Century Palestinian Judaism" *DUJ* 82 (1990): 9–18; Bruce W. Longenecker, *Eschatology and the Covenant: A Comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1–11* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).
[76] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 300. See also Sheinfeld on the idea of the remnant, "Who is the Righteous Remnant?"
[77] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 376.

other words, the grape symbolism should be interpreted referring to Ezra's position of leadership in the community.

That the grape is associated with two additional similes in *4 Ezra* suggests that its interpretation is tied specifically to these other examples. Ezra is associated with a "lamp in a dark place" and a "haven for a ship saved from a storm." While these two similes have no parallels elsewhere in *4 Ezra*, the image of a lamp in the darkness is replete with meaning: Ezra not only offers comfort during confusing (i.e. dark) times, but he also serves as the one who will offer clarity to the situation in which the community finds itself. This simile reinforces Ezra's role as leader, and is paralleled in other places, most obviously in *2 Baruch* 77:13–15:[78]

> For the shepherds of Israel have perished, and the lamps which gave light are extinguished, and the fountains from which we used to drink have withheld their streams. Now we have been left in the darkness and in the thick forest and in the aridness of the desert.
> And I [Baruch] answered and said to them:
> Shepherds and lamps and fountains came from the Law and when we go away, the Law will abide…[79]

While the narrative situation differs in *2 Baruch*, the ultimate meaning is the same—shepherds, lamps, and fountains all refer to the leadership found within leaders such as Baruch.[80] The meaning is equivalent in *4 Ezra*. The image of the ship and the haven is less prevalent. Stone notes that this likely reflects the fact that the Israelites were not a seafaring society, in contrast to the frequent nautical references in Greek literature.[81] However, *2 Baruch* again offers up a similar description in 85:10:

> For the youth of this world has passed away, and the power of creation is already exhausted, and the coming of the times is very near and has passed by. And the pitcher is near the well, and the ship to the harbor, and the journey to the city, and life to its end. Further, prepare yourselves so

[78] The use of a lamp as simile for a leader takes place in other prophetic and Second Temple texts. See, for instance, Isa 9:1 and 2 Pet 1:19.
[79] All quotations from *2 Baruch* are from A. F. J. Klijn, "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch" (*The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments.* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983), pages 615–652, unless otherwise noted.
[80] The meaning in *2 Baruch* also emphasizes Baruch himself as a kind of revelation on earth. See Part 3 for further discussion.
[81] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 379.

> that, when you sail and ascend from the ship, you may have rest and not be condemned when you have gone away.

In *2 Baruch*, however, the nautical reference refers to the eschaton rather than a simile for a leader as it should be understood in *4 Ezra*. The three similes of the grapes, lamp, and the haven as offered by the people in verse 42 highlight the important role that Ezra plays for the community, as defined by the community, and emphasize Ezra's election and his place among the people.

The community follows these similes of Ezra as leader with a guilt-statement, asking, "Are not the evils which have befallen us sufficient, that you also forsake us?" (12:43). This statement explains why they have sought out Ezra: the current crisis of the destruction of Zion is overwhelming, and the people need their leader, Ezra, to be present to lead them. Their concern over Ezra's absence reflects their fear of being left without guidance in the current crisis. In fact, Ezra's perceived abandonment is likened to the destruction of Zion when the people continue, "Therefore if you also forsake us, how much better it would have been for us if we had been consumed in the burning of Zion!" (12:43).[82] The reaction of the people to the loss of a leader, exemplified here in the wish of the people to have rather burned with Zion if they are going to lose their leader anyway, is found elsewhere in other second temple literature, such as *2 Baruch* 33:3.[83] However, the verse is best taken at a simpler level, that "we are *no better off* than those who died, if Ezra abandons us"[84] refers to their helplessness without a leader. That is, the people

[82] Stone (*Fourth Ezra*, 376) relies heavily upon his idea of the role reversal here, where the people's lament is akin to Ezra's laments earlier in the text, while Ezra's response is similar to the angel's response earlier. I would note that Ezra as leader serves in a position to comfort and lead the people. His situation is not reversed with the angel, but his position *in relation to* the people is similar—but not identical to!—the angel's position in relation to him. That is, Ezra is the inferior of the two when he is in dialogue with the angel, while here, when conversing with the people, Ezra serves on the top of the leadership hierarchy and thus it is only logical that he would offer consolation similar to what Uriel offers to him. This does not mean, however, that there is a role reversal with Ezra now taking on Uriel's role and viewpoint.

[83] "And now, if you abandon us too, it would have been better for all of us that we shall die first, and that then you should abandon us," *2 Baruch* 33:3; Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 379.

[84] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 379. Italics in original.

do not actually wish to have burned with the destruction of the temple, but that the loss of their leader as found in Ezra is *equivalent to* having been destroyed with the temple—without their leader, they are directionless, homeless, and without hope.

3.3.2.c Ezra's Response 12:45b–48

Ezra's response to the people is initially to comfort them: "Take courage, O Israel; and do not be sorrowful, O house of Jacob; for the Most High has you in remembrance, and the Mighty One has not forgotten you forever." This response reminds the people that Ezra is not, in fact, the community's only hope, and God will not forget the people.[85] Ezra continues his response, addressing the people's question of why he has left them. Ezra claims that he has only removed himself temporarily in order to "pray on account of the desolation of Zion and to seek mercy on account of the humiliation of our sanctuary" (12:48). Hogan argues that this response is misleading: nowhere in *4 Ezra* before this point does Ezra claim he went out specifically to pray for the people.[86] However, I would argue that Ezra's reasons for initiating his communication with God at the very beginning of the narrative is the desolation of Zion:

> I was troubled as I lay on my bed, and my thoughts welled up in my heart, because I saw the desolation of Zion and the wealth of those who lived in Babylon. My spirit was greatly agitated, and I began to speak anxious words to the Most High (3:1–3)

[85] This response—to remind the people to rely on God—is also found in *2 Baruch*, where it is the more common response to the unfolding crisis presented by the destruction of the temple. See also Hogan, 171; cf. Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 379. Stone argues heavily that this section sees Ezra as consoler of the people, in place of the consoling that Uriel gave Ezra in the dialogues. However, Ezra's response about God here does not coincide with Uriel's in the dialogues, "Both the visions and Ezra's speeches to the people (12:46–49 and 14:28–36) affirm Ezra's belief in God's continued mercy toward Israel, which Uriel rigorously denies in the dialogues" (Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 35). The consolation that Ezra offers, however, is akin to the consolation found through the Eagle vision; Stone does argue that Ezra's words here are the "exoteric expression of the meaning of the secret revelation of the eagle vision" (Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 379).

[86] Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 171. Cf. Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 379. Stone thinks that this points back specifically to the fourth episode: "which, though not strictly a prayer for Zion, is in fact a call for mercy and restoration of the city." In fact, it seems to me that it references *all* Ezra's past prayers and laments: one should not expect him to give a play-by-play to the community of all the specifics he addressed to the Most High and to Uriel in the earlier sections of the text.

Thus, Ezra's comments are not deceptive, as Hogan argues, but just a simplified response to the people in order to keep them informed as to what Ezra is doing while he is away from them. According to Hogan, Ezra is misleading the people because of God's injunction in the previous vision against sharing the revelation with anyone except the wise.[87] It seems to me more likely, however, that Ezra seeks to comfort a large group of people in a short amount of time. In order to do this, he must answer briefly and in a way that is understandable by the majority of the population. In other words, Ezra is not misleading the people but instead limiting his communication with them so that 1) everyone, *from least to greatest*, can understand, and 2) so that Ezra may continue to receive revelation without the interference of the community. In chapter 14 the revelation culminates with the re-giving of the 24 public books and the 70 secret books, and it is only after that point that Ezra teaches the people.

Stone argues that Ezra calls what he does "prayer" on behalf of the people because of his new role as prophet, indicating that the activity is mediating. According to this view, it is here that Ezra finally fully accepts his prophetic role.[88] As explained above, however, this viewpoint overemphasizes the process of Ezra *becoming* a prophet for the people: Ezra's prophetic status is a feature of his leadership role from the first instance where he interacts with members of the community, specifically with Paltiel in 5:16. This is not seen, however, only through Ezra's interactions with Paltiel in chapter 5 and the community here in chapter 12, but also in Ezra's specific questions addressed to God, found from the very start of the text. The questions are concerned with the fate of the community as a whole, and in fact with the fate of the entire

[87] Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 171. The theme of the wise will be taken up more fully in chapter four.
[88] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 377. While she does not place the same emphasis on the beginning of the role, Hogan, too, notes that Ezra is fulfilling his "prophetic role of intercessor" for the people here (Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 171). While there is no doubt that this is what Ezra is doing at this point in the narrative, it seems to me that acting as intercessor on behalf of the people is what he does throughout the entire book, and these sections where Ezra and the community interact only serve to highlight that his actions as a receiver of revelation are in fact on behalf of the people, and not just for personal benefit.

world. Ezra's actions from the beginning reflect his role as leader and intercessor on behalf of the people. Ezra acts as leader—a feature of which is his prophetic abilities—from the beginning of *4 Ezra*, shown through his concern for the people, even if the actual title "prophet" is not used until this point in the narrative.

3.3.2.d Conclusion of the Narrative 12:49–50

Ezra dismisses the people after his words of consolation, which the people seem to accept as there is no further dialogue and they leave Ezra alone so that he may continue to pray and receive revelation. Especially of note here is Ezra's comment in verse 49: "and after these days I will come to you." Previous scholars such as Box and Kabisch have argued "these days" refers back to 12:40 and note a problem of chronology; however Stone maintains that "'these days' are part of Ezra's "misleading" of the people and, in fact, mean the days in which he is praying on behalf of the people."[89] Unless you accept Stone's claim that Ezra is in fact lying to the people by stating that he came there to pray (see 12:48), which I have shown above is not the case, then Ezra's request is simply for more time in order to continue what he has already been doing throughout the narrative. There is no misleading of the community going on here, just Ezra insisting that he will continue with his current role, and will then return to the people after "these days," which he does indeed do in chapter 14.

3.3.3 Excursus: The remnant in *4 Ezra*[90]

[89] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 380.
[90] This excursus was originally presented as part of a larger paper on the remnant idea in Paul and Second Temple Jewish texts at the 3rd Enoch Nangeroni meeting. The chapter will appear in final form in Sheinfeld, "Who is the Righteous Remnant?"

The idea of the remnant in *4 Ezra* is tied intricately to the idea of election, and that Israel is elect is not challenged. Throughout the first three episodes, Israel's election is emphasized through Ezra's arguments against the current degraded status of Israel. In the first dialogue, Ezra reminds God that when the peoples and the nations were sinning, God chose Abraham and "made with him an everlasting covenant, and promised him that you would not forsake his descendants" (3:15). Ezra continues, highlighting the patriarchs to whom God made promises and emphasizing the giving of the law on Mount Sinai (3:19). Ezra's lament is over the evil heart which God did not take away from Israel (3:20), so they therefore continued to sin. However, Ezra asks, is Babylon better than Israel, that they should have dominion over her (3:28–36)? Ezra's lament acknowledges Israel's election but questions why Israel was allowed to sin if she is indeed God's chosen nation. Likewise in the second dialogue with the angel, Ezra reflects on the chosenness of Israel, selected by God from "all the multitude of people" (5:28) and subsequently scattered among the nations. Ezra argues that since the people of Israel are God's elect, it should be God who punishes them directly, not the nations (5:30). Again, in the third dialogue, Ezra reiterates Israel's status as the elect:

> All of this I have spoken before you, O Lord, because you have said that it was for us that you created this world. As for the other nations which have descended from Adam, you have said that they are nothing, and that they are like spittle, and you have compared their abundance to a drop from a bucket. And now, O Lord, behold, these nations, which are reputed as nothing, domineer over us and devour us. But we your people, whom you have called your first-born, only begotten, zealous for you, and most dear, have been given into their hands. If the world has indeed been created for us, why do we not possess our world as an inheritance? (6:55–59)

None of Ezra's complaints throughout the first three episodes call into question Israel's status as elect, but they do question God's role in the current political situation in light of Israel's election. In other words, Ezra asks how God could allow the nations of the earth, who are like "spittle," to conquer and rule over Israel.

The angel Uriel responds to Ezra's concerns about the elect of Israel in the third episode, where Uriel notes that the world was made for the sake of Israel, but that the "entrances of this world were made narrow and sorrowful and toilsome; they are few and evil, full of danger and involved in great hardships. But the entrances of the future world are broad and safe, and really yield the fruit of immortality" (7:11–14). Thus, the righteous must first pass through the harsh realities of this world before gaining admittance into the next. This leads to the discussion of the many versus the few: "the Most High made this world for the sake of the many, but the world to come for the sake of only a few" (8:1).[91] The righteous are never defined explicitly as Israel here, but based on Ezra's own concerns with Israel's election, the righteous should indeed be identified with Israel, who must first pass through the hardships of this world.[92]

At no point in these early passages in *4 Ezra* is the election of Israel specifically associated with the remnant. It is not until the apocalyptic visions of episodes 5–6 that the remnant is connected with the elect—that is, with Israel. The fifth episode is a vision of an eagle and a lion, reminiscent of Daniel 7, which requires an interpretation from the angel.[93] In the interpretation, the angel tells Ezra that the lion represents the messiah, who will judge the nations and destroy them, after which "he will deliver in mercy the remnant of my people, those who have been saved throughout my borders, and he will make them joyful until the end comes, the day of judgment, of which I spoke to you at the beginning" (12:34). This interpretation suggests

[91] Alden Thompson argued that, based on Ezra's poignant laments for the "many" who will perish which takes place in the third dialogue, Ezra was more concerned with general humanity than with the fate of Israel, see A. L. Thompson, *Responsibility for Evil in the Theodicy of 4 Ezra* Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 29 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 269. This is an unnecessary conclusion, however. See John J. Collins, "The Idea of Election in *4 Ezra*" *JSQ* 16 (2009), 87.

[92] Hogan argues that the theology that Uriel puts forth stands in a tradition that uses universal language and creates a dualism based on "ethical, rather than ethnic, lines" (133); that is, it does not specifically address Israel but all humanity in general. However, while Uriel utilizes universal language and does not highlight the importance of the covenant, the Torah still occupies a place of centrality in Uriel's theology. See Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 126–134, especially 133–134.

[93] While not named as such, Reynolds ("The Otherworldly Mediators") has successfully shown that it is indeed the angel who serves as interlocutor here.

two main points. First, the remnant belongs to the tribe of Israel, in spite of Uriel's universal language from the third episode.[94] Second, the remnant may only derive from those who are within the borders of the land; members of Israel who live in the Diaspora, then, are not to be saved.[95]

Episode 6 contains a vision of the man from the sea, interpreted by Uriel as a messiah figure who will reproach the assembled nations and then destroy them. He will then gather together the peaceful multitude which is made up of the "ten tribes which were led away from their own land into captivity in the days of King Hosea, whom Shalmaneser the king of the Assyrians led captive" (13:40), and together with them are the remnant "who are left of your people, who are found within my holy borders" (13:48). Again the remnant consists of Israelites who remain in the land; it is questionable whether the ten tribes can be considered part of the remnant, since they were not those remaining in the land, and in fact return to the land from a far away, mythical place beyond the Euphrates River.[96]

The remnant in *4 Ezra*, then, consists of righteous members of Israel who reside in the land at the time that the messiah comes to judge. However this remnant does not constitute all of Israel: Uriel makes it clear in the third dialogue that while many will live through the hardships of this world, only a few will be righteous enough to qualify for the world to come. The author in *4 Ezra* thus uses the remnant concept in order to suggest that only a small portion of Israel will survive. This strategic application of the remnant concept would encourage *4 Ezra*'s audience to

[94] See the discussion (and subsequent footnote) above about Uriel's universal language and its application to who forms the righteous; however, in light of the fifth episode, there is no doubt that the righteous from episode 3 should be defined as Israel.
[95] But see the discussion of episode 6 below.
[96] For a discussion on the Euphrates as a temporal boundary, see my forthcoming article, "The Euphrates as Temporal Marker in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*" (*forthcoming*).

follow the program set out in the narrative in order to be included in that final, saved remnant: believe in the imminence of the eschaton and observe the Torah.

3.3.4 *4 Ezra* 14

> And it came to pass on the third day while I was sitting under an oak, behold a voice came out of a bush opposite me and said "Ezra, Ezra." And I said, "Here I am, Lord," and I rose to my feet.
>
> Then he said to me, "I revealed myself in a bush and spoke to Moses, when my people were in bondage in Egypt; and I sent him and led my people out of Egypt; and I led him up to Mount Sinai. And I kept him with me many days; and I told him many wondrous things, and showed him the secrets of the times and declared to him the end of times. Then I commanded him, saying, 'These words you shall publish openly, and these you shall keep secret.' And now I say to you; Lay up in your heart the signs that I have shown you, the dreams that you have seen, and the interpretation that you have heard; for you shall be taken up from among men, and henceforth you shall be with my servant and with those who are like you, until the end times are ended. For the age has lost its youth, and the times begin to grow old. For the age is divided into twelve parts, and nine of its parts have already passed, as well as half of the tenth part; so two of its parts remain, besides half of the tenth part. Now therefore set your house in order, and reprove your people; comfort the lowly among them and instruct those that are wise. And now renounce the life that is corruptible, and put away from you mortal thoughts; cast away from you the burdens of man, and divest yourself now of your weak nature, and lay to one side the thoughts that are most grievous to you, and hasten to escape from these times. For evils worse than those which you have now seen happen shall be done hereafter. For the weaker the world becomes through old age, the more shall evils be multiplied among its inhabitants. For truth shall go farther away and falsehood shall come near. For the eagle which you saw in the vision is already hastening to come.
>
> Then I answered and said, "Let me speak in thy presence, Lord. For behold, I will go as thou hast commanded me, and I will reprove the people who are now living but who will warn those who will be born hereafter? For the world lies in darkness, and its inhabitants are without light. For the law has been burned, and so no one knows the things which have been done or will be done by thee. If then I have found favor before thee, send the holy spirit[97] into me, and I will write everything that has happened in the world from the beginning, the things which were written in thy law, that men may be able to find the path, and that those who wish to live in the last days may live."
>
> He answered me and said, "Go and gather the people, and tell them not to seek you for forty days. But prepare for yourself many writing tablets, and take with you Sarea, Dabria, Selemia, Elkana, and Asiel—these five, because they are trained to write rapidly; and you shall come here, and I will light in your heart the lamp of understanding, which shall not be put out until you finish what you are about to write. And when you have finished, some things you shall make public, and some you shall deliver in secret to the wise; tomorrow at this hour you shall begin to write."
>
> Then I went as he commanded me, and I gathered all the people together, and said to them, "Hear these words, O Israel. At first our fathers dwelt as aliens in Egypt, and they

[97] Or: spirit of holiness. See Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 425.

were delivered from there, and received the law of life, which they did not keep, which you also have transgressed after them. Then land was given to you for a possession in the land of Zion; but you and your fathers committed iniquity and did not keep the ways which the Most High commanded you. And because he is a righteous judge, he took from you what he had given in due time. And now you are here, and your brethren are farther in the interior. If you, then, will rule over your minds and discipline your hearts, you shall be kept alive, and after death you shall obtain mercy. For after death the judgment will come, when we shall live again; and then the names of the righteous will become manifest, and the deeds of the ungodly will be disclosed. But let no one come to me for forty days."

So I took the five men, as he commanded me, and we proceeded to the field, and remained there. And it came to pass, on the next day, behold, a voice called me, saying, "Ezra, open your mouth and drink what I give you to drink." Then I opened my mouth, and behold, a full cup was offered to me; it was full of something like water, but its color was like fire. And I took it and drank; and when I had drunk it, my heart poured forth understanding, and wisdom increased in my breast, and my spirit retained its memory; and my mouth was opened, and was no longer closed. And the Most High gave understanding to those five men, and by turns they wrote what was dictated, in characters which they did not know. They sat forty days, and wrote during the daytime, and ate their bread at night. As for me, I spoke in the daytime and was not silent at night. So during the forty days ninety–four books were written. And when the forty days were ended, the Most High spoke to me, saying, "Make public the twenty–four books that you wrote first and let the worthy and the unworthy read them; but keep the seventy that were written last, in order to give them to the wise among your people. For in them are springs of understanding, the fountains of wisdom and the river of knowledge." And I did so. In the seventh year of the sixth week, five thousand years and three months and twenty–two days after creation. At that time Ezra was caught up, and taken to the place of those who are like him, after he had written all these things. And he was called the Scribe of the knowledge of the Most High forever.

3.3.4.a Ezra's Call and the Parallels with Moses

This chapter begins with God's call to Ezra. The call as presented here is reminiscent of other double calls made by God to important biblical figures; in Gen 22:11 with Abraham's call, Exod 3:4 with Moses' call, and 1 Sam 3:10 with Samuel's call.[98] Ezra's response is akin to the response of his biblical predecessors; the call and response is meant to draw clear parallels for the audience of *4 Ezra*, especially to that of Moses and the burning bush episode in Exod 3:2. The connection is made explicit in 14:3 when the Most High specifically references his call to Moses from the burning bush: "I revealed myself in a bush and spoke to Moses." Further, God

[98] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 410.

continues to describe his interaction with Moses, paralleling it to what is and will be happening with Ezra; this includes the revelation of Torah as well as secret books.

The call draws on the biblical precedent of Moses and the receiving of the Torah in order to set up Ezra's authority as a prophet like Moses and his authority to re-receive of the Torah and other books through the use of parallel language.[99] Ezra's call and his dialogue directly with God[100] establishes Ezra as the ultimate prophet-*cum*-Moses, one worthy of receiving the highest revelation, that is, the Torah, in addition to the seventy secret books; as such, he is uniquely equipped for teaching the people how to handle the current crisis of the destruction of the temple and its aftermath. This last episode functions as the narrative climax to what Ezra experiences in the first six episodes: finally, Ezra is no longer privately lamenting and communicating with the divine. Instead Ezra's role has now moved completely from the realm of private musings and revelation into the realm of the public, as he shifts to speaking with God directly and to exhorting the people, the role that the community has been asking that he return to from chapter five onwards.

It should be noted that scholars disagree on how to approach chapter 14. It has often been treated as an appendix or epilogue to the entire narrative of *4 Ezra* due to its distinctive character, which differs from the previous visions and dialogues.[101] Other interpretations include that of Box, who argues that chapter 14 represents an attempt by the redactor of *4 Ezra* to secure a place for apocalyptic literature within the tradition of the oral law,[102] and of Stone, who argues that Ezra's final speech to the people (14:28–36) exemplifies Uriel's point of view as presented in the

[99] That Ezra is worthy to receive the Torah is a trope present in rabbinic literature and discussed more fully in chapter 1.
[100] As opposed to dialogue with or interpretation through the angel Uriel. See Reynolds, "The Otherworldly Mediators," and Meredith J. C. Warren, "'My Heart Poured Forth Understanding': *4 Ezra*'s Fiery Cup as Hierophagic Consumption" *SR* (March 2015), accessed 7 April 2015, http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0008429814566212.
[101] See, for instance, Richard Kabisch, *Das vierte Buch Esra auf seine Quellen untersucht* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1889), 117ff. See also Breech, "These Fragments," 274.
[102] G. H. Box, *The Ezra-Apocalypse* (London: Pitman and Sons, 1912), lix.

dialogues at the beginning of the book.[103] Most recently, Hogan has argued that the position represented by Ezra in the visions and in chapter 14 are the same, and do not represent the same as the position held by either Uriel or Ezra during the dialogues—and thus represent the actual view held by the author, while the positions of Uriel and Ezra in the dialogues reflect competing theological viewpoints.[104] Both Stone and Hogan, however, are well aware of the importance of this last episode in the larger overriding structure of *4 Ezra*: "The indications provided here [in chapter 14] show that what is involved in this vision is not merely a "legitimation" or a historical context of the book. The vision completes and complements the process of revelation that is one of the chief motifs of the book."[105] I argue that the climax of the book takes place in this seventh episode;[106] the entire narrative of *4 Ezra* leads up to the re-giving of the twenty–four books of scripture by God to Ezra, and subsequently to the people, along with the additional seventy secret books to be shared with the wise. In addition, this act of re-receiving the Torah and disseminating its knowledge to the people is the ultimate act of Ezra as leader: here he is not just prophet but also teacher and maintainer of the only tradition that will ultimately save (at least a remnant of) the people, even once he is absent from them.

3.3.4.b Ezra speaks to the People

Before Ezra's dialogue with God is finished, Ezra makes a request to write "everything that has happened in the world from the beginning [and] the things which were written in thy

[103] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 30, 16, following Brandenburger and Harnisch.
[104] Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 35. Earlier in this chapter I pointed out the overabundance of literature emphasizing the question of which character represents the actual author of *4 Ezra* and why it is problematic. See S. Sheinfeld, "Oral Performance and the Function of *4 Ezra*," *Biblical Performance Criticism* (15 February 2013), accessed 7 April 2015, http://www.biblicalperformancecriticism.org/index.php/20-full-text-articles/202-oral-performance-and-the-function-of-4-ezra.
[105] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 412. Hallbäck, too, notes its importance, although his argumentation is focused around narratology. (G. Hallbäck, "The Fall of Zion and the Revelation of the Law: An interpretation of *4 Ezra*." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 6/2 [1992]), 281–2.
[106] Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 205.

law" (14:22). This request stems from Ezra's concern for the people since these writings will be available to them even once Ezra is gone. The request also reinforces Ezra's place as leader: Ezra uses his only direct interaction with God[107] in order to make requests on behalf of the people so that they will know the history and the laws. Ezra's concern for the people can be seen throughout the narrative, especially in his own anxiety regarding the remnant during the first three episodes of *4 Ezra*, as expressed in the dialogues with Uriel. Here in episode 7, however, it comes out in his direct request to God, where his request is not out of angst, but out of concern for the people, since the "law has been burned, and so no one knows the things which have been done or will be done by" God (14:21). Thus, Ezra asks for the "holy spirit" or "spirit of holiness" to be sent on to him in order to pass along this knowledge to the community. This spirit should be interpreted as a spirit of understanding or prophecy and is found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature.[108] Ezra's act signifies that his ultimate concern is to guide the people.

Ezra's speech to the people can be broken down into multiple parts[109] including an introduction, a call to attention that reflects on the Deuteronomic formulae used often by Moses ("Hear these words, O Israel"), followed by a summary of the history of Israel. Ezra ends the speech with an exhortation to the people and then a concluding injunction which requests that the community remain apart from him for 40 days, a request that would not have been exceptional to the community since Ezra has been requesting to be left alone throughout the narrative in order to pray and receive revelation. These 40 days are also a nod to Moses' time on the mountaintop,

[107] See Reynolds, "The Otherworldly Mediators," 180.
[108] For instance in Isa 63:10, *Ps Sol* 17:37, CD 2:12, 1QH 7:7, along with examples from rabbinic literature and the New Testament. The phrasing is not always written as "holy spirit" even if the idea is the same; see *4 Ezra* 5:22 for another example of a "spirit of understanding". *1 Enoch* 91:1 uses "spirit," *Jubilees* 25:14 uses "spirit of truth," *Test Patr Levi* 2:3 uses "spirit of understanding." Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 427.
[109] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 433.

reiterating the connection between Moses as the first leader, prophet, and lawgiver, and Ezra, who is now fulfilling that role. Stone argues that this speech contains component parts that together make up the genre of a farewell speech (*Abschiedungsrede*), but I argue this is not the case because it lacks some of the main elements for this genre.[110] Instead, this speech should be considered the final part of the narrative frame that I have been analysing throughout this chapter.

Ezra's version of the summary of the history of Israel in this speech[111] focuses almost exclusively on the sins of the people and God's grace. Because of Israel's unfaithfulness as told through this summary, God eventually[112] punished Israel. The focus on the sins of the people is in order to emphasize Ezra's solution to the contemporaneous crisis: the people need to maintain self-control in order to be righteous, and they need to maintain their belief in eschatological salvation. Immediately following the summary of the history of Israel, Ezra requests 40 days of solitude, implying that after 40 days he will return to the community. His reminder of Israel's unfaithfulness in the past and the reminder to remain righteous, combined with his request for 40 days of solitude alludes to Moses' time away receiving the Torah (Exod 24:18; cf. Exod 34:28) is reminiscent of Moses' 40-day interlude with the Lord resulted in Israelite's disbelief and fear, and led to the creation and worship of the golden calf (Exod 32). Thus Ezra's speech to the people is a reminder to remain steadfast while he is absent now and in the future, emphasizing once again Ezra's leadership role toward the community.

[110] Most importantly it lacks any reflection on the imminent death of Ezra. For a discussion of farewell speeches as a genre, see H.-J. Michel, *Die Abschiedsrede des Paulus an die Kirche Apg. 20,17–38: Motivgeschichte und theologische Bedeutung* (SANT 35; München: Kösel-Verlag, 1973), 36–54.
[111] This is not the first time we have seen this genre used in *4 Ezra*. See, most obviously, the beginning of chapter 3.
[112] Or "in due time (14:32)." This phrase emphasizes that Israel was not immediately punished for the sins of the past, Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 433.

The following pericope tells of Ezra's heavenly revelation of the 94 books. The placement of this revelation immediately following Ezra's instructions to the people to remain righteous and to focus on eschatological salvation suggests that these books will assist the community with this task. The knowledge to be gained through the revealed books will thus serve to guide the people. Unlike Ezra's previous visions, his upcoming revelation is not just for him but also for the benefit of the community. In fact, while only Ezra will receive the revelation directly, the presence of five scribes and their divinely given spirit of understanding (see 14:42) indicates the public nature of this revelation. Ezra is commanded to share this entire revelation with the people—24 books to be shared with everyone, regardless of status, and 70 secret books which will still be shared among the wise (14:26). Ultimately the entire message is to be disseminated among at least some of the people. The revelation, then, is an extension of Ezra's exhortation to the people.

While this speech is Ezra's longest one to the people, interaction with them is kept to a minimum. Ezra uses this platform in order to remind the people of their ancestors' sins and how those sins have led to the current situation—a situation which is not specifically named here but which the audience would understand to be the post-destruction crisis. Since the destruction of the temple plays such a large role in the earlier dialogues between Ezra and Uriel, and also in the fourth episode with the mourning woman, it can be assumed that the destruction of the temple and the violation of Zion makes up at least part of the crisis that Ezra hints at here. However, Ezra's emphasis in his speech is on the observance of the "law of life" (14:30), that is, the Torah. Stone has thus argued that since the destruction and restoration of Zion are not explicitly mentioned in the speech, the concern of the narrative must relate only to the Torah.[113] However, while not explicit in the narrative, Ezra's speech is meant to exhort the people to continue their

[113] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 434.

observance of the law in light of the sins that led to the destruction of Zion. That is, the fundamental backdrop for the exhortation to remain righteous and look toward the eschaton is the sins that brought about the current situation. Ezra's role as leader is to remind the community that the judgment of the righteous will indeed come, if only after death, and so to hold fast and "rule over your minds and discipline your hearts" (14:34). This section simultaneously looks toward Ezra's upcoming revelation that he will teach to the community while reminding the people of the sins of the past.

3.3.4.c Ezra's Final Revelation

After Ezra's speech he takes the five scribes assigned by God to the field where he had previously received revelation, and it is there where Ezra receives his ultimate revelation: that of the 94 books. While Ezra does not directly interact with the community through the rest of the narrative, it is inferred that he will do so, since he is commanded to give 24 books to the people and the other 70 to share only with the wise.[114] Ezra thus emerges from the self-imposed isolation of the earlier episodes in order to lead the people through the revelation of God. It is with this last revelation that he engages in his ultimate act as leader by shifting to a completely public position. This is significant because Ezra is now acting fully as a leader in the public sphere; he has received his revelations and has knowledge, both esoteric and exoteric, to share with the people in order to guide them fully through the crisis in which they have found themselves. Ezra is finally available to serve the community with all his attention.

[114] The 24 books refer most likely to the books that now make up the Hebrew Bible; this would be one of our earliest references to such a canon. Josephus mentions 22 books in *Contra Apionem* 1.38, a reference that may be earlier or at least contemporary with *4 Ezra*. The remaining question is over which books might make up the 70 that are to be shared only with the wise. It seems quite possible that *4 Ezra* itself is one of these books. See Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 441; see also my analysis in the next chapter.

Following Ezra's revelation and dissemination of the books to the community, Ezra is taken up: "At that time Ezra was caught up, and taken to the place of those who are like him, after he had written all these things. And he was called the Scribe of the knowledge of the Most High forever" (14:50). In a recent article, Jason Zurawski argues that while Ezra's assumption in the narrative of *4 Ezra* happens literarily immediately following Ezra's revelation and God's instructions on the dissemination of the texts, that the narrative of *4 Ezra* may actually serve as a prequel to the biblical Ezra as found in Ezra-Nehemiah.[115] That is, the assumption in 14:50 could be interpreted as occurring after Ezra leaves Babylon and returns to Judah in order to teach the people the books of the law.[116] Zurawski's interpretation would leave many years between Ezra's receiving of the books and his ultimate translation to heaven, during which time Ezra leads exiles from Babylon back to Judah and then acts as leader for the community in Judah.

3.4 Conclusion

The literary frame of *4 Ezra* creates a contextual space where Ezra's dialogue with Uriel and his eschatological visions have meaning beyond Ezra's own experience. Instead, Ezra is the leader of the people, and his questioning of God's actions and his subsequent revelations reflect directly on his place as the prophetic communal authority. The interactions between Ezra and the inscribed community are nestled among Ezra's interaction with otherworldly beings and visions and provide a literary grounding of Ezra as the archetypical authority figure who bridges the divine world with the concerned

[115] Jason M. Zurawski, "Ezra Begins: *4 Ezra* as Prequel and the Making of a Superhero," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures* (ed. Eibert Tigchelaar; BETL 270; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 289–304, especially 298–302.
[116] See my analysis of the character Ezra through Second Temple literature in chapter one.

community. While Ezra must eventually leave the people, it is not before he receives the ultimate guidebooks with which to leave them: the 24 public books, representative of holy scripture, and the 70 secret books representing esoteric knowledge reserved only for the wise serve as Ezra's final revelation and his final offer to the community. Ezra leaves behind not necessarily a leader to follow in his place, but the knowledge of what is to be done through these heavenly writings. The ones who can understand and interpret them are the wise who will serve as leaders of the community.

Ezra is first called back to the community in 5:16–20a, where the chief of the people approach him. The language used by Paltiel in his address to Ezra suggests that 1) a leadership hierarchy exists in the inscribed community, where Paltiel stands below Ezra but above the community-at-large, and that 2) the community fears Ezra's absence from them because they feel directionless without his presence. This latter point can be seen through the metaphor that Ezra should not be "like a shepherd who leaves his flock in the power of cruel wolves." The alternative to Ezra's leadership, then, is subjugation under unspecified enemies[117] and a lack of guidance that can lead to loss of salvation.

Similar language is used the next time Ezra is approached in 12:40–50. This time, however, it is not just the chief Paltiel but the entire community who asks Ezra to return to the community in order to lead them. Ezra's position as leader is again reiterated through the use of the similes of the cluster of grapes from the vintage, the lamp in a dark place, and the haven for a ship saved from the storm. This language also emphasizes Ezra's own chosenness, which is reflected in the remnant nature of the community. While Ezra is called prophet for the first time here, I have argued that his prophesying has been

[117] Who could, theoretically, be competing Jewish leaders.

an essential attribute of his position at the top of the leadership hierarchy from the beginning of the narrative.

Ezra reiterates his commitment as leader to the people by claiming that his absence is necessary for their own good—Ezra is praying to God on behalf of the community. That is, even in his absence Ezra is serving the people as intermediary between them and God. Ezra encourages them to return to their homes with a promise that soon he will come back to lead them. Ezra does indeed return to the people in chapter 14, where in a call type-scene that closely recalls the call of Moses, God prepares Ezra to directly receive divine revelation. Ezra speaks to the people, reminding them through a review of history that they have not kept their side of the covenant with God. Ezra calls on them to control their actions, to act righteously, and to prepare for eschatological salvation. Then, Ezra conducts his final (in this narrative) act as leader: he drinks from the fiery cup[118] and receives the divine revelation: 24 holy books to be shared with all the people, and 70 to be shared with only the wise. This revelation, unlike the previous ones in the narrative, is not just for Ezra's own edification. Ezra needs the assistance of the five scribes in order to properly receive and pass it along, and so from the beginning it is a communal event.

The narrative frame of Ezra as leader, as seen through his interactions with the community in 5:16–20a, 12:40–50 and the entirety of chapter 14, serve to place his dialogues and revelations in the context of the community which he serves. Without them, he is a lone seer arguing against God, as Job did. While Ezra's place as one of God's chosen is indeed emphasized in the narrative, one reason for his chosenness is

[118] For an interpretation of the fiery cup and Ezra's other eating and fasting habits in *4 Ezra*, see Warren, "'My Heart Poured Forth Understanding.'"

because he argues with God on behalf of the community. Ezra is leader and prophet of the community from the beginning of *4 Ezra* until its conclusion. And as such Ezra leaves his community with the ultimate successor, that is, the instructions offered by the Torah. Whosoever interprets them correctly is considered among the wise, and thus to whom the community should turn to for a leader following Ezra's ascent.

Chapter Four

The Historical Implications for Leadership as Portrayed in *4 Ezra*

4.1 Introduction

This chapter moves from the literary to the socio-historical; while the previous chapter focused on a predominantly literary analysis of leadership as portrayed by the figure of Ezra in *4 Ezra*, keeping historical concerns to a minimum, this chapter shifts to a grounding of the text in its socio-historical context. While I have hitherto narrowed my focus to the narrative concerns of the community around leadership, faced with the potential loss of Ezra as their only guidance, I now expand the area of focus to include potential conclusions that can be drawn from *4 Ezra* about leadership in post-destruction Jewish communities. I argue that *4 Ezra* does not derive from a sectarian environment and is not meant for a sectarian audience, and therefore its emphasis on leadership—and the message of the text as a whole—is meant to reach a broader Jewish audience. This argument goes against the more popular scholarly opinion that *4 Ezra* was written for a group that the text calls "the wise" (*4 Ezra* 14:45–46), not unlike "the wise" found in Daniel 11–12. Instead, I propose that the intended audience of *4 Ezra* is the broader Jewish community, and that the terminology of the wise in *4 Ezra* 14:45–46 is used to lend legitimacy to the text of *4 Ezra*. Thus, with the emphasis on imminent eschatology and on Torah observance throughout *4 Ezra*, I propose that the leader type proffered by the narrative is one who supports these ideas and thus one who maintains the correct interpretation of scripture.

4.2 Socio-Historical Location of *4 Ezra*

Determining the social location of *4 Ezra* is a difficult task. Knowing the approximate date when the text was written based on both internal and external evidence[1] only offers a general knowledge of the context; we know that the text was produced in the late first or early

[1] See comments on dating *4 Ezra* in chapter three, 3.2.1.

second century of the common era, which places it about a generation after the destruction of the second temple, most likely before the Diaspora revolt in 115 C.E., and certainly before the Bar Kokhba revolt (132–135 C.E.) and the codification of the Mishnah (c. 200 C.E.). Like the dating, the provenance is fairly certain: *4 Ezra* was written in Judaea, most likely originally in Hebrew, and thus is a good representation of at least one Jewish community in Judaea dealing with the destruction of the second temple.[2]

Working beyond the date and provenance is challenging. Bruce Longenecker presents the difficulty of the situation succinctly:

> If the text of 4 Ezra claims to reveal mysteries of the end time, it reveals very few mysteries in relation to its own social setting. The enterprise of reconstructing 4 Ezra's social context is largely determined by the extent to which its narrative is indicative of concrete social realities that lie behind the narrative. On the one hand, there remains the danger of a simplistic "referential fallacy"—the assumption that literary elements correspond to concrete social realities outside the narrative. On the other hand, it is often thought, and may seem likely, that narratives frequently betray aspects of their social contexts, so that an author and/or a community are recognisable to one extent or another within the narrative.[3]

As I discussed in the introduction, literary evidence is often the only evidence scholars of antiquity have when attempting to draw conclusions on the social historical world in which a text was produced. The same applies to *4 Ezra*. I posit that features of the text can indeed shed light on the socio-historical world, and the literary analysis about leadership in *4 Ezra* can be used to reconstruct that world. Below I discuss features that illuminate the world in which *4 Ezra* was produced, with a specific eye toward issues of community and leadership.

---

[2] For a discussion on *4 Ezra* (and other pseudepigrapha) as Jewish, see James Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), especially chapter one which contains a discussion of criteria. For a basis as understanding *4 Ezra* to have communal influence, see Henze, "*Fourth Ezra* and *Second Baruch*: Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First Century Apocalyptic Literature" (*JBL* 131.1 [2012]: 181–200) which argues for both oral and written development of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* based on the content of each text. This development suggests a performative nature to the texts, and in order for there to be a performance there must be an audience and interaction between the author and the audience. For more on the *Nachleben* of *4 Ezra* see Karina Martin Hogan, "The Preservation of *4 Ezra* in the Vulgate: Thanks to Ambrose, not Jerome," in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall* (ed. M. Henze and G. Boccaccini; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 381–402.

[3] Bruce W. Longenecker, "Locating 4 Ezra: A Consideration of its Social Setting and Functions," *JSJ* 28 (1997): 271.

4.3 Issues of Social Location

Like most apocalypses from the Second Temple period, *4 Ezra* was previously thought to come from a small, sectarian community.[4] This idea derived from the concept that apocalypses do not represent any type of mainstream Judaism—that instead they were texts written for a small community "whose members had a strong sense of group identity in their separateness from more mainstream forms of Jewish life."[5] According to this way of thinking, the separateness can be seen through language that is indicative of social divisions—language that is obvious in *4 Ezra* in terms of the dialogue between Uriel and Ezra in the first three episodes. However, Longenecker notes that there are at least three major issues with identifying the text of *4 Ezra* with its own sectarian community.[6] First, the assumption underlying the idea that all apocalypses, *4 Ezra* included, derive from a sectarian communities is no longer tenable.[7] In a 1989 article on the social setting of apocalypses, Lester L. Grabbe argues that the authors of some apocalyptic texts may have been individual scribes or priests who were in fact targeting community leaders.[8] If that were the case, there is no need to assume that the author or intended audience is a disenfranchised or separate community (i.e. a sect). Similarly, P. R. Davies argues that many of the concepts found in apocalyptic literature are not necessarily "counter-establishment."[9] If scribes were the writers of the text, a conclusion which is easy to make since

[4] See Longenecker, "Locating 4 Ezra," 272–3, who reviews the major literature that discusses *4 Ezra* as a piece of sectarian literature. Cf. H.C. Kee, "The Man in Fourth Ezra: Growth of a Tradition," (*SBL 1981 Seminar Papers*. Edited by K. H. Richards; Chicago: Scholars Press, 1981), 199–208.
[5] Longenecker, "Locating 4 Ezra," 272.
[6] Longenecker, "Locating 4 Ezra," 274–5.
[7] Longenecker, "Locating 4 Ezra," 275; J. H. Charlesworth, "In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation," in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth and C.A. Evans; *JSPS* 14: Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 23.
[8] Lester L. Grabbe, "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism," *JSP* 4 (1989): 27–47.
[9] P.R. Davies, "The Social World of Apocalyptic Writings" in *The World of Ancient Israel* (ed. by R. E. Clements; Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989), 251–71, here 265.

the scribes made up part of the educated upper class,[10] then the authors of the apocalypses must have been part of the intellectual elite as well. Thus the authors of the apocalypses must have participated in mainstream society, even if they were discontented with the status quo. Davies argues that the interpretation of the "signs of the times […] became an important pedagogical tool in the instruction of their people."[11] Knibb makes a similar claim as to the authorship of the Jewish apocalypses, and argues that *4 Ezra* was produced by scholars of scripture rather than by a sectarian group.[12] He even goes so far as to make the connection between the author of *4 Ezra* and the rabbinic circles that he claims existed during the writing of the text—an argument that will be discussed further below.[13]

Since it cannot be assumed that the author of an apocalypse belongs to a sectarian group, this leads to the second point: there is no obvious dichotomy between insider and outsider groups in *4 Ezra.* Even within the dialogues Ezra's concerns reflect concerns for the remainder of Israel rather than just a small community. Thus, *4 Ezra* does not seem to be addressing itself to its own small sectarian group.

The third issue, according to Longenecker, relates to the relationship between *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. *2 Baruch*, a text which will be examined in detail in the following section, has a long history of being associated with *4 Ezra*, and has been called a text that falls "well within the mainstream of rabbinic Judaism."[14] While the exact relationship between *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* is

[10] D. Andrew Teeter, "Scribes and Scribalism," in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (eds. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 1201–1204.
[11] Longenecker, "Locating 4 Ezra," 275; Cf. Davies, "Social World," 265. Note that Davies' argument came out of the discussion of whether apocalypticism arose from prophecy or wisdom circles. This dichotomy has been shown to be irrelevant, however since both wisdom and prophecy contributed to the development of apocalyptic literature, so his arguments must be taken already with a grain of salt. See Karina Martin Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2008), 1–8; 223.
[12] M. A. Knibb, "Apocalyptic and Wisdom in 4 Ezra" in *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 64.
[13] Knibb, "Apocalyptic and Wisdom," 73 n48.
[14] J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (2nd ed.; New York: Crossroad, 1998), 222.

uncertain, that there is some sort of relationship has been confirmed repeatedly.[15] However, if *2 Baruch* promotes mainstream ideologies and has a close relationship to *4 Ezra*, then how does one justify calling *4 Ezra* sectarian while *2 Baruch* is not considered as such? It is more likely that Stone has it right when he says that "those who composed [*4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*] were socially coherent enough to cultivate a common tradition, and one that was clearly at home in Judaism of the period following the destruction."[16]

These issues provide a basic sampling of the problem with calling *4 Ezra*—and all apocalypses—"sectarian," and with thus making the assumption that it was not written by a mainstream author or was not produced for a broader audience. By "mainstream" here I simply mean not sectarian. Both the use of these terms—mainstream and sectarian—and their definitions can be highly problematic; I am not seeking, however, to create taxonomies within first- and second century Judaism, but to differentiate between an obviously sectarian group which clearly removes itself from the larger community (such as the Qumran community), versus those who may hold a variety of distinct opinions but who still consider themselves part of something larger—a view found within both *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. What can be determined, then, about *4 Ezra* is that it is *not* specifically a sectarian text, that it sought to propose and respond to a problem created by the destruction of the second temple, and that it was created and performed for an audience, and thus an audience of sorts can be assumed to have heard and responded to its message. Therefore the emphasis on leadership throughout *4 Ezra* was also meant to reach this audience and contribute to the larger message of the narrative. In other

[15] For the most recent theory, see Matthias Henze, "*Fourth Ezra* and *Second Baruch*: Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First Century Apocalyptic Literature," *JBL* 131.1 (2012): 181-200, here 184–185.
[16] Michael E. Stone, "The Messiah in 4 Ezra," in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (ed. J. Neusner *et al*; Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987), 219.

words, *4 Ezra*'s inscribed teachings about authority reflect the socio-historical world from which it came.

4.3.1 The Intended Audience of *4 Ezra*

While the question of authorship has been discussed frequently,[17] the intended audience of *4 Ezra* has received shorter shrift. The language used internally in *4 Ezra* for its intended audience is "the wise." Scholars have derived this idea from *4 Ezra* 14:45–46, where for forty days Ezra receives the ninety-four books via inspired revelation while five scribes write down what Ezra dictates:

> And when the forty days were ended, the Most High spoke to me, saying, "Make public the twenty-four books that you wrote first and let the worthy and the unworthy read them; but keep the seventy that were written last, in order to give them to the wise among your people."

Michael Knibb was the first to point out that this statement implied that *4 Ezra* was not meant for just anyone, but for a learned audience made up of scribes.[18] He bases this interpretation on the five scribes to whom Ezra dictates his heavenly revelations in chapter 14, five scribes who, Knibb states, are a "deliberate allusion to Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai and his five famous disciples."[19] The scribes allude to the intended audience of *4 Ezra*, Knibb argues, must be referencing the rabbinic circles extant at the time of the writing of the text. Supporting this line of thought, other scholars, such as Lester Grabbe and Bruce Longenecker,[20] also identify the intended audience of *4 Ezra* as members of early rabbinic circles. However, Longenecker takes the argument further, proposing that the author of *4 Ezra* should be placed among the rabbinic

[17] See chapter three, section 3.2.1.
[18] Michael A. Knibb, "Apocalyptic and Wisdom in 4 Ezra," *JSJ* 13 (1982); repr. in *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 271–288. Cf. Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 222–227.
[19] Knibb, "Apocalyptic," 288 n. 49.
[20] Longenecker, "Locating 4 Ezra," and Lester L. Grabbe, "Chronography in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch" (*Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers*; ed. K. H. Richards; SBLSP 20, Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981), 62. Grabbe is careful not to make a definitive argument connecting *4 Ezra*'s social location with the rabbinic sages but only posits it as an option.

sages at Yavneh, the supposed location where the early rabbinic sages gathered after the temple was destroyed.[21] Longenecker supports this social location through two main arguments: first, since Ezra is described as a scribe, and since those who gathered at Yavneh were in fact sages—or were perceived as wise/educated people, just as a scribe would have been—then, Longenecker argues, it is possible that the author of *4 Ezra* was one of those who gathered at Yavneh. Second, Longenecker draws upon the similarities between *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, and, given the longstanding scholarly opinions that *2 Baruch* reflects many of the tendencies in the emerging rabbinic Judaism, argues that it is also likely that *4 Ezra* also reflects some of these tendencies and can be associated in a similar way.[22] In this way Longenecker argues that *4 Ezra* was written both by and for some rabbinic sages at Yavneh in the post-destruction period.

However, what can actually be known of Yavneh as an historical location is in itself an ongoing discussion in current scholarship, with favour currently falling toward the minimalist approach. While the past trend was to argue, building off Shaye Cohen's article,[23] that Yavneh was the Jewish equivalent for the Council of Nicea, current scholarly thought leans heavily away from this interpretation,[24] instead arguing that the evidence from Yavneh is generally late and comprises an idealistic portrait of the period after the destruction of the temple.[25] If Yavneh as an

[21] Longenecker, "Locating 4 Ezra," 277.
[22] Longenecker, "Locating 4 Ezra," 278.
[23] See Shaye J.D. Cohen, "The Significance of Yavneh: Pharisees, Rabbis, and the End of Jewish Sectarianism" (Hebrew Union College, Annual 55 [1984]), 27–54.
[24] For the dismantling of Yavneh as myth, see R. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 274–77; S. Z. Leiman, *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture* (Hamden: Archon, 1976), 120–124; and J.P. Lewis, "What Do We Mean by Jabneh?" *JBR* 32 (1964): 125–132. James VanderKam, in *From Revelation to Canon* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 11, refers to the above authors as having "pulverized the thesis that a 'council' of Jamnia closed the third and final division of the canon."
[25] See Daniel Boyarin, "The Yavneh-Cycle of the Stammaim and the Invention of the Rabbis," in *Creation and Composition: The Contribution of the Bavli Redactors (Stammaim) to the Aggada* (ed. J. L. Rubenstein; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 237–290; Catherine Hezser, *The Social Structure of the Rabbinic Movement in Roman Palestine* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 5–7, 171–180.

academy of learning is a construction of the Stammaim,[26] who are dated no earlier than the sixth century C.E., then it cannot be a social location for the production and audience of *4 Ezra*. Thus, Longenecker's argument does not stand up to this careful scrutiny.

I assert here that the intended audience to whom the author of *4 Ezra* wrote is the *entire* community of Jews in Judaea; the intended audience does not need to coincide with just "the wise" among the people, as alluded to in chapter 14. Rather than attempting to connect the wise with some contemporaneous group that we know little about, I propose that the wise who are referred to in *4* Ezra is actually meant to serve as an explanation for why the text of *4 Ezra* has only been "made available" to the community recently, in the late first or early second century C.E., rather than around the narrative time frame, after the destruction of the *first* temple. That is, I am positing that the audience is not a specialized audience made up of only scribes, but is rather broader, and that the direction to Ezra within chapter 14 to keep the seventy books for the wise is a literary argument created to establish legitimacy for the narrative of *4 Ezra*. If the text itself can be identified as one of these secret books, which is likely,[27] then two things result: first, the intended audience of the text would be identified with the wise. That is, one need not find some group of Jews from the late first/early second centuries to call "wise" and therefore to identify with the intended audience; instead, the text's rhetoric implies that whoever reads/hears *4 Ezra* from that original provenance is being encouraged to align with the claims of the text, through the desire to be identified among "the wise." Second, that the text of *4 Ezra* had only surfaced recently, rather than with other scripture, gains legitimacy because of this self-identification of the intended audience with the wise, that is, the select few granted access to the

[26] For more on the Stammaim, see Jeffrey L. Rubenstein, "Social and Institutional Settings of Rabbinic Literature," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature* (Ed. C. E. Fonrobert and M. S. Jaffee; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 70.
[27] Michael E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 439; David G. Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986), 97.

text. The use of the wise therefore establishes both the legitimacy of the text and the relevance of its message. Thus while previous research which identifies these wise with a select few individuals affiliated with early rabbinic Judaism, without sufficient evidence that such a community existed, I argue that the wise could be identified with any of the community members who remained in Judaea after the destruction of the second temple. Since literarily *4 Ezra* suggests that a leader should be an interpreter of the Torah and one who teaches anticipation of the eschaton, it appears that the narrative of *4 Ezra* intends that the wise, being able to interpret the scripture left to them by Ezra, should take over leadership from Ezra following his ascension. Further, the intended audience of *4 Ezra* should be identified with any Jew in Judaea following the destruction of the second temple. It then follows that one who is able to understand and apply the message found in *4 Ezra* in Judaea in the period following the destruction—who is thus able to correctly interpret scripture through the lens of observance and belief in the imminence of the eschaton—should in fact serve as a leader of the community.[28]

4.4 Conclusion: The Portrayal of Leadership in *4 Ezra* and its Implication for Leadership in the Post-Destruction Period

Above I discussed the possible intended audiences for *4 Ezra* and concluded that a mainstream Jewish community of some unknown size, located in post-70 Judaea, is the most likely candidate for the intended audience of the text. *4 Ezra* emphasizes time and again the

[28] I will take a minimalist approach here, as elsewhere, and not posit an identification of who those persons may have been. We know too little about what came of the various sectarian groups following the war against Rome to be able to make a positive (or negative!) identification between any of those groups and *4 Ezra*. Likewise, our knowledge of the budding rabbinic movement in this period is too slim to associate them directly with the writing of or audience of *4 Ezra*. See M. Goodman, "Religious Variety and the Temple in the Late Second Temple Period and its Aftermath," *JJS* 60.2 (2009): 202–213; M. Goodman, "Sadducees and Essenes after 70 CE," in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Honour of Michael D. Goulder* (ed. S. E. Porter, P. Joyce, and D.E. Orton; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 347–356. On the rabbinic movement see J. Neusner, *In the Aftermath of the Catastrophe: Founding Judaism, 70–640* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2009).

importance of Torah observance; this is seen especially in the concluding episode where Ezra receives the Torah and secret books and passes them along to the inscribed community. The narrative tells us, then, that even with the recent disaster of the destruction of the temple, even with the questions of theodicy and the lack of understanding, Torah observance, through dedication to studying scripture *and* the seventy secret books, is what will lead to the eventual salvation of the people. While the entirety of this information is passed only to the "wise" in the narrative of *4 Ezra*, the socio-historical implication of the addressing of this information to these wise implies that any general audience who reads *4 Ezra* gains automatic membership in a privileged (imaginary) group. Thus the book exhorts those listening to hold fast to the teachings of the Torah and other books including *4 Ezra*. These instructions are given knowing that Ezra will soon be taken up into heaven, as per the Most High's instruction in 14:9: "for you [Ezra] shall be taken up from among men, and henceforth you shall be with my servant and with those who are like you, until the times are ended." Thus, even without Ezra, the leader *par excellence*, those who are wise will be able to reach salvation through the wisdom contained in the text.

Ultimately, the narrative sets up a situation where there will be no Ezra, no leader to tell the people what to do and how to do it. The narrative is instead setting up the audience to handle the consequences for Jewish society after the destruction of the second temple. It is, in essence, addressing the leadership crisis that I posit existed during this period by moving focus away from the personage of the leader, in this case Ezra, and shifting focus to alternate means of leading the community—in this case, anyone of the "wise" in the intended audience who can understand and apply the knowledge in *4 Ezra* and the other 93 books mentioned in chapter 14. Thus, in place of Ezra, *4 Ezra* proposes a leader learned in both scripture and esoteric knowledge, including at least the narrative of *4 Ezra* itself. As for the identity of potential human leaders, political

authority is deemphasized: one does not find an emphasis on the priesthood or the Davidic dynasty, and there is no requirement for the leader to serve in the role of a prophet. Authority according to *4 Ezra*, then, rests with those who have a correct interpretation of scripture and additional esoteric knowledge, including belief in and the teaching of the end times and proper observance of Torah.

Part Three: Analysis of *2 Baruch*

Chapter Five

"Israel will not be in Want of a Wise Man" (*2 Baruch* 46:4): Baruch as Leader in *2 Baruch*

5.1 Introduction

The narrative of the *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*, also known as *2 Baruch*, is set immediately before the destruction of the first temple. It describes the crisis then facing the Israelites: the destruction of their holy temple and the renegotiation of Israelite identity as they attempted to redraw the boundaries in the worship of the God of Israel. In the book of Jeremiah, "Baruch, the son of Neriyahu the scribe" (Jer 36:32) is reported as the assistant to the prophet Jeremiah. Baruch plays a minor role in the book of Jeremiah. In *2 Baruch*, however, his role moves from supporting to primary, and it is to Baruch that the Israelites remaining in Judaea turn after the exile. *2 Baruch* chronicles Baruch's attempt to make sense of the destruction of the temple, the city of Jerusalem, and the exile of his people—and thus attempts to answer questions of theodicy.[1] In addition, Baruch seeks to comfort the people and to guide them through their tragedy by way of exhortation of the law and belief in an imminent eschatological salvation.

During Baruch's career as told in *2 Baruch* there are three times when Baruch instructs the community. Each time Baruch's audience increases in size, shifting from the elders (31:1–34:1), to the elders plus two additional men (44:1–47:2), then to the entire community (77:1–26). During each of these interactions, Baruch's audience expresses their concerns not about Baruch's teachings, but for Baruch's impending departure. The community fears being left leaderless, but Baruch insists that there will always be a leader present, if only the community looks to the Torah. I argue that the narrative of *2 Baruch* is unclear as to whether the leader following Baruch

[1] Here I refer to the broad sociological definition of theodicy, as provided by Tom Willett in *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 12: "any attempt to explain evil and death in terms of religious legitimations, of whatever degree of sophistication or rationality."

will be a human, such as one of the leaders that Baruch is attempting to groom, or whether it will be a messiah figure.[2]

Beyond these three incidents, there are two other sections that are relevant for a discussion of leadership as portrayed in *2 Baruch*. In the Apocalypse of the Cloud (53–76), Baruch receives a vision of alternating black and bright waters which rain upon the earth, followed by lightning that heals where the black rains have fallen. These waters represent good and bad leaders in a review of the history of Israel, reinforcing the attributes of those in authority, especially the good leaders who I argue encapsulate the variety of leadership qualities found already in Baruch and promulgated as essential for a good leader of the community. In chapters 78–87, Baruch writes a letter meant to be read by Diaspora Jews, expanding Baruch's audience to include all Jews, everywhere. This expansion of the audience, already seen through Baruch's growing audience in the three incidents described above, establishes Baruch as the ultimate authority figure who is able to exhort all Jews to observe the law and to believe in the imminent eschaton.

This chapter will begin with a brief review of the history of scholarship on *2 Baruch* as it relates to the question of leadership and community. Following this, I will turn to a literary analysis of *2 Baruch*, focusing on the sections where Baruch interacts with the community in *2 Baruch* 31:3–34:1, 44:1–47:2, and chapter 77. I will also analyze the Apocalypse of the Cloud in *2 Baruch* 53–76. Lastly, I will examine three key sections of the epistle (78–87) that highlight Baruch's authority as perceived in the letter. I conclude that *2 Baruch* shares an uncertainty about the future of leadership in Judaea and for all Jews everywhere, leaving open the question as to whether the leader to follow in Baruch's footsteps is someone from the inscribed

[2] Note that here and throughout my discussion of *2 Baruch* I am not making an assertion as to whether the messiah as portrayed in *2 Baruch* will be divine or human, but instead differentiating between a messiah figure and a "regular" human, such as one of the elders to whom Baruch speaks.

community or a messiah figure. This uncertainty highlights the socio-historical leadership crisis, which I will expand upon in chapter 6. What is certain, however, as seen through Baruch's actions, the epistle, and especially in the Apocalypse of the Cloud, are the leadership qualities that *2 Baruch* emphasizes as essential for a good leader.

5.2 *Status Quaestionis* of *2 Baruch* Research

5.2.1 Language of *2 Baruch*

The *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*, also known as *2 Baruch*, was rediscovered by Antonio Maria Ceriana in the Ambrosian Library in Milan, Italy in 1855.[3] This Syriac manuscript, Bibliotheca Ambrosiana Ins, folios 257f–265b, #7a1, is the oldest known full manuscript of *2 Baruch* and dates to the sixth or seventh century C.E.[4] The *Epistle of Baruch*, comprised of chapters 78–87, maintains its own transmission history separately from the entirety of the apocalypse and is attested in thirty-eight manuscripts.[5]

The Ambrosian manuscript begins with a superscript noting that the Syriac is a translation from the Greek; the single extant Greek fragment of *2 Baruch*, Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 403, confirms this superscription. This fragment covers *2 Baruch* 11:1–13:2 verso and 13:11–14:3 recto and the papyrus dates from the late fourth or early fifth century.[6] A Latin excerpt of *2 Baruch* 48:36, 33–34, possibly translated from the Greek,[7] is found in Cyprian, *Testimonia ad*

[3] Daniel M. Gurtner, *Second Baruch: A Critical Edition of the Syriac Text* (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 6.
[4] Gurtner, *Second Baruch*, 7; A. F. J. Klijn, "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 615.
[5] Mark Whitters, *The Epistle of Second Baruch* (New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 1–33.
[6] Matthias Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading 'Second Baruch' in Context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 19; Bernard Grenfell and Arthur Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 3. (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1903), 3–7; B. Violet, *Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt* (GSC 32; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924), 219–23; Whitters, *The Epistle,* 8; and Gurtner, *Second Baruch*, 7.
[7] Gurtner, *Second Baruch*, 7.

Quirinum 3:29.[8] An Arabic manuscript, most likely translated from Syriac but not from the same Syriac edition as that which is extant in the Ambrosian manuscript,[9] was found in the 1970s at St. Catherine's Monastery in the Sinai Peninsula. This translation is late and reflects Muslim influence,[10] suggesting it should be dated to sometime between the tenth and eleventh centuries.[11]

There is a near consensus in the field that *2 Baruch* was originally written in Hebrew: scholars of *2 Baruch* have noted numerous Hebraisms as well as grammar and syntax that is odd in the Syriac but becomes clear when retroverted into the Hebrew.[12] In addition, the similarities and relationship of *2 Baruch* to both *4 Ezra* and *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,[13] both of which are thought to have been originally written in Hebrew, support a Hebrew original.

5.2.2 Dating and Provenance of 2 Baruch

The narrative of *2 Baruch* begins before the destruction of the first temple. The entire narrative prologue (1:1–9:1) covers the period from the eve of the destruction of the temple through the actual destruction. The story thus begins immediately before the first temple is destroyed, with God telling Baruch of the plans of destruction and Baruch protesting on behalf of the Israelites. This discussion is followed by the actual destruction of the temple by angels. Like

[8] Gurtner, *Second Baruch*, 7; Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 20–21.
[9] Gurtner, *Second Baruch*, 8.
[10] Klijn, "2 Baruch," 615; Gurtner, *Second Baruch*, 8.
[11] Gurtner, *Second Baruch*, 8; Aziz Suryal Atiya, *Arabic Manuscripts of Mount Sinai: a hand-list of the Arabic Manuscripts and Scrolls Microfilmed at the Library of the Monastery of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1955).
[12] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 23–24. The notable exception in recent scholarship is Liv Ingeborg Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008), 23. Lied supports the hypothesis of a Greek original; see Pierre Bogaert, *Apocalypse de Baruch, introduction, traduction du syriaque et commentaire* 2 volumes (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1969), I.353–380.
[13] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 10–11; Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 25.

4 Ezra, however, the narrative setting is pseudepigraphic: there is scholarly consensus that *2 Baruch* 32:2–4 alludes instead to the destruction of the second temple in 70 C.E.:

> For after a short time, the building of Zion will be shaken in order that it will be rebuilt. That building will not remain; but it will again be uprooted after some time and will remain desolate for a time. And after that it is necessary that it will be renewed in glory and that it will be perfected into eternity.[14]

This *ex eventu* prophecy about the rebuilding and subsequent destruction of the second temple suggests a *terminus a quo* after 70 C.E., while the lack of reference to the Bar Kokhba revolt suggests a *terminus ad quem* of 132 C.E. A more precise dating of the book, however, is difficult to determine. Internally, *2 Baruch* 28.2 is sometimes used to try to pinpoint a more accurate dating than the span just mentioned: "For the measure and the calculation of that time will be two parts: weeks of seven weeks." However, as Violet succinctly noted, "The calculation is debatable, the term probably deliberately vague and enigmatic,"[15] just like its precedent in Daniel 12:7. What is most probable is a date between 70 and 132 C.E., most likely, as Henze argues, toward the end of the first century:

> *Second Baruch*'s dramatic setting on the ruins of the Jerusalem temple (10.4–5), as well as the tremendous sadness over the loss of Jerusalem that permeates the text, suggest that not much time had elapsed between the sacking of the city and the composition of the apocalypse. On the other hand, the author shows no signs of hope that the temple would be rebuilt any time soon, a hope that must have been widespread immediately after its demolition. All of this would imply that *2Bar* was composed toward the end of the first century CE, but we cannot be certain.[16]

---

[14] Translations for *2 Baruch* are taken from A. F. J. Klijn, "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (J. H. Charlesworth, ed. New York: Doubleday, 1983), 615–652, unless otherwise noted. I will mention noteworthy textual variations in the footnotes, however, they are generally not relevant for the present discussion because the text is not in dispute and therefore variations do not alter the literary meaning for which I am arguing.

[15] "Die Berechnung ist strittig, der Ausdruck wohl absichtlich unklar und geheimnisvoll," Violet, *Die Apokalypsen*, 243. See also Klijn, "2 Baruch," 1.616–7; R. H. Charles, *The Apocalypse of Baruch: Translated from the Syriac* (London: A. & C. Black, 1896; Reprint, Eugene, Or.: Wipf & Stock, 2005), 50; Gurtner, *Second Baruch*, 16–17; Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 29–32. Although this does not prevent some scholars from proposing various dates based on the passage: see for instance Bogaert, *Apocalypse*, I.288–95; N. Roddy, "'Two Parts: Weeks of 7 Weeks': The End of the Age as the *Terminus ad Quem* for 2 Baruch," *JSP* 14 (1996): 3–14; A. Laato, "The Apocalypse of the Syriac Baruch and the Date of the End," *JSP* 18 (1998): 39–46.

[16] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 26–7.

Later potential patristic citations, which could assist in establishing a *terminus ad quem*, do not produce definitive enough parallels to assist with the dating dilemma. Bogaert has argued that the *Epistle of Barnabas* cites *2 Baruch*, with two sets of parallels between the two texts;[17] however Gwendolyn Sayler accurately notes that "the attempts to find allusions to 2 Baruch in patristic writings are based on the assumption that similarity indicates dependence rather than independent appropriations of common material."[18]

2 Baruch 1:1 begins with its own dating schema—"And it happened in the twenty-fifth year of Jeconiah, the king of Judah, that the word of the Lord came to Baruch, the son of Neriah"—which some scholars have used to argue for a literal dating of the text.[19] Most recent is Daniel Gurtner, who has argued that the lack of an actual biblical event during the 25th year of the reign of Jehoiachin suggests that the author of *2 Baruch* meant the date to be taken literally, that is, 25 years after the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E., which would places the date of composition at 95 C.E.[20] Henze rightly notes, however, that apocalyptic literature as a genre is "allusive and symbolic rather than historiographically precise,"[21] and this dating should be taken as symbolic, reflective of biblical books which contain similar dating schema. Daniel 1:1, for example, begins in the third year of Jehoiakim, when Nebuchadnezzar laid siege to Jerusalem. This dating in Daniel is known to be historically inaccurate.[22] Similarly *4 Ezra* begins with the dating of the "thirtieth year after the destruction of our city" (3:3), which as noted in chapter 3 is

[17] Bogaert, *Apocalypse*, I.272–80; Sayler, *Have the Promises Failed? A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch* (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984), 109–110; Gurtner, *Second Baruch*, 17.
[18] Sayler, *Promises*, 110; this point is taken up again by Henze when he discusses similar language and themes used in both apocalypses ("*Fourth Ezra* and *Second Baruch*: Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First Century Apocalyptic Literature" *JBL* 131, no. 1 [2012]: 181–200.)
[19] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 27–29.
[20] D. M. Gurtner, "The 'Twenty-Fifth Year of Jeconiah' and the date of *2 Baruch*," *JSP* 18, (2008): 23–32; Gurtner, *Second Baruch*, 17–18.
[21] Henze*, Jewish Apocalypticism*, 28.
[22] Henze*, Jewish Apocalypticism*, 28; John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 130–33.

a reference borrowed from Ezekiel 1:1, "In the thirtieth year, in the fourth month, on the fifth day of the month, as I was among the exiles by the river Chebar, the heavens were opened, and I saw visions of God." Thus, *2 Baruch* 1:1 should not be used as an internal dating element for the text itself and in fact is modeled on the prophetic precedent. In fact, the dating provided by *2 Baruch* 1:1 most likely derives from Ezekiel 40:1, "In the twenty-fifth year of our exile, at the beginning of the year, on the tenth day of the month, in the fourteenth year after the city was struck down, on that very day, the hand of the Lord was upon me, and he brought me there." While the verse from Ezekiel does not refer to the same event as it does in *2 Baruch*, the passage in Ezekiel serves as an introduction to the eschatological section of the book, suggesting parallels between the material in *2 Baruch* and in Ezekiel.[23]

A discussion on the dating of *2 Baruch* would not be complete without a reference to the relationship between *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. These two texts are often called "twin" or "sibling" apocalypses because they are closely related in language and theme. Henze, in his article, "*Fourth Ezra* and *Second Baruch*: Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First Century Apocalyptic Literature,"[24] proposes complex written and oral developments for both *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra* which are related at an early stage of their compositions; thus, the fact that scholars have for so long argued about which text is primary, and these arguments can be made in either direction, suggests to Henze that an alternate methodology must be taken in order to explain their relationship. According to Henze, the similarities between the two texts happened during their pre-redactional phase, while they were still undergoing the typical stages involved with the production of a text (i.e. composition, revision, transmission).[25] In terms of dating this suggests

[23] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 29.
[24] Matthias Henze, "*Fourth Ezra* and *Second Baruch*: Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First Century Apocalyptic Literature," *JBL* 131, no. 1 (2012): 181–200.
[25] Henze, *"Fourth Ezra* and *Second Baruch*," 197.

that the texts were produced around the same time; if this is indeed the case, arguments for the dating of one text can be used to support the dating of the other, with the usual caveats. As both texts support a date sometime after the destruction of the second temple, but before the Bar Kokhba revolt, this is the date I accept in my own work.

2 Baruch is a Jewish text[26] most likely written in Judaea. Internal evidence from the text suggests this provenance, with the narrative beginning in Jerusalem and moving away from the city but remaining in Judaea as the text progresses. In addition, external factors such as the original language and the relationship with *4 Ezra* support a provenance of Judaea. This conclusion is accepted with scholarly consensus.

5.2.3 Literary Unity

Except for the epistle of *2 Baruch*, there is scholarly consensus that *2 Baruch* is a literary unity.[27] Whether the epistle, which is made up of chapters 78–87 in *2 Baruch*, is an intrinsic part of the apocalypse has seen disagreement, since the epistle has its own reception history apart from the apocalypse.[28] The majority of scholars,[29] myself included, argue that it was indeed a

[26] Rivka Nir (*The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*, [Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 20. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature/Leiden: Brill, 2003]) argues for a Christian provenance for *2 Baruch*. While her analysis is careful, her ultimate conclusions are not persuasive. See reviews of Nir's book that argue against a Christian provenance: Matthias Henze, review of Rivka Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*, *JSP* 15 (2006): 145–8; Liv Ingeborg Lied, review of Rivka Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*, *Journal of Semitic Studies* 50 (2005): 403–5; Gary A. Anderson, review of Rivka Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*, *Journal of Religion* 85 (2005): 155–157; Frederick J. Murphy, review of Rivka Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*, *Journal of Semitic Studies* (2005): 403–5; Beate Ego, review of Rivka Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 116 (2004): 470. Consider, too, Davila's arguments that *2 Baruch* emphasizes characteristics of a boundary-maintaining Jew, James Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 128.

[27] So much so, in fact, that the question of literary unity is not addressed in recent monographs on *2 Baruch*. As was commonly the case in analyses of ancient Jewish texts in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, R. H. Charles (1896; 2005), followed by Violet (1924), adopted a source-critical approach to *2 Baruch*. In the 1960s the tides turned against this approach, beginning with Bogaert (1969), who argued for the text as an integrated whole.

[28] For a history of the reception of the letter, see Whitters, *The Epistle,* 4–12.

part of the original apocalypse. This is because the epistle is clearly dependent on the contents in the apocalypse. Also, the ease with which the text transitions from the apocalypse proper to the epistle in chapter 77 supports the epistle as an integral part of the original narrative.

Unlike *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch* cannot be easily broken down into sub-sections.[30] However, while *2 Baruch* lacks a single organizing principle,[31] the text is not without an organization of its own; Henze rightly notes that the apocalypse is made up of different genres but that "the repetition of the same genre lends the book a certain cadence […]. Generic repetition is also an effective way for the author to describe different movements or progressions in the text, the progression of an idea, for example […] or the progression of Baruch's personal development."[32] Certain sub-genres are repeated regularly, and there are narrative markers that assist in organizing the text.[33] Below is a breakdown of the narrative based on Henze's chart:[34]

Chapter/verse	Sub-genre
1:1–9:1	Narrative prologue
10:1–12:5	Baruch's prayer
13:1–20:6	Revelatory dialogue[35]
21:1–21:26	Baruch's prayer
22:1–30:5	Revelatory dialogue
31:1–34:1	First public address

[29] Such as Bogaert, *Apocalypse*, I.77–8; Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 37; L. Doering, "The Epistle of Baruch and its Role in *2 Baruch*" in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall* (eds. M. Henze and G. Boccaccini; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 151–173; Whitters, *The Epistle*, 33. Contra Sayler, *Promises*, 98–101.
[30] Although not for lack of effort. See Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 37–39 for an overview of the numerous ways in which scholars have attempted to divide *2 Baruch* into seven sections. This effort was made in a further attempt to compare *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra*, since *4 Ezra* is easily divisible into seven sections.
[31] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 40. Although numerous scholars have attempted to enforce an organization on it, especially a seven-fold organization, presumably influenced by the seven episodes in *4 Ezra*. See Sayler, *Promises*, 161–2; R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* Vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1896), 481–526; Bogaert, *Apocalypse*, I.145; Thompson, *Responsibility for Evil in the Theodicy of 4 Ezra* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 123–4; F. J. Murphy, *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 11–13.
[32] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 35–36.
[33] Bogaert, *Apocalypse*, I.58–67; Cf. Whitters, *The Epistle*, 38–42.
[34] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 41–42. I have made a few minimal changes to his chart. Doering has recently suggested another seven-part structure that is a reasonable division; however, I do not see a better merit in dividing *2 Baruch* based on certain internal features over other features. Since genre is an emphasis I am examining in this project, outlining *2 Baruch* based on genre is logical ("The Epistle of Baruch," 155).
[35] For more on the revelatory dialogue, see Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 128–148.

35:1–5	Baruch's prayer
36:1–43:3	Baruch's first vision
44:1–47:2	Second public address
48:1–25	Baruch's prayer
48:26–52:7	Revelatory dialogue
52:8–76:5	Baruch's second vision
77:1–17	Third public address
77:18–26	Narrative epilogue/Introduction to epistle
78:1–87:1	The epistle

Especially of note is that two out of the three public addresses, not including the epistle, are preceded by visions. This connection will be analyzed in more detail in the literary analysis below, but it should be made explicit that this structure suggests Baruch's revelations are shared, at least to some degree, with the people; this is unlike *4 Ezra*, where the revelations of Ezra are for Ezra alone until the end, when then only "the wise"[36] will inherit the secret knowledge. In *2 Baruch*, revelation from God to Baruch is used by Baruch in order to direct his communication with and guidance of the people.

5.3 Literary Analysis of *2 Baruch*

5.3.1 *2 Baruch* 31:1–34:1

> And it happened after these things, that I went to the people and said to them: Assemble to me all our elders and I shall speak words to them.[37] And they all assembled in the valley of the Kidron. And I began to speak and said to them: Hear O Israel, and I shall speak to you, and you, O seed of Jacob, pay attention, and I shall teach you. Do not forget Zion but remember the distress of Jerusalem. For, behold, the days are coming, that all that has been will be taken away to be destroyed, and it will become as though it had not been.
>
> You, however, if you prepare your minds to sow into them the fruits of the law, he shall protect you in the time in which the Mighty One shall shake the entire creation. For after a short time, the building of Zion will be shaken in order that it will be rebuilt. That building will not remain; but it will again be uprooted after some time and will remain desolate for a time. And after that it is necessary that it will be renewed in glory and that it will be perfected into eternity. We should not, therefore, be so sad regarding the evil which has come now, but much more (distressed) regarding that which is in the future. For greater than the two evils will be the trial when the Mighty One will renew his creation. And now, do not draw near to me for some days and do not call upon me until I shall come to you.

[36] But see my interpretation of the wise as being all of the Jews remaining after the destruction in the last chapter, 4.3.1.

[37] Gurtner's translation, *Second Baruch*, 67. Klijn has "speak words to you." See below for a discussion of the likely audience of this speech.

> And it happened after having said all these words to them that I, Baruch, went my way. And when the people saw that I went away, they raised their voices and lamented and said: "Where are you going from us, Baruch, and do you leave us as a father who leaves his children as orphans and goes away from them? These are the commands which your friend Jeremiah, the prophet, gave to you. And he said to you, "Look to this people during the time I am absent, while I help the rest of our brothers in Babylon, against whom has been declared the sentence that they should be carried away into captivity." And now, if you abandon us too, it would have been better for all of us that we shall die first, and that then you should abandon us.
>
> And I answered and said to the people: "Heaven forbid that I should abandon you or that I should go away from you. But I shall go to the Holy of Holies to ask from the Mighty One on behalf of you and Zion so that I may receive in some ways more light, and after that I shall return to you.

This section, the first of three paraenetic sections,[38] begins Baruch's interaction with the people. This pericope is clearly marked as a separate unit: it begins with the phrase "And it happened after these things" (31:1) and concludes with Baruch's departure from the people in order to go to the temple remains (34:1–2). Like the other two addresses with the people in chapters 44:1–47:2 and 77, this scene is arranged into three sections:

1. Narrative frame: the circumstances and audience of Baruch's address are introduced
2. Public address by Baruch
3. Exchange between Baruch and his audience regarding their concern over his impending departure[39]

Prior to this meeting with the elders, Baruch watches as angels deposit the holy vessels of the temple into the earth for safekeeping. The angels then make the initial breech of the walls of Jerusalem, in order that no enemy of God's people could claim a victory against God (6:3–9). Baruch witnesses the destruction of the city and the temple by the Babylonians (8:1–9:2), and offers up prayers of lament on behalf of Zion (10:1–12:5). Following a seven-day fast, Baruch hears voice of God (13:1). Baruch engages in dialogue with God, with Baruch questioning the righteousness of the current events and the transgression of the law. God responds with mention of the end times, but cuts the conversation short (13:1–20:6). After Baruch's prayer (21), God and Baruch again engage in discussion. God attempts to clarify information about the eschaton

[38] The other two being 44:1–47:2 and 77. Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 47, 49, 51–52.
[39] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 191; 192.

and especially the tribulation that will come before and the messianic age that will follow (22:1–30:5).

This dialogue between God and Baruch seems to be the reason Baruch calls together the elders in order to speak to them. While this conversation is not, as noted above, in the sub-generic category of an apocalypse, as what happens preceding the next two interactions between Baruch and the people, the material is similar to the apocalyptic sections because like them it describes the time leading up to and including the eschaton. Henze notes here that Baruch's calling together of the people is abrupt;[40] before Baruch speaks to the people in 44:1–47:2 and 77, God requests that Baruch has an audience with the them, and thus God is the cause of their meeting. While God instigates the subsequent meetings, I would argue that as the leader of the people, it is Baruch's job to speak to the people, and the narrative hints that he has done so even in the time before this narrative begins. That explains why the people are so worried when they think that Baruch is leaving them (31:8–33:3, 46, 77:13–14), because from the beginning it is Baruch's role as the leader to guide them and pass God's teachings along to them. This becomes clearer at the end of this pericope in 34:1, as well as in the subsequent interactions between Baruch and the people. It is the revelations from God about the end times, then, that cause Baruch to seek out the people in order to teach them.[41]

Henze states that the information passed from Baruch to the leaders/public in this and subsequent interactions should not be read as the same as the knowledge that Baruch receives from God in their dialogue and through Baruch's revelations.[42] Baruch's interactions with God

[40] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 190.
[41] The passing of this information from Baruch and the other leaders/elders is a central issue in *2 Baruch*. See Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel*, 44.
[42] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 143.

all happen in intimate settings, while his interactions with the community are all public. Henze rightly notes that Baruch's interactions with God are

> primarily *descriptive*, in that it paints a broad picture of the end time. By contrast, the speeches are explicitly *prescriptive*, in that in them Baruch directly advises the people of Jerusalem—and through them the reader—on how to live their lives in the meantime between the biblical time and the end time.[43]

However, Baruch's goal is to guide the people to the end times. So while the dialogues/revelation between God and Baruch do differ from the exhortation between Baruch and the community, the end result is ultimately the same: to offer leadership through guidance to the eschaton. Thus I disagree slightly with Henze's emphasis on the *difference* between the two relationships: while Baruch receives considerably more information from God than he passes along to the people, it is not due to Baruch's need to keep some things secret[44] but instead, I argue, due to the hierarchical nature of authority and knowledge as represented in *2 Baruch*. God is all knowing about the *telos* of history, and shares what is appropriate with Baruch; likewise, Baruch knows more than the rest of the community about the eschaton and must choose the most appropriate way to share that information with his community through the hierarchy of leadership.

The elders that Baruch calls together in this pericope seem to constitute the group of leaders who served the remnant community. Mentions of similar groups can be found in other Jewish literature. A group of elders (שבי יהודיא) are mentioned in Ezra 6:7: "let the work on this house of God alone; let the governor of the Jews and the elders of the Jews rebuild this house of God on its site." From this and several other references in Ezra,[45] the elders seem to be leaders among the Jews in Jerusalem at the time of Ezra. Josephus reports of a letter purportedly written

[43] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 143.
[44] Contra the narrative-level reading *4 Ezra*; cf. *4 Ezra* 14:26
[45] They are also mentioned in Ezra 5:5, 5:9, and 6:14, but without a further reference to the governor.

by Antiochus III to Ptolemy, where a similar group of Jewish leaders, here called the "senate" (ἡ γερουσία) greeted Antiochus upon his visit to Jerusalem.[46]

Baruch, at the top of this human hierarchy, calls together this group of elders who are next in the line of leadership beginning in 31:1. The hierarchy of authority is thus established at the earliest point in the narrative frame. In fact, each subsequent interaction between Baruch and the people expands this hierarchy, creating a clearly-defined line of authority: within the larger narrative Baruch's audience grows with each interaction he has with the community. This transition from specific to general can be seen in more than just Baruch's audience; the location of Baruch and the addressees also moves from in the city of Jerusalem before the destruction of the temple at the beginning of the apocalypse, to outside the city of Hebron at an oak tree at the end of the narrative.[47] This movement can be seen in the following chart:

Part	**Chapters**	**Baruch's Audience**	**Location**
Public Address 1	31–34	The Elders	Jerusalem immediately after destruction
Public Address 2	44–47	The Elders, Baruch's son, and his friend Gedaliah	Kidron valley
Public Address 3	77	Public Address to Remnant/all who are present	Hebron
The Epistle: Public address 4	78–87	9.5 Tribes/ entire Diaspora	"The Oak"

The chart shows the movement of the narrative on multiple levels, including the broadening of Baruch's audience from the elders at the beginning to an incorporation of *all* Jews by the end,

[46] Josephus, *Ant.*12.129–144. First Maccabees also mentions a "council of elders" (πρεσβύτερος; see 1 Maccabees 11.23; 12:35; 13:36) and both 1 and 2 Maccabees mention the senate (γερουσία; 1 Maccabees 12:6; 2 Maccabees 1:10, 4:44). See Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 192; J. C. VanderKam, "Judaism in the Land of Israel" in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. J.J. Collins and D.C. Harlow; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 57–76, here 63.

[47] Lied argues that Baruch uses the landscape surrounding Hebron in an equivalent way to how he used Jerusalem in terms of sanctification, prayer, etc. Lied, *The Other Lands*, 150–151. This does not detract from the fact that Baruch's location move further away from the Holy of Holies as the narrative progresses.

even those in the Diaspora and those separated from Baruch and his people by time as well as by space.[48]

Baruch's speech begins with a common biblical phrase, "Hear, O Israel," which is reminiscent of the *shema* in Deuteronomy 6:4**.** Violet argues that due to the generic language of Baruch's instruction, Baruch is not instructing just the elders but all of Israel.[49] However, Baruch's call to the group of community leaders, as well as the hierarchy described above, suggests otherwise. In fact, Lied argues, and I concur, that the elders are an essential link in the chain of instruction that begins with God and next goes through Baruch before reaching these elders, then Gedaliah and Baruch's eldest son (44:1), the rest of the people who are present, and then finally all Jews.[50] Baruch's language should instead be read as reminiscent of Moses' speeches in the Torah, positioning Baruch as a leader who should be considered like Moses.

The phrasing in 31:3 also connects Baruch to Moses, reinforcing Baruch's authority to speak to and advise the people on the level that Moses had:

> The language that imitates Moses's proclamations to the Israelites expresses the source of Baruch's authority and makes an important claim about the significance of the speech. Baruch's mission aspires to be anchored in the Deuteronomic tradition; Baruch speaks with Mosaic authority.[51]

Baruch's does not just speak with Mosaic authority, however; Baruch speaks with direct knowledge *from God* about God's plan for the impending eschaton. Baruch tells the elders to remember the destruction of the temple because shortly the world as they have known it will be gone. Baruch urges them to prepare their minds for the end times by focusing on observance of the law. He then predicts the end of times through a *vaticinium ex eventu*:

> For after a short time, the building of Zion will be shaken in order that it will be rebuilt. That building will not remain; but it will again be uprooted after some time and will remain desolate for

[48] For a discussion of the temporal nature of the epistle of *2 Baruch*, see S. Sheinfeld, "The Euphrates as Temporal Marker in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch,*" *JSJ* [forthcoming].
[49] Violet, *Die Apokalypsen*, 247; Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 192.
[50] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 129–30.

> a time. And after that it is necessary that it will be renewed in glory and that it will be perfect into eternity (32:2–4).

Baruch notes that the "building of Zion" (that is, the temple) will be destroyed ("shaken") and then rebuilt. This rebuilding, the second temple, would also be destroyed ("uprooted"),[52] and only after a period of time ("desolate for a time") would the temple be renewed and perfected as an eschatological temple.[53] This eschatological prediction serves a paraenetic purpose, offering consolation to the elders by placing the current devastation into God's larger plans of salvation for Israel.[54] Baruch commands the elders to focus on the upcoming tribulations rather than on the current crisis. Baruch then excuses himself for some days, presumably to receive further revelation.

Baruch's eschatological message to the elders does not seem to receive wider dissemination in the community, however, because once Baruch leaves, the people cry out, fearful that Baruch is leaving them "as a father who leaves his children as orphans and goes away from them" (32:9). The people do not expect that Baruch will return, although it is to him (the father) that they look for guidance and instruction. Henze argues that the concern about Baruch's return is a rhetorical device that "creates a tension in the text [and] links Baruch's first address with the two addresses that follow, since in both cases the discussion will return to the

---

[51] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 192. See also Chapter One in this dissertation; Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 1–40. Note, too, Henze's discussion of Moses and the Torah (*Jewish Apocalypticism*, 102–107) as well as the Mosaic Torah and Deuteronomy/Deuteronomic Schema in *2 Baruch* (*Jewish Apocalypticism*, 207–227).

[52] Identifying these buildings as references to the first and second temples has not been challenged in recent scholarship on *2 Baruch*. Bogaert was the last to challenge this idea, unnecessarily complicating the identification of the temples by stating that, based on the imperfect use of the verb, there is no mention of the first temple but that the interpretation should begin with the second temple. Following this line of reasoning, the rebuilding and subsequent destruction refers to an eschatological temple which would be destroyed and thus, according to Bogaert, end the messianic age (*Apocalypse*, I.422–24). This interpretation is highly speculative, unnecessarily complicated, and has not found favor among scholars. Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 194–5.

[53] Whether this is a preexistent eschatological temple or a renewal of the first and/or second temples is unclear. See Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel*, 295, 298. Henze states outright that it is the eschatological temple, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 193, and this interpretation seems the most likely to me.

[54] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 47, 194.

same misunderstanding regarding Baruch's 'departure.'"[55] While the text does indeed create tension and assist in creating continuity, there are many ways this could have been done. Instead, I argue that the emphasis on the fear of being without a leader with Baruch's authority is reflective of a concern among an historical—and not just the inscribed—community. The main purpose of *2 Baruch* is not only to provide consolation[56] but also to tell the community how to handle life once Baruch is no longer among it. Throughout these public addresses, Baruch continues to exhort the members of the community to observe the Torah and to look forward to the imminent eschaton, where their faithfulness of observance will be rewarded. Thus, the actual audience of *2 Baruch* would also be receiving the same guidance, along with the intimate knowledge that Baruch receives directly from God through dialogues and revelation.

To further persuade Baruch, the people recall the message that Jeremiah, the friend of Baruch and prophet to the people, said: "Look to this people during the time I am absent, while I held the rest of our brothers in Babylon, against whom has been declare the sentence that they should be carried away into captivity" (33:1). The people call upon the words of Jeremiah in order to convince Baruch not to leave them, noting that these words are from a prophet, and therefore are akin to God's own message. This is, of course, ironic since in *2 Baruch* 10:2–3 Baruch tells Jeremiah what to do:

> And it happened after seven days that the word of God came to me and said to me: Tell Jeremiah to go away in order to support the captives unto Babylon. You, however, stay here in the desolation of Zion and I shall show you after these days what will happen at the end of days.

It is possible, then, that the people may not realize Baruch's full role as prophet. Alternatively, this statement could be playing off of what would have been known from scripture, that Baruch

[55] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 47, 195.
[56] See, for example, Sayler, *Promises*, 155.

was Jeremiah's assistant and therefore Jeremiah would have held influence over Baruch, even though that is not the hierarchy expressed in *2 Baruch*.[57]

The people express that it would be better if they die before Baruch abandons them. While it is possible that this statement is hyperbolic, as was a similar statement in *4 Ezra* 12:44, Baruch's answer suggests that he takes the exclamation seriously, confirming that he will not abandon them or permanently leave them. Lied suggests another possible reason for the people's outcry about Baruch's abandonment: his imminent death.[58] There is nothing in the text at this point, however, to suggest that this is a specific fear of the people. In fact, it is not until 44:2 where Baruch notes that he will soon be leaving the people "in accordance with the way of the whole earth," that is, that he will soon die. Thus it is preemptive to assume that the people's fear of abandonment in chapter 34 is a reference to Baruch's impending death. Henze points out that while the issue of Baruch's absence is resolved through Baruch's response, the apprehension of the community is not unfounded, as this is indeed a situation that occurs in the next section which I will analyze.[59] This foreshadowing suggests that Baruch realizes the need of strong leader in the community,[60] and his response addresses this directly.

Baruch answers by reaffirming his position as leader of the community, informing the community that his absence will be temporary and is actually for the benefit of the people.[61] Baruch will go to speak with God in the Holy of Holies[62] in order to "receive in some ways more light" on behalf of the people and Zion, and then return to them, presumably with news of some

---

[57] Henze (*Jewish Apocalypticism*, 109) also notes this odd reference to Jeremiah's role as prophet without any subsequent explanation. Nickelsburg suggests that this alludes to an earlier tradition about Jeremiah, who would have been in command of the situation before he left for Babylon (see *4 Baruch* 4). (G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "Narrative Traditions in the Paraleipomena of Jeremiah and 2 Baruch," *CBQ* 35 [1973]: 60–68, here 66).
[58] Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel*, 151 n10.
[59] See 5.3.2 below. Cf. Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 195.
[60] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 195–196.
[61] Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel*, 151.
[62] Henze notes that this language "implies that the temple is still functioning as a place in which the faithful can communicate with God" (*Jewish Apocalypticism*, 196). See also Jeremiah 41:4–10.

kind. While this light is not defined, that Baruch seeks to receive it from God suggests that it is some sort of revelation or wisdom that derives from God. The idea of light as wisdom is further developed in the analysis of the subsequent interactions between Baruch and the community members below.

5.3.2 *2 Baruch* 44:1–47:2

> And I, Baruch, went from there and came to my people and called my first-born son and Gedaliah, my friend,[63] and seven of the elders of the people and said to them: "Behold, I go to my fathers in accordance with the way of the whole earth. You, however, do not withdraw from the way of the Law, but guard and admonish the people who are left lest they withdraw from the commandments of the Mighty One. For you see that he whom we serve is righteous and that our Creator is impartial. And see what has befallen Zion and what happened to Jerusalem, that the judgment of the Mighty One will be made known, as well as his ways which are inscrutable and right. For when you endure and persevere in his fear and do not forget his Law, the time again will take a turn for the better for you. And they will participate in the consolation of Zion. For that which is now is nothing. But that which is in the future will be very great. For everything will pass away which is corruptible, and everything that dies will go away, and all present time will be forgotten, and there will be no remembrance of the present time which is polluted by evils. For he who runs now runs in vain and he who is happy will fall quickly and be humiliated. For that which will be in the future, that is what one will look for, and that which comes later, that is what we shall hope for. For there is a time that does not pass away. And that period is coming which will remain forever; and there is the new world which does not carry back to corruption those who enter into its beginning, and which has no mercy on those who come into torment or those who are living in it, and it does not carry to perdition. For those are the ones who will inherit this time of which it is spoken, and to these is the heritage of the promised time. These are they who prepared for themselves treasures of wisdom. And stores of insight are found with them. And they have not withdrawn from mercy and they have preserved the truth of the Law. For the coming world will be given to these, but the habitation of the many others will be in the fire. You, therefore, admonish the people as much as you can. For this is our work. For, when you instruct them, you will make them alive.
>
> And my son and the elders of the people said to me: "Did the Mighty One humiliate us to such an extent that he will take you away from us quickly? And shall we truly be in darkness, and will there be no light anymore for that people who are left? For where shall we again investigate the Law, or who will distinguish between death and life for us?"
>
> And I said to them: "I cannot resist the throne of the Mighty One. But Israel will not be in the want of a wise man, nor the tribe of Jacob, a son of the Law. But only prepare your heart so that you obey the Law, and be subject to those who are wise and understanding with fear. And prepare your soul that you shall not depart from them. If you do this, those good tidings will come to you of which I spoke to you earlier, and you will not fall into the torment of which I spoke to you

[63] Cf. Charles, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, 70; Bogaert, *Apocalypse*, I.78–79, who notes that the manuscript, which reads it in the plural, is likely corrupt. Klijn keeps it in the plural, "and the Gedaliahs, my friends" (*2 Baruch*, 634) while Violet wants to delete the reference altogether (*Die Apokalypsen*, 261). See my analysis following this section of why the number seven plus two—the elders plus Gedaliah and Baruch's eldest son—is more likely than an unspecified number of "Gedaliahs." See also Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 197 n35.

> earlier." But with regard to the word that I shall be taken up, I did not let it become known to them at that time, not even to my son.
>
> And after I had left, having dismissed them, I returned from there and said to them: Behold, I go to Hebron, for to there the Mighty One has sent me. And I arrived at that place where the word was spoken to me, and I sat there and fasted seven days.

Following Baruch's first interaction with the community, Baruch has a dream vision (36:1–37:1), concerning which he prayers to God (38:1–4), and subsequently receives its interpretation (39:1–43:3). The interpretation of the dream vision ends with a prediction of the resurrection (42:6–8). Baruch is told that he himself will not go through this, however, because he will "go away from this place" and not simply die (43:2), a more explicit reference to Baruch's impending assumption.[64] God then commands Baruch to instruct the people, after which time he should fast, and then God speaks with him once again (43:3).

Baruch follows God's command to instruct the people by calling together a set number of leaders: "my first-born son and Gedaliah, my friend, and seven of the elders of the people" (44:1). The seven elders plus two—Gedaliah and Baruch's eldest son—increases Baruch's previous audience in 31:1 by two. This is a pattern, pointed out above, that will be continued when Baruch addresses the entire community—not just the leaders—in chapter 77, following which point Baruch's audience expands to include the entire Diaspora in the epistle. The grouping in 44:1 likely alludes to the leadership organization under Moses in Deuteronomy,[65] but also reflects leadership expectations of the Second Temple period. Josephus also delineates seven elders plus two officers as leaders in his retelling of the laws in *Jewish Antiquities* 4.214: "As rulers let each city have seven men long exercised in virtue and in the pursuit of justice; and to each magistracy let there be assigned two subordinate officers of the tribe of Levi."[66] Bogaert

[64] The first allusions to Baruch's assumption are in 13:3 and 25:1, where it reads that Baruch "will surely be preserved until the end of times."
[65] Murphy points specifically to Deuteronomy 5:23, 27:1, 29:10, and 31:28 (*Structure and Meaning*, 131).
[66] Josephus, *Ant.* 4.214 (Thackeray, LCL).

suggests that Josephus' report should not merely be taken as a restatement of the biblical precedent, but that "it is legitimate to believe that the rule reported by Josephus is the one that was applied in his time."[67] Considering Josephus wrote *Antiquities* around the same time that *2 Baruch* was written, the author of *2 Baruch* drew from the same cultural repertoire from which Josephus drew. Similarly, Alon and Neusner have argued for a traditional government council run by seven men in early rabbinic texts, suggesting that this format of government was in use in the early rabbinic period.[68] *2 Baruch*'s use of this setup—seven elders plus two—may harken back to the biblical precedent, but it likely also reflected first-century leadership practices at the time of the writing of *2 Baruch* based on the abundance of evidence.

Baruch's exhortation, which utilizes language similar to that in the book of Qohelet,[69] is to remind these leaders that they are to maintain observance of the law even in his death. Baruch explains that while God's ways are unknowable, God is righteous and impartial, and therefore the time will come when the present punishment of the people and Zion will end.[70] This time, which is soon, will involve the passing away of the current time and current world, and life as the community currently knows it will disappear. The eschaton will mark the beginning of a new world, according to Baruch, which will last into eternity, and in which those who are prepared with Torah learning will be included (44:14–15). Those who do not follow the law, however, — those who are corrupt (44:12), those who deserve torment or who are currently living in torment (44:13)—will be left behind to be in the fire (44:15). Baruch's exhortation emphasizes that those

[67] "Il est légitime de croire que la règle rapportée par Josèphe est celle qui était appliquée de son temps," Bogaert, *Apocalypse*, II.79.
[68] G. Alon, *The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age (70–640 C.E.)* (Trans. by G. Levi; Jerusalem: Magness, 1980–1984; Repr., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), 178–9; J. Neusner *A History of the Jews in Babylonia* (5 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1965–70), V.264–67. Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 197; Whitters, *The Epistle*, 142–3.
[69] M. Henze, "Qoheleth and the *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*," *VT* 58 (2008): 28–43.
[70] For more on the acts of remembering, including remembering the law, and forgetting in *2 Baruch*, see Lied, *The Other Lands*, 42.

whom Baruch has gathered to himself, the seven elders, Gedaliah, and his first-born son, will have a leader to guide them even after Baruch has left this world. This leader is not to be defined as a person explicitly, at least in this pericope, but is Baruch's teachings on the imminence of the eschaton and on the Torah.

Further, Baruch commands this group to act in his stead as the leaders of the people once he has died.[71] Once again, the leadership hierarchy is emphasized, with Baruch at the pinnacle, the elders (as seen in the analysis of *2 Baruch* 31:1–34:1) immediately below Baruch, and finally Baruch's friend Gedaliah, and his first-born son (44:1).[72] One of Baruch's contributions as leader is his passing on of his authority to his successors,[73] making sure that once he is gone there are others who are capable of replacing him and leading the people. This succession of leadership is not a new rule that Baruch establishes with his own imminent passing, but is a continuation of the past and essential for the future of the people, as shown in this excerpt from the epistle:

> Further, know that our fathers in former times and former generations had helpers, righteous prophets and holy men. But we were also in our country, and they helped us when we sinned, and they intervened for us with him who has created us since they trusted in their works. And the Mighty one heard them and purged us from our sins. But now, the righteous have been assembled, and the prophets are sleeping. Also we have left our land, and Zion has been taken away from us, and we have nothing now apart from the Might One and his Law. Therefore, if we direct and dispose our hearts, we shall receive everything which we lost again by many times (85:1–4).

As Lied has pointed out, this passage shows the importance of the leaders for Israel and the land: "The existence of righteous leaders who could intervene and interpret the law protected all

[71] In *2 Baruch* 34:1, Baruch comforted the people by insisting that he was not leaving them for good, but only seeking answers on their behalf from God. At the beginning of chapter 44, Baruch admits to the leaders he has collected,—his first-born son, his friend Gedaliah, and the seven elders of the people—that he will indeed be leaving the people behind, as he will die ("go to my fathers in accordance with the way of the whole earth" 44:2). This phrase is reminiscent of a biblical idiom that means going to a peaceful death; however, in the biblical texts, the idiom is either phrased as sleeping with one's fathers, as in 1 Kings 2:10 and 11:43 or as being gathered to one's fathers, as in 2 Kings 22:20 and 2 Chronicles 34:28. Henze suggests that the rephrasing is intentional, hinting at Baruch's impending ascension rather than Baruch dying a regular death; Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 197 n37. However, at the end of this pericope in 46:7, Baruch comments that he has not yet told the people of his ascension: "But with regard to the word that I shall be taken up, I did not let it become known to them at that time, not even to my son." I would like to suggest instead that the phrase "go to my fathers" in 44:2 is just another way of stating the expected biblical idiom; Baruch is not hinting at his secret to the people, but he is telling them that he will soon die.
[72] Lied has also noted the differentiation of leaders in this hierarchy. See Lied, *The Other Lands*, 129–30.
[73] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 135.

inhabitants of the land. These high-profile individuals were the ones who kept Israel's covenantal relationship to God intact."[74] Baruch is seen doing the same here by securing the future of the community through its leaders once he is gone. Baruch is thus passing the torch of authority to this group.

Baruch commands this group of leaders to admonish the people: "For this is our work. For, when you instruct them, you will make them alive" (45:1–2). Baruch notes that the work of the leader is to admonish or instruct[75] the people in order to guide them toward correct action, in this case to "make them alive"[76] through their proper observance. What is meant here is not to keep them alive in terms of their everyday survival, although that may be a part of correct action, but to extend their lives[77] past the end of history into the new creation, of which Baruch was just speaking, and about which Baruch had just received revelation from God. Thus, according to Baruch, the job of a leader is to secure the place of his followers in the eschaton.

The collected leaders are filled with trepidation over the impending absence of Baruch. Similarly to the way the community reacts in 32:8–33:3, analyzed above, the leaders here worry that without Baruch, they will have no one to turn to for their own guidance, and therefore for the guidance of the people as a whole. According to the leaders, Baruch's absence will create a darkness, that is, an absence of light. The idea that Baruch represents a light for the community should be read together with 34:1:

---

[74] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 135.
[75] "Instruct" is the translation of Charles and L.H. Brockington ("The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch" in *The Apocryphal Old Testament* [ed. H.F.D. Sparks; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984], 835–895; reprinted in *Apocalyptic Literature: A Reader* [ed. M.G. Reddish; Nashville: Abingdon, 1990], 97–142), while Klijn prefers "admonish". See also Gurtner, *Second Baruch*, 81.
[76] Also translated as "preserve them" (Brockington, and Gurtner, following his lead), "quicken them" (Charles). Bogaert prefers "save" or "give them life" ("Vous les sauverez. Ou encore: vous leur donnerez la vie" (*Apocalypse*, II.82). Klijn's translation is reflected here.
[77] It is not clear in the text whether *2 Baruch* is suggesting a corporeal extension of their lives past the eschaton.

> And I answered and said to the people: "Heaven forbid that I should abandon you or that I should go away from you. But I shall go to the Holy of Holies to ask from the Mighty One on behalf of you and Zion so that I may receive in some ways more light, and after that I shall return to you.

As discussed above, this light likely refers to a revelation or to direct wisdom that derives from God, and Baruch seeks it on behalf of the community. The leaders' naming Baruch himself as a light, without whom there will only be darkness, suggests that Baruch is seen as if he himself is a revelation or is wisdom deriving from God. While it may not mean that Baruch was sent directly by God to the people,[78] the use of the term "light" in order to discuss Baruch's own presence, as well as its use in 34:1, implies that Baruch is imbued with God's wisdom, and it is this wisdom that places him in the highest position of authority.

Just as Baruch-as-light may be interpreted as revelation and/or wisdom from God, the same language of light and dark used here in 46:2–3 is also used to describe the fall of Zion in 10:12:

> And you, sun, keep the light of your rays within you. And you, moon, extinguish the multitude of your light. For why should the light rise again, where the light of Zion is darkened?

Baruch's impending absence may be paralleled to the absence of the temple since its destruction: the destruction of Zion created a permanent absence of light for the people, and Baruch's death would create a similar dearth of light. Without Baruch's light, his wisdom, and his guidance, life would once again turn into the chaos that followed the destruction of the temple.[79]

Without the light—that is, without Baruch and his interpretive abilities—the gathered leaders fear that they will no longer be able to ask questions with regards to the law, nor will they

[78] Although it also could be taken in this wasy: if Baruch is to be taken up into heaven like Enoch and Elijah, and in *4 Ezra* 14, like Ezra, it could be that Baruch was considered a kind of revelation on earth, a light incarnate. This is purely conjecture, however. The text is not clear, and it seems unlikely that Baruch was thought to be a divine being in disguise. See also references to Jesus and light, especially in the Gospel of John, e.g. John 1:1 ff.
[79] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 136. Lied also notes that light is still existent on earth, pointing to the fountain of light in the heights (54:13) and the treasuries of light (59:11). Like Moses in Exodus 34:29–30, the face of the righteous shine with light, 51:3, 51:10. Lied, *The Other Lands*, 300.

be able to "distinguish between death and life." This last statement should be read together with the first part of this pericope about investigating the law.[80] Just before this point in the narrative, Baruch reminds the leaders that they must instruct the people for it is through instruction that the leaders can secure the community's place in the eschaton. Thus, the ability for the leaders to distinguish between life and death relates specifically to the investigation of the law that will then keep the people alive in the future. Instruction and praxis *may* lead to an extension of the current life; however, they *will* ensure life in the eschatological future.[81] Baruch's gathered leaders distrust their ability to instruct the people in this manner.

Regardless of their protestations, Baruch cannot resist his call from God, and instead offers the people consolation:

> And I said to them: "I cannot resist the throne of the Mighty One. But Israel will not be in the want of a wise man, nor the tribe of Jacob, a son of the Law. But only prepare your heart so that you obey the Law, and be subject to those who are wise and understanding with fear. And prepare your soul that you shall not depart from them. If you do this, those good tidings will come to you of which I spoke to you earlier, and you will not fall into the torment of which I spoke to you earlier."

In this passage Baruch assures the leaders that the community of Israel will not remain without a leader learned in the law, someone akin to Baruch.[82] This is an odd promise, since shortly Baruch will be taken from them, and he is presumably the only available person above them in the leadership hierarchy. While the narrative does not hint at any other potential leaders, this section clearly insinuates that the community will not be left without leaders who are "wise and understanding." Baruch exhorts his group of leaders to prepare themselves in the observance of the law and the knowledge of the imminent eschaton in order for one of two options to happen:

---

[80] While the concept of law and life are intertwined in *2 Baruch*, they are not synonymous. Lied, *The Other Lands*, 136–137. Contra Shannon Burkes, "'Life' Redefined: Wisdom and Law in Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch," *CBQ* 63 (2001): 55–71; Murphy, *Structure and Meaning*, 106–107.
[81] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 137.
[82] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 173. Henze points out at least two attributes that make Baruch an exemplar: his ability to interpret the Torah and his ability to lead and take care of the community as a father would (*2 Baruch* 32:9).

either 1) Baruch's speech encourages these elders to learn in order to become the new leaders, or 2) Baruch is preparing the way for a new, unknown leader to come. While neither option is clear based on the language,[83] it is clear that Baruch expects that the community will have another learned leader who is similar to himself in his ability to interpret and teach the law and to guide the people.[84] This new leader, if it is not those elders and friends that Baruch calls together, may, in fact, be a messiah.[85] Numerous texts contemporaneous with *2 Baruch* contain references to a forerunner to the messiah,[86] a position in which Baruch may function here. Since this narrative section ends with Baruch dwelling on his imminent departure, which will be followed shortly by the messianic era, the leader Baruch is hinting at may indeed be a messiah.[87]

The section ends with Baruch reflecting to himself on the knowledge of his being taken up—as opposed to dying. However, from the beginning of this pericope Baruch has called the elders together in order to instruct them of his death, which will be soon. Baruch's self-reflection reiterates his impending departure, and it serves to set the rest of the message here and throughout *2 Baruch* as Baruch's testament, given over at the end of his life. Thus, as his testament Baruch's words and teachings bear particular significance and import since they are his last words.[88]

---

[83] See also 77:15–16, which insinuates that the law will provide learned leaders.
[84] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 345.
[85] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 182–3.
[86] For instance, John the Baptist; see Mark 1:1–8; Matthew 3:1–6, 3:11; Luke 3:1–6, 3:15–16; John 1:15, 1:26–27. A. Laato, *A Star is Rising: The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of the Jewish Messianic Expectations* (Atlanta, Georgia, Scholars Press, 1998), 367; J. Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah* (Trans. W.F. Stinespring; New York: Macmillan, 1955), 343; J.H. Charlesworth, "From Jewish Messianology to Christian Christology: Some Caveats and Perspectives," in *Judaism and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (ed. J. Neusner; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 225–264, here 246–7; J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 116–118.
[87] Although I reiterate that it is not clear; this is just one of two options.
[88] *2 Baruch* could be generically categorized as a testament just as much as an apocalypse, if not more so. The genre testament has been widely discussed by, e.g., Robert A. Kugler, "Testaments" in *Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. J.J. Collins and D.C. Harlow; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 1295–1297; M. de Jonge, *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin* (Van Gorcum's Theologische Bibliotheek 25;

As in chapter 34, this pericope ends with Baruch leaving his audience with the people. In this case Baruch is to go to Hebron where "the Mighty One has sent [him]" (47:1). This shift of place is part of Baruch's role as leader and does not suggest an abandonment of the people.[89] In fact, Baruch's change of location to Hebron will widen his audience beyond the elders, his son, and Gedaliah, to include the entire community, whom he will address in chapter 77. First, however, Baruch receives a revelation that highlights the history of Israel in terms of idealized good and bad leadership.

5.3.3 *2 Baruch* 53–76

2 Baruch 53 begins what is commonly referred to as the "Apocalypse of the Cloud." While this is not a point of interaction between Baruch and the community, it does relate to the portrayals of leadership in *2 Baruch.* In this apocalypse, Baruch, who is now in Hebron, receives a dream vision of a cloud filled with black and many-colored waters (53:1) and topped with lightning. The cloud begins to rain, alternating twelve times between black and bright waters, with the black waters always producing more rain than the bright (53:3–6). The final black water is darker, mixed with fire, and is more destructive than all the other previous waters (53:7). However, at the end, the lightning that sits on top of the cloud now presses down to the earth and lights it up, healing the regions that were injured from the last black waters (53:8–9). The

---

Assen: Van Gorcum & Co., 1953); D. Dimant, "The Testament as a Literary Form in Early Jewish Pseudepigraphical Literature," *WCJS* 8 (1982): 79–83; A.B. Kolenkow, "The Literary Genre 'Testament'" in E*arly Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (ed. R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; BMI 2; Atlanta: Scholars press, 1986) 259–267; John J. Collins, "Testaments" in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M.E. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 325–355; W. Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung der Geschichte: Untersuchungen zum Zeit- und Geschichtsverständnis im 4 Buch Esra und in der syr. Baruchapokalypse* (FRLANT 97; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 208–222; Sayler, *Promises*, 95–98; Whitters, *The Epistle*, 44–48; 165–168.

[89] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 151–2.

lightning then takes control of the earth, and twelve rivers[90] that come from the sea become subject to the lightning (53:10–11). This brief revelation is followed by a prayer of Baruch, who does not understand the vision (54:1–22), and then by a lengthy interpretation offered by the angel Ramael[91] (chapters 55–74).[92]

The choices made in the use of generic categories such as the review of the history of Israel allows the reader to better understand the function of the author, as discussed in chapter one. In this case, the interpretation of the Apocalypse of the Cloud is a review of the history of Israel that provides information on the attributes of leaders throughout Israelite history as defined by *2 Baruch*. The history of Israel is split into twelve periods alternating between good and bad periods, which are often defined by good or bad leaders.[93] Ramael's interpretation begins the review of history with the first man, Adam, and follows the history of Israel through the destruction of the first temple and the rebuilding of Zion. The review of history is not recorded neutrally: the black waters focus on sins (pre-Mosaic) and transgression of the law (post-Mosaic), while the bright waters highlight good leadership through proper observance. The chart below visually outlines the review of history in Ramael's interpretation:

---

[90] The twelve rivers are not identified in the interpretation; Lied points out that the *Targum Jonathan to Isaiah* 66:2, which itself shares similarities with *2 Baruch*, highlights the importance the number twelve: "the number twelve reflects everything that was made for the twelve tribes: the months, the constellations of the firmament, the day and the night" (Lied, *The Other Lands*, 60).

[91] In *2 Baruch* Ramael is the angel who presides over true visions (55:3). Ramael (alternative spellings include Ramiel and Remiel; it is likely a shortened version of the name Jeremiel, see Bogaert, *Apocalypse*, I.428–38) is known from other apocalyptic literature, including *1 Enoch* 20:7–8, where he is the angel that presides over the resurrection. *4 Ezra* 4:36 lists the archangel Jeremiel as the one who answers questions about the resurrection. See *Sibylline Oracles* 2:215–17; *4 Baruch* 6:11, 15, 19; Bogaert, *Apocalypse*, I.428–38; Gurtner, *Second Baruch*, 97 n644; Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 272.

[92] Henze (*Jewish Apocalypticism*, 275) argues that the interpretation of Baruch's Apocalypse of the Cloud likely draws from earlier sources, such as the Apocalypse of Weeks in *1 Enoch* 93:1–10, 91:11–17. He states that while "the agreements between the two visions are far from perfect, […] their structural resemblance suggests that the vision of the cloud depends on and has incorporated traditional materials. Most likely the author has adopted the vision and used it for his apocalypse." See also Murphy, *Structure*, 108–14; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 434–50; Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch* 91–108 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 49–152.

[93] Not unlike Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. See excursus in chapter two: "Leaders in other Jewish Literary Tradition: Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*."

Black Water (1) 56:5–16	Adam's transgression, beginning of death, the fall of the watchers[94]
Bright Waters (2) 57:1–3	Abraham and progeny following the unwritten law, belief in the coming judgment, and the world to come[95]
Black Waters (3) 58:1–2	All the sins of the nations after the death of the patriarchs, and the wickedness of Egypt[96]
Bright Waters (4) 59:1–12	Moses, Aaron, Miriam, Joshua son of Nun, and Caleb[97]
Black Waters (5) 60:1–2	The period of the Judges[98]
Bright Waters (6) 61:1–8	The reigns of King David and King Solomon[99]
Black Waters (7) 62:1–8	The reign of King Jeroboam and subsequent rulers of Israel, to the conquering of Israel by the Assyrians[100]
Bright Waters (8) 63:1–11	The righteousness of King Hezekiah, king of Judah[101]
Black Waters (9) 64:1–65:2	The wickedness of King Manasseh[102]
Bright Waters (10) 66:1–8	The purity of King Josiah[103]
Black Waters (11) 67:1–9	The destruction of Zion (i.e. "now" in the pseudepigraphic world of Baruch)
Bright Waters (12) 68:1–8	The rebuilding of Zion (i.e. the Second Temple period)

This review of history makes intentional choices: for instance, the reigns of King David and King Solomon are considered as bright waters, clearly ignoring their numerous transgressions,

[94] Genesis 2:1–6:4; also *1 Enoch* 1–36.
[95] Genesis 12–35.
[96] Exodus 1:1–22.
[97] Exodus 2:1–Joshua 24:33
[98] Judges
[99] 2 Samuel 5ff.
[100] 1 Kings 12:25–33ff.
[101] 2 Kings 16:20ff.
[102] 2 Kings 21:1–9.
[103] 2 Kings 22ff.

while the repentance of King Manasseh is pointedly ignored.[104] Viewing history through a dualistic lens is a common feature of apocalypses, and the review of history here should not be read differently: God punishes the wicked, while the righteous are rewarded. There is no room for anything in between the two poles.[105] Lied identifies the logic of this review based on *2 Baruch* 69:3–4:

> Concerning the wickedness of the impieties which would occur before him, he foresaw six kinds. And of the good deeds the righteous would accomplish before him, he foresaw six kinds." According to 69:3–4 it is the actions of humankind, and first and foremost the acts of the twelve tribes through their kings and leaders, that decide whether the period becomes dark or bright, since their actions make God work on their behalf or against them in history.[106]

Accordingly, the leader and their righteous decisions or their transgressions represent the entire people through their actions. Therefore, an analysis of the leadership attributes in this section will reveal qualities of leadership that *2 Baruch* defines as both good and bad.

5.3.3.a The Bright Waters

The first leaders associated with the bright waters are the patriarchs in 57:1–3:

> And after these you saw the bright waters; that is the fountain of Abraham and his generation, and the coming of his son, and the son of his son, and of those who are like them. For at that time the unwritten law was in force among them, and the works of the commandments were accomplished at that time, and the belief in the coming judgment was brought about, and the hope of the world which will be renewed was built at that time, and the promise of the life that will come later was planted. Those are the bright waters which you have seen.

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob[107] are all mentioned here, along with "those who are like them."[108] It is, however, the observance of the unwritten law that identifies the leaders with the bright waters, along with their belief in the eschaton and their hope in the life after the end. *2 Baruch* is putting

[104] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 62n19; Bogaert, *Apocalypse*, I.296–304; Sayler, *Promises*, 72.
[105] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 63; Bogaert, *Apocalypse*, I.88; Murphy, *Structure and Meaning*, 23; Sayler, *Promises*, 14–38.
[106] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 63.
[107] Abraham is the only named person who appears in this pericope. While Isaac and Jacob are presumably the "son and son of his son," the emphasis is clearly on the figure of Abraham as exemplar.
[108] The named person is considered the paradigmatic righteous one, with others following in his stead. See also *4 Ezra* 8:51 and 8:62; Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 166.

forth the idea that Abraham and his son and grandson, as well as unnamed others, followed the Sinai covenant even before it was given to Moses.[109] Other texts from the Second Temple period promulgate this idea as well. For instance, the book of *Jubilees* suggests that those who came before the event at Sinai still worshipped God in the same way as those who did so after the Torah had been received. Abraham was just one in a chain beginning with Adam who did this: "For Abraham was perfect in all of his actions with the Lord and was pleasing through righteousness all of the days of his life" (*Jubilees* 23:10).[110] Since the black waters begin with Adam (*2 Baruch* 56:5–10) and the first bright waters begin with Abraham, it seems that in this review of the history of Israel that Enoch and Noah are both associated with the first black waters (56:11–16).[111] Thus in *2 Baruch* Abraham is the first to observe God's commandments, and thus to bring about the first bright period.[112]

Similarly, Abraham seems to be the first to believe in the eschaton, another point shared among second temple texts.[113] This idea in *2 Baruch* likely stems from the vision that Abraham receives in Genesis 15 after his sacrifice to the Lord; *2 Baruch* 4:4 mentions this as well, "After

---

[109] Note this does not mean that Abraham followed some sort of oral Torah, but that he followed the Torah that was given later at Sinai intuitively. Bogaert, *Apocalypse*, II.110; Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 277.

[110] Translations from O. S. Wintermute, "Jubilees" in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 2: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 35–142. Cf. Sirach 44:20.

[111] In *Jubilees* Adam, Enoch, and Noah are all part of the chain that Abraham belongs to, observing the Sinai covenant before it was given. See J.L. Kugel *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 7. G. Anderson, who notes the unambiguous giving of the law to the patriarchs in *Jubilees*, "The Status of the Torah before Sinai: The Retelling of the Bible in the Damascus Covenant and the book of *Jubilees*," *DSD* 1 (1994): 1–30, here 23.

[112] B. *Yoma* 28b offers the same idea that Abraham kept the commandments:

> Rab said: Our father Abraham kept the whole Torah, as it is said: Because that Abraham hearkened to My voice [kept My charge, My commandments, My statutes, and My laws].
> R. Shimi b. Hiyya said to Rab: Say, perhaps, that this refers to the seven laws? — Surely there was also that of circumcision! Then say that it refers to the seven laws and circumcision [and not to the whole Torah]? — If that were so, why does Scripture say: 'My commandments and My laws'?
> Raba or R. Ashi said: Abraham, our father, kept even the law concerning the 'Erub of the dishes,' as it is said: 'My Torahs': one being the written Torah, the other the oral Torah.

From "The Soncino Talmud on CD-ROM." *Judaic Classics Library* (Davka Corporation Version 2.2. 2001. Print ed.: Isadore Epstein, ed., *The Babylonian Talmud*. 30 vols. [London: Soncino Press, 1990]).

[113] Although *2 Baruch* 4:3 says that Adam saw the preexistent temple before he sinned. It does not infer anything about Adam's *belief*, however, about which *2 Baruch* 57:2 is referring.

these things I showed it [the preexistent temple] to my servant Abraham in the night between the portions of the victims."[114] *4 Ezra* 3:13–15 uses Genesis 15 similarly, recounting how God revealed the end of times to Abraham, and the entirety of the second half of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (9–32) builds upon this same tradition by depicting Abraham's ascension directly into the seventh heaven, where he is initiated into the divine mysteries and the eschaton. In *2 Baruch* Abraham thus represents the first person who follows God's laws and who harbors belief in the eschaton, both attributes that I have already shown are essential to the leadership of Baruch.

The next leaders associated with the bright waters appear in 59:1–12. Here, following Moses, the leaders Aaron, Miriam, Joshua, Caleb, and "all those who are like these" (59:1) are listed. Similar to Abraham in the first bright waters, the details focus specifically on Moses as exemplar, beginning with the giving of the Torah, here called "the lamp of the eternal law which exists forever and ever" (59:2). Lamp refers specifically to the Torah as a revelation from God, to Moses and subsequently the people. However, it is not just the law that Moses receives, but also future and eschatological revelation: for instance, Moses saw the dimensions of the temple, measurements of the elements such as fire and wind, Paradise, judgment, the angels and archangels, the treasuries of the light, and the inquiries into the law, to list just a sampling.[115] Like Abraham in the first bright waters, Moses is privy to the law and to eschatological visions, again reinforcing the same attributes that Baruch himself exemplifies.

The third bright waters highlight the reigns of David and Solomon (61:1–8), combining the reign of these two kings into a unified perspective on this part of Israel's history.[116] While

[114] See also Pseudo-Philo *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 23:6–7 and *Genesis Rabbah* 44:22.
[115] This mention of the lamp, and through it the light, suggests that God's revelation may be the light, and the Torah as lamp diffuses God's revelation so it is accessible by the people.
[116] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 84. Some texts, such as 2 Chronicles 22:2–29:22, also present a clear continuity between David's preparations for the building of the temple and Solomon's implementation of the building. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 8.106–117.

this period does not mention eschatological salvation, the observance of the law through holidays and offerings at the newly built temple, as well as wisdom and understanding of the law are highlighted. The third bright waters could be said to reinforce proper observance and understanding of the law, especially through the inauguration of the sanctuary in the first temple,[117] when God's presence took up residence in the temple.[118]

The fourth bright waters (63:1–11) highlight the reign of King Hezekiah who fears the destruction of the remaining two-and-a-half tribes by the Assyrian king and thus "trusted upon his works, and hoped upon his righteousness, and spoke with the Mighty One" (63:3), that is, acted piously through repentance and prayer. God responds by sending the angel Ramael to destroy the Assyrians and save Zion (63:6–9), who then rejoice and praise the Mighty One (63:10). The attributes of King Hezekiah highlighted here are his trust in God and his piety, again characteristics that are exemplified in the figure of Baruch in *2 Baruch*.

The fifth bright waters (66:1–8), and the last to focus on an individual from Israel's past, discusses the purity of King Josiah who erased idolatry from the land, killed the impious, and reestablished priestly observance at the temple and the observance of the festivals and Sabbaths. King Josiah's reforms were so zealous, according to *2 Baruch*, that he "left no one un-circumcised or anyone who acted wickedly in the whole country all the days of his life" (66:5). That is, it was not just the re-establishment of the law that marks King Josiah's reign, but also his persecution of those who do not follow the law.[119]

The bright waters highlight leadership attributes that are consistently portrayed by Baruch. Abraham, even without the Sinai covenant, follows the commandments, and he also

[117] See1 Kings 8–9; 2 Chronicles 7.
[118] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 65–66.
[119] Kolenkow notes that the reigns of both King Hezekiah and King Josiah are bright waters that repair the damage done by the preceding wicked reigns, represented by the black waters ("An Introduction to *2 Baruch* 53, 56–77: Structure and Substance" [PhD diss., Harvard, 1972], 127–8; 130); Lied, *The Other Lands*, 72.

believes in the eschatological revelations he receives after his sacrifice to God as recounted in Genesis 15 and expanded upon in other texts from the Second Temple period. Moses, too, receives eschatological revelations when he is on Mount Sinai, in addition to receiving the Torah. Kings David and Solomon understand and follow the law and also establish correct temple worship, while Kings Hezekiah and Josiah are known for their piety to God and covenant as well as their observance of commandments. All of these attributes, observance of commandments, piety, belief in the eschaton, and inquiry into the law, are features that highlight the character of Baruch in *2 Baruch.*

5.3.3.b The Black Waters

Just as the bright waters portray the attributes of good leaders, the black waters emphasize the attributes of the bad leaders. Beginning in 56:5, the black water lists the transgression of Adam as the cause of all subsequent black waters, because

> when he transgressed, untimely death came into being, mourning was mentioned, affliction was prepared, illness was created, labor accomplished, pride began to come into existence, the realm of death began to ask to be renewed with blood, the conception of children came about, the passion of the parents was produced, the loftiness of men was humiliated, and goodness vanished (56:6).

Adam's transgression, the eating of the fruit from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, was the beginning of humanity as we know it, but it also led to the ultimate downfall, which only the end of the world will fix. Even with Adam's sin, humans still have the ability to determine their own eschatological fate; humanity inherited not only Adam's sin but also his free will.[120]

[120] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 169. Henze also notes that *2 Baruch* places more emphasis on personal free will than does *4 Ezra*.

However, it was not only humanity who fell during these first black waters, but also some of the angels, who like the humans, possessed free will at this point in time (56:11). *2 Baruch* 56:12–15 expand upon the tradition of the watchers:[121]

> And some of them [the angels] came down and mingled themselves with women. At that time they who acted like this were tormented in chains. But the rest of the multitude of angels, who have no number, restrained themselves. And those living on earth perished together through the waters of the flood

Thus, the first person, Adam, to go against the commandments of God created a downward spiral for not only all subsequent humans, except for a few select who existed during the period of bright waters, but also for some of God's angels.

The first bright waters, listed above, start directly with Abraham and skip over mention of Enoch and Noah, which is surprising since they both appear prominently in other Jewish writings.[122] Instead, these antediluvian patriarchs are implied in the first black waters through the inclusion of the watchers. No reason for their omission is to be found in *2 Baruch* or subsequent secondary literature.[123]

The following two black water periods, listed in 58:1–2 as the sins in the period after the patriarchs and the sins of the Egyptians, and 60:1–2 as the sins in the period of the judges, emphasize a time without righteous leaders, where Israel follows the ways of the nations and not the ways of God. These lawless periods lack someone who can interpret the law, someone who leads with the attributes emphasized during the bright water periods and thus keep the people in line with God's covenant.

---

[121] See *1 Enoch* 1–36.
[122] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 276; M.E. Stone et al, eds. *Noah and his Book(s)* (Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010).
[123] Although their absence is noted. See Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 276. It is possible that the omission is purposeful; I could see an intentional omission of Enoch and/or Noah due to their popularity in the early Jesus movement, if one decided this text might speak against that movement, which to my knowledge has not been established. The focus on Adam and Abraham is also something found in the early Jesus movement, such as in Paul's letter to the Romans, which may also suggest an underlying conversation among texts/communities. For a comparison of Adam in Romans and *2 Baruch*, see Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 335–337.

The next two black water periods (62:1–8 and 64:1–65:2), and the last with leaders listed, discuss the reigns of King Jeroboam and King Manasseh.[124] Both of these periods emphasize the leaders' challenge to the temple cult and their attempts to introduce the worship of foreign gods.[125] While Jeroboam causes the eventual dispersion of the nine and a half tribes from the north (62:5–6), Manasseh is responsible for the judgment that went out against the remaining two and a half tribes (64:5), thus encompassing all of the Israelites between them. Jeroboam's period of leadership focuses on the idolatry that was practiced by the people (62:1, 4) after Jeroboam made two golden calves[126] and placed them in the cities of Dan and Bethel. Manasseh's idolatry exceeded that of Jeroboam's, not only driving away the priests and overturning altars, but creating a "statue with five faces: four of them looked into the direction of the four winds, and the fifth was on the top of the statue so as to challenge the zeal of the Mighty One" (64:3). Manasseh's idolatrous behaviour was so extreme that *2 Baruch* reports that "the glory of the Most High removed itself from the sanctuary."[127] While Manasseh's actions are reported as worse than Jeroboam's, they are both guilty of introducing foreign gods to Israel and challenging the temple cult and worship.

The black waters highlight the times when the Israelites suffered from either lack of leadership or poor leaders who acted against the commandments and cult of God. Beginning first with Adam, who committed the first transgression and caused a series of consequences for the rest of humanity as well as for some of the angels, subsequent periods represented by the black

[124] Early rabbinic lists of evil kings include Ahab with Jeroboam and Manasseh as the only kings in Israel's history who have no part in the world to come. *M. Sanh.* 10; *b. Sanh*. 90b; 103b. See A.B. Kolenkow, "Introduction," 135; Lied, *The Other Lands*, 88n139.
[125] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 87–92. Cf. Murphy, *Structure and Meaning*, 111; Sayer, *Promises*, 34–35; 71–72.
[126] *2 Baruch* 62:1; 1 Kings 12:25–33.
[127] 2 Kings 21:7; 2 Chronicles 23:7–8 (Hebrew and Peshitta); Ezekiel 8:5; *b. Sanh* 103b. See Violet, *Apokalypsen,* 309–310; Bogaert*, Apocalypse*, I.304–310; Klijn, "2 Baruch," 643; Lied, *The Other Lands*, 80.

waters highlight leaderless times when Israel engaged in unrighteous acts against God or when the leaders themselves, like Kings Jeroboam and Manasseh, act against God.

5.3.3.c The End Times and the Messiah[128]

The interpretation of the thirteenth black water, the one that appears to Baruch to be "much darker than all the water that had been before. And fire was mingled with it. And where the water descended, it brought about devastation and destruction" (53:7), is meant to signify the catastrophic events at the end times. These events will affect the entire world and cause a reversal of the natural order (70:3–5),[129] leading to the destruction of humanity through war, earthquake, fire, and famine, until the advent of the messiah.

The time of the messiah, which is represented as the lightning in Baruch's dream vision and by the last bright waters in Ramael's interpretation,[130] will be a time of peace, health, and joy, but only after the messiah judges those nations and punished those who have subjugated Israel.[131] Finally, after the alternating periods of good, bad, or lack of leadership, God's anointed will reign with the ultimate in righteous leadership, as the eventual ruler of the people, the one whom Baruch tells his own people will come from the law.[132]

---

[128] This last set of black and bright waters are separate from the traditional division of history in twelve periods, suggesting that they are outside of time as it is conceived in *2 Baruch* and thus belong to the eschaton, Violet, *Die Apocaklypsen*, 309. Note that the messianic age appears in *2 Baruch* happens in two stages. During the first, only Israel will benefit from the appearance of the messiah; the rest of the world will continue through the trials of devastation and destruction. In the second period, the messiah will judge the nations based on how they have treated Israel in the past. See also Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 301–3.

[129] *2 Baruch* 73:1–74:4 also contains a list of eschatological reversals based on the list of curses in Genesis 3 and combined with the prophecies in Isaiah 11:6–9; Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 283.

[130] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 273, 301.

[131] As Baruch's messiah appears as lightning on the top of the clouds, it is likely that behind this scene is Daniel 7 and the vision of the Son of Man who comes "with the clouds of heaven" (Daniel 7:13; see also Mark 14:62). See also Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 270; A.Y. Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 705.

[132] Cf. *2 Baruch* 46:4, 77:16.

Following this revelation, Baruch offers up a prayer to God (76:1–8), and is rewarded with a response directly from God.[133] Baruch is reminded of his imminent translation—which will take place in forty days at the top of "this mountain," clearly an allusion to Moses' time on Mount Sinai[134] as well as to his death.[135] During the interim forty days, however, Baruch is commanded by God to instruct the people: "Go, therefore now during these days and instruct the people as much as you can so that they may learn lest they die in the last times, but may learn so that they live in the last times" (76:5). Baruch's last commandment from God before his own ascension is to act as the ultimate leader, teaching the people what Baruch himself has learned so that they will live in the eschaton.[136] Instruction in the law by Baruch will ensure life. That Baruch himself is instructed here by God to give specific guidance to the community about the last times suggests again that neither Baruch nor God expect a new human leader like Baruch to arise before the advent of the messiah.[137]

5.3.4 *2 Baruch* 77

> And I, Baruch, went away from there and came to the people, and assembled them from the greatest to the smallest and said to them: "Hear, O children of Israel, behold how many are left from the twelve tribes of Israel. To you and to your fathers the Lord gave the Law above all nations. And because your brothers have transgressed the commandments of the Most High, he brought vengeance upon you and upon them and did not spare the ancestors, but he also gave the descendants into captivity and did not leave a remnant of them. And, behold, you are here, with me. If, therefore, you will make straight your ways, you will not go away as your brothers went away, but they will come to you. For he is merciful whom you honor, and gracious in whom you hope, and true so that he will do good to you and not evil. Have you not seen what has befallen Zion? Or do you think that the place has sinned and that it has been destroyed for this reason, or that the country has done some crime and that it is delivered up for that reason? And do you not

[133] Unlike most other apocalypses, in the majority of *2 Baruch* there is no interpreting angel. The exception to this is in the interpretation of the apocalypse of the cloud (53–74), where Ramael interprets the meaning of Baruch's dream vision. However there is no indication beginning in chapter 76 that it is still Ramael speaking. See Reynolds, "The Otherworldly Mediators," 181–183.
[134] Exodus 24:18, 34:28; Deuteronomy 9:9, 18; also *4 Ezra* 14:23, 43, 45.
[135] Deuteronomy 34:1–3. Other ascensions may be alluded to as well: Elijah's ascension as reported in 1 Kings 17–19 and 2 Kings 1–2; Phineas in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 48; Enoch's assumption in *2 Enoch* 36, 64. Lied, *The Other Lands*, 165.
[136] Lied, *The Other Lands*, 165.
[137] See my discussion on 46:4–5 above. Although here, again, like in 46:4–5, it is unclear.

know that because of you who sinned the one who did not sin was destroyed, and that because of those who acted unrighteously, the one who has not gone astray has been delivered up to the enemies?"

And the whole people answered and they said to me: "Everything which we can remember of the good things which the Mighty One has done to us we shall remember, and that which we do not remember he knows in his grace. But do this for us, your people: Write also to our brothers in Babylon a letter of doctrine and a roll of hope so that you might strengthen them also before you go away from us. For the shepherds of Israel have perished, and the lamps which gave light are extinguished, and the fountains from which we used to drink have withheld their streams. Now we have been left in the darkness and in the thick forest and in the aridness of the desert."

And I answered and said to them: "Shepherds and lamps and fountains came from the Law and when we go away, the Law will abide. If you, therefore, look upon the Law and are intent upon wisdom, then the lamp will not be wanting and the shepherd will not give way and the fountain will not dry up. Nevertheless, I shall also write to your brothers in Babylon, as you have said to me, and I shall send it by means of men. Also I shall write to the nine and a half tribes, and sent it by means of a bird.

And it happened on the twenty-first day of the ninth month that I, Baruch, came and sat down under the oak in the shadow of the branches, and nobody was with me; I was alone. And I wrote two letters. One I sent by means of an eagle to the nine and a half tribes, and the other I sent by means of three men to those who were in Babylon. And I called an eagle and said to him these words:

You have been created by the Most High that you should be higher than any other bird. But now go and do not stay in any place, do not go into a nest, do not sit on any tree until you have flown over the breadth of the many waters of the river Euphrates and have come to the people that live there and cast down to them this letter. Remember that Noah at the time of the flood received the fruit from the olive tree from a dove when he sent it away from the ark. And also the ravens served Elijah when they brought food to him as they were commanded. Also Solomon, in the time of his kingship, commanded a bird whither he wanted to send a letter and in whatever he was in need of and it obeyed him as he commanded it. And do not be reluctant and do not deviate to the right nor to the left, but fly and go straight away that you may preserve the command of the Mighty One as I said to you.

This section begins the conclusion to the apocalypse proper. It can be split into two separate parts. *2 Baruch* 77:1–17 is Baruch's third speech, while 77:18–26 is, along with 1:1–9:1, the *Rahmenerzählung*, the narrative frame, of the apocalypse.[138] Following on the heels of Baruch's dream vision of the apocalypse of the cloud (53:1–12), his request for an interpretation (54:1–22), Ramael's interpretation (55:1–76:5), Baruch's prayer (76:1–8), and God's response which includes a command to teach the people for the next forty days before Baruch is taken up (76:1–5), Baruch gathers together all the remaining people, showed through the biblical merism

[138] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 34, 352.

"from greatest to smallest."[139] The address begins with the phrase "Hear, O Israel," reminiscent of the *shema* Deuteronomy 6:4[140] and specifically notes that the gathered community is a remnant community; that is, they are only the few who remain with Baruch from the original twelve tribes of Israel. Baruch exhorts the members of the community to remember the laws that they and their forefathers received, since the current punishment has been caused by a lack of observance and everyone, righteous and unfaithful alike, has been punished and the majority of the tribes exiled. In order to correct this, Baruch urges his followers to "make straight their ways" so that not only will the current remnant not be exiled, but also so that those who are in exile will return. Baruch reminds the people that God is gracious, and that what has befallen Zion is because of the people's sin.

In response to Baruch's exhortation, the people respond that they will remember "the good things which the Mighty One has done to us," and that if there is anything that they forget, God knows that their lack of observance in these cases is innocent and will be gracious to them. This ends the people's direct response to Baruch's speech. The response lacks complexity and engagement—the purpose of this pericope does not seem to be the dialogue between Baruch and the people, but instead is the segue into the community's request of Baruch to write a letter.

The people ask Baruch to write a letter to their brethren in Babylon before he dies, a "letter of doctrine and a roll of hope" in order to offer them the support of maintaining observance and moving toward the imminence of the eschaton. The purpose of asking Baruch to write this letter is to secure his authority in their community and the communities outside of their

[139] As discussed in chapter three. Henze states that Baruch is speaking to all of Israel (*Jewish Apocalypticism*, 201) but as I will show below and in chapter 6, Baruch does not yet speak to everyone but only those present. The epistle will be Baruch's address to all of Israel.
[140] See *2 Baruch* 31:3, discussed above.

immediate vicinity, in this case, the exiles in Babylon, even with his absence. The people justify this request with several similes:

> For the shepherds of Israel have perished, and the lamps which gave light are extinguished, and the fountains from which we used to drink have withheld their streams. Now we have been left in the darkness and in the thick forest and in the aridness of the desert (77:13–14).

The people compare Baruch's looming departure to that of a shepherd leaving its flock (i.e. Israel), a lamp being extinguished, and a waterless fountain,[141] and with the people's own situation after his departure as equivalent to being in darkness, in a thick forest, and in the aridness of desert. Like the comparative simile in *4 Ezra* 12:42, the people are concerned about their lack of guidance once Baruch leaves them. Beyond that, however, is a concern that *all* authority figures who interpret the law will now be absent from their lives. This is parallel with the discussion in 46:1–3 where the leaders under Baruch worried that Baruch's absence would leave them without an interpreter of the law and without one who can teach them about the eschaton. Baruch comforts them by noting that even with his absence they will not be "in want of a wise man or […] a son of the law" (46:4). In 77:13–14, the entirety of the remnant community expresses the same concern, that it will be without the leadership which Baruch currently embodies.

The members of the community first refer to Baruch's position of authority as akin to that of a shepherd—Baruch watches over his flock in order to keep them safe and to guide them, and now without Baruch they lack that guidance and oversight, and will potentially be lost.

---

[141] There have been numerous attempts to assign specific leadership categories to the role of shepherds, lamps, and springs. Harnisch identifies them potentially with the Davidic kingship, priests, and prophets (*Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 213); R. Deines identifies them as prophets, seers, and sages (*Die Gerechtigkeit der Tor aim Reich des Messias. Mt 5, 13–20 als Schlüsseltext der matthäischen Theologie* [Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 177. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004], 226); Bogaert associates shepherds specifically with Moses (*Apocalypse*, II.135); Henze reads them as potentially prophets, scribes, and sages (*Jewish Apocalypticism*, 205). However, there is nothing in the text to encourage identifying specific leadership roles with any of these similes. What is certain, however, is that Baruch fulfills the role of them all, especially the lamp and its numerous associations with light that have been used throughout *2 Baruch*.

Following the shepherd analogy, the community states that "the lamps which gave light are extinguished." A full exploration of Baruch-as-light is above in the analysis in 46:2, but the motif appears here again, with the people reiterating Baruch's leadership position in comparing it to light. In 77:13, however, rather than Baruch being the equivalent of light, Baruch's role is the equivalent of a lamp which brings light. That is, just as a lamp contains and diffuses light, Baruch is a vessel for God's revelation to come through and then to be disseminated to the people. The use of lamps and light here is perhaps more reminiscent of the usage of light in 34:1, where Baruch seeks light from God on behalf of the people. Thus Baruch is seen as being both the bringing/transmitter of revelation and potentially, the revelation incarnate, an argument supported by his impending translation to heaven in place of typical death.[142]

The absence of the leader is further compared to the "fountains from which we used to drink [but] have withheld their streams" (77:13). Unlike the lamp simile through which light/revelation is provided to the community and the shepherd simile where the leader offers guidance and protection, a fountain that offers water is a source of life, especially in the arid geography of Judaea. In fact, this is the exact language that is used in the following verse, where the people state that they have been "left in the darkness and in the thick forest and in the aridness of the desert" (77:14). This verse emphasizes that Israel is now without light, without guidance, and without water, and thus without a source of life. While the fountain reference could refer literally to life versus death from thirst, it more probable that the water refers to the same interpretations that will lead to life in the eschaton that one finds earlier in *2 Baruch* 46:3.[143] These three similes together portray Baruch's looming absence as that which will leave

[142] Note that I still do not argue that *2 Baruch* is making this claim, just that there is a play on the light idea, and Baruch is light, receives light, and diffuses light to the people.
[143] There may be parallels here to Jesus speaking of himself as the water of life, cf. John 4:10–15; Rev 7:17, 21:6, 22:1–2, 17.

the people without guidance, without safety, without revelation, and thus without life in the eschaton.

Baruch's response in 77:15–16, like that he gave to the leaders in 46:4, reiterates that the way to continue accessing authority such as that provided by shepherds, lamps, and fountain is to look toward and observe the law. Baruch urges the community to look to the law, which will provide a new source(s) of authority and subsequently will provide guidance, safety, revelation, and ultimately, life. Above in 46:4–5 I have argued that the authority Baruch is actually urging his people to look to may be the coming of the messiah, and here, too, Baruch seems to be encouraging continued observance and belief in the impending eschaton in order to guide his audience to look towards the messianic age.

Baruch agrees to write a letter to their brethren in Babylon, since members of his community requested this one last thing from him. Baruch extends this request to include not only a letter to the exiles in Babylon, but also one for the nine-and-a-half tribes who have been lost to the land.[144] Thus, in order to console the people, Baruch offers both exhortation and a letter of his words which will pass to all the tribes of Israel, regardless of their current location. This letter serves to maintain Baruch's authority even without his physical presence while the community awaits the eschaton about which Baruch has been preaching.

The following section (77:18–26) should be considered separately from the above part of chapter 77. Baruch has separated from the community and is sitting by himself, writing his letters in the shade of an oak tree. This section functions as a narrative bridge between the

[144] The narrative takes place immediately following the destruction of the first temple. If we date that historically, it would be in 589 B.C.E. The nine-and-a-half tribes mentioned here were exiled by the Assyrians from the kingdom of Israel in 722 B.C.E.; therefore the difference in time is about 130 years. However, since *2 Baruch* is a piece of pseudepigraphy and is dated to approximately 100 C.E., the time expanse to the nine-and-a-half tribes would be about 822 years. This time-distance is important for Baruch's authority, as will be explored shortly.

apocalypse proper and the epistle found in *2 Baruch* 78–87.[145] It also serves along with 1:1–9:1 as the *Rahmenerzählung*, the narrative frame, of the apocalypse.[146] Baruch sends two letters, the first to the Babylonian exiles and the second to the Assyrian exiles; the epistle found at the end of *2 Baruch* is supposed to be the letter sent to the Assyrian exiles. The expansion of the inscribed audience from those in Baruch's presence to then include those in Babylon and ultimately in all of the Diaspora is not surprising considering the movement of space within *2 Baruch*—Baruch begins the apocalypse located in Jerusalem immediately before the destruction of the temple, and moves from there to Jerusalem after the destruction, then to Hebron, next to the oak, and finally, through his letters, he moves outside of the land itself. This expansion of Baruch's audience reiterates his authority: "The Epistola Baruch itself is not mandated by God, and it makes no revelatory claims of authority. Instead, it rests squarely on Baruch's authority with the Jewish community at large."[147] The letters that Baruch writes in 77:18–26 serve to establish Baruch's teachings, which are of course divinely inspired, as the foundation of subsequent community actions and beliefs.

The letter written to the Babylonian exiles, which either never existed or is no longer extant, is sent with three men to be delivered in Babylon (77:19). In order to send the letter to the nine-and-a-half tribes, however, Baruch calls in the service of an eagle, the king of birds.[148] Baruch instructs the eagle:

> You have been created by the Most High that you should be higher than any other bird. But now go and do not stay in any place, do not go into a nest, do not sit on any tree until you have flown over the breadth of the many waters of the river Euphrates and have come to the people that live

[145] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 352.
[146] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 34, 352.
[147] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 352.
[148] Doering points out other parallels to the eagle being the king of the birds, "Cf. Aeschylus, *Ag.* 113; Callimachus, *Hymn*. 1:68; Pindar, *Pyth*. 1:13; *Isthm*. 6:50; Josephus, *War* 3:123; 4 Bar. 7:9; b. Hag. 13b" (Lutz Doering, "The Letter of Baruch and its Role in 2 Baruch" [paper presented at the Sixth Enoch Seminar, Milan, Italy, June 27, 2011], 8 n35. Note that this paper now exists in a published format, but the published edition no longer contains his footnote: Doering, "The Epistle of Baruch").

> there and cast down to them this letter. Remember that Noah at the time of the flood received the fruit from the olive tree from a dove when he sent it away from the ark. And also the ravens served Elijah when they brought food to him as they were commanded. Also Solomon, in the time of his kingship, commanded a bird whither he wanted to send a letter and in whatever he was in need of and it obeyed him as he commanded it (77:21–25).

The nine-and-a-half tribes are now located outside of the realm of geography, in a location acknowledged as being beyond the "many waters of the river Euphrates." This location is outside the reach of the general populous, and it requires divine assistance in order to be reached. In *2 Baruch*, the eagle acts as the bridge between Baruch's world and the location of the nine-and-a-half tribes.[149] The eagle was "created by the Most High [to be] higher than any other bird" (77:21), a description which highlights its position in the avian hierarchy as well as its closeness to God,[150] and therefore Baruch calls upon its ability to complete the task of delivering the letter. The eagle must, according to Baruch, "fly and go straight away that [it] may preserve the command of the Mighty One." (77:26). The use of the eagle, who is portrayed as God's own representative, reiterates the eschatological bent of the form of transmission—only through the eagle can the nine-and-a-half tribes be reached, as they are "isolated by an event long past and by an unbridgeable distance."[151] With this form of transmission, the narrative has left the realm of physical geography, and moved into temporal geography, transporting the letter back in time to reach the unreachable nine-and-a-half tribes. That Baruch can access and control the eagle, a

[149] In Greek mythology, the eagle is the symbol of Zeus, and, at times, is actually Zeus. The eagle may pass between the world of the gods and the world of humans, either doing Zeus' bidding or representing an omen of Zeus. According to Pollard, the eagle "was, in effect the king god's own private emissary which he invariable employed when communicating with men," (John Pollard, *Birds in Greek Life and Myth* [London: Thames and Hudson, 1977], 141, also 167). While the references are sparser than in Greek mythology, birds can serve a similar function in early Jewish literature. Besides the reference here in *2 Baruch*, see, for instance, the sacrificed turtledove and pigeon in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* that assist the angel Iaoel and Abraham in their ascent into the heavens (*Apoc. Ab.* 12:10, 15:2).

[150] Likewise, Baruch moves to encounter God in places that reach toward the heavens, such as Mount Zion and the oak. Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel*, 126.

[151] Whitters, *The Epistle*, 50.

creature that spans the human and divine worlds, reiterates Baruch's liminal state,[152] accessing revelation in the divine realm while maintaining authority on earth. Baruch has access to the nine-and-a-half tribes through the eagle's travels through time. Baruch uses the highest of God's birds, relying on its unwavering flight in order to exhort the tribes who are across the Euphrates, but also back in time. The location of these tribes spans centuries, and through the eagle's ability to cross temporal boundaries Baruch is able to teach the tribes that they should continue to observe the law even without the land[153] and to focus on Baruch's teachings of the eschaton. Baruch's use of the eagle to communicate with the lost tribes emphasizes Baruch's authority through time and space.

Baruch's speech to the eagle continues, referencing other birds from Israel's history including the dove used by Noah, the ravens used by Elijah, and the bird that Solomon used to do his bidding. Baruch, in recalling these narratives relating scriptural authorities and their use of various birds, associates himself as being similar to the likes of Noah, Elijah and Solomon. However, Baruch uses an eagle, which is "higher than any other bird" while the other figures use "lesser" birds. Thus Baruch claims a higher authority than Noah, Elijah, and Solomon. Mark Whitters points out that the biblical characters that Baruch names are "three figures [who] constituted Israel's ambassadors to the nations, contributing Jewish insights on law, prophecy and wisdom."[154] The association with these characters further bolsters the Baruch's message to this distant community. In addition to the transmission of this epistle by means of an eagle, the

[152] Hindy Najman, "Between Heaven and Earth: Liminal Visions in 4Ezra" in *Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World* (eds. T. Nicklas et al; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 153–167.
[153] Clearly, this letter was not meant to actually reach the 'lost' tribes, but to serve as a reminder and guideline for Jews as to how to continue to observe the law even through the devastation caused by the destruction of the second temple in 70 C.E. For more information about the function of the land in *2 Baruch*, see Lied, *The Other Lands*.
[154] Whitters, *The Epistle*, 51.

letter's intended destination beyond the river Euphrates lends itself to an eschatological bent[155] through its own mythical location symbolizing "a region far away and near to the end of time."[156] By associating the distribution of the letter by means of the "highest" bird, to the distant location beyond the River Euphrates, Baruch reinforces his own authority as a prophet to all the tribes of Israel, crossing time and space.

5.3.5 The Epistle of *2 Baruch*: *2 Baruch* 78:1–87

While the epistle of *2 Baruch* is not presented in the text as a point of interaction between the sage and the community, it does serve the purpose of acting as message from Baruch to the people. As the people's only source of authority from the holy land, the epistle functions as an exhortation to the distant tribes through a summary of the apocalypse proper. As such, the epistle reiterates Baruch's message as well as his authority as the one capable of guiding Jews everywhere and at any time.[157] Henze notes that "the letter is another form of public announcement, only to a much larger audience, the Jews who live away from home. The intention is to bring *2Bar*'s apocalyptic program to all of Israel, including the Diaspora."[158] On a whole, the letter reiterates the same message that appeared in Baruch's three public addresses in the formal apocalypse,[159] and the leadership qualities emphasized in the epistle parallel those speeches. Since this chapter focuses on a literary analysis of leadership as portrayed in *2 Baruch*, and the subsequent chapter will look at the socio-historical implications, this section will highlight only a few segments of the epistle which emphasize Baruch's authority. In chapter six I

[155] For similar interpretations, see *4 Ezra* 13:39–49; Revelation 16:12. Whitters, *The Epistle*, 50; Sheinfeld, "The Euphrates."
[156] Whitters, *The Epistle*, 50.
[157] See above on the temporal qualities of the epistle and the eagle.
[158] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 370.
[159] Whitters, *The Epistle*, 35.

will consider more in-depth what role the epistle plays in discussing the historical world in which *2 Baruch* was created and disseminated.

The epistle begins with a salutation stating that the letter is sent by Baruch, the son of Neriah, and that its recipients are the nine-and-a-half tribes. From the historical location of the Babylonian exile, the memory of these tribes was not so far removed. However, by the time of Baruch, these tribes had already taken on a mythic quality due to their assimilation into non-Israelite culture, their identity and location being unknown except that it is "over the breadth of the many waters of the river Euphrates" (77:22). Because the tribes exist outside the realms of time and space, addressing the letter to them allows Baruch to directly speak to the problems facing his Jewish community in Judaea, especially in relation to the loss of the temple; if the preserved letter had been the letter written to the Babylonian exiles, there would be no need to discuss the recent events, as the exiles were themselves a result of the Babylonian conquest in Judaea. The features of traversing time and space in order to exhort the nine-and-a-half tribes work with the use of the eagle, discussed above, to reiterate Baruch's authority.

The main theme transmitted in the epistle is that of consolation. Even while watching their enemies gain and maintain power, the Diaspora community should take comfort knowing that this is a temporary situation. Instead of focusing on the present time, they should observe the laws and look forward to the end times, which are near, when the enemies of the Israelites will be punished. This has been Baruch's main message throughout the apocalypse, and it is reinforced in the letter.

There are three key pericopes in the letter that highlight Baruch's authority. In this initial quotation, Baruch states his reasons for writing the letter, and it is not simply because he was asked by his community:

> Therefore, I have been the more diligent to leave you the words of this letter before I die so that you may be comforted regarding the evils which have befallen you, and you may also be grieved with regard to the evils which have befallen your brothers, and then further, so that you may consider the judgment of him who decreed it against you to be righteous, namely, that you should be carried away into captivity, for what you have suffered is smaller than what you have done, in order that you may be found worthy of your fathers in the last times (78:5).

Baruch tells the audience that his letter should act as a comfort, indicating that words from Baruch hold authority enough to console the people. Baruch also serves as teacher, informing the tribes of the events that have befallen their brethren in Zion. Most importantly, however, Baruch serves as the link between all of Israel and God, passing along God's revelations to the people so they will know how to properly behave in preparation for the end times.

> But also hear the word of consolation. For I mourned with regard to Zion and asked grace from the Most High and said "will these things exist for us until the end? And will these evils befall us always?" And the Mighty One did according to the multitude of his grace, and the Most High according to the magnitude of his mercy, and he revealed to me a word that I might be comforted, and showed me visions that I might not be again sorrowful, and made known to me the mysteries of the times, and showed me the coming of the periods (81:1–4).

This second pericope reiterates Baruch's authority as God's prophet through a retelling of one of his communications with God. Baruch states how he mourned and expressed his concern on behalf of the people. The Almighty responded to Baruch with secret knowledge, which Baruch alludes to here in the phrase "and showed me visions that I might not be again sorrowful, and made known to me the mysteries of the times, and showed me the coming of the periods." These allusions support Baruch's authority as a receiver of secret revelation—Baruch does not share these mysteries with the audience of the letter, even though the actual audience of *2 Baruch* would have been privy to these details. However, Baruch's sharing of (some of) his knowledge through this letter is meant to console the people because Baruch, who wrote this letter as

guidance, received revelations from God, and now Baruch is sharing them with all Jews through his letter.[160]

> When you, therefore, receive the letter, read it carefully in your assemblies. And think about it, in particular, however, on the days of yours fasts. And remember me by means of this letter in the same way as I remember you by means of this, and always (86:1).

The last section of the epistle that explicitly portrays Baruch's authority is in an oft-analyzed statement about public reading and fasting.[161] Baruch commands the audience to read and think about the letter, but especially to do so publicly on fast days. While this has festal and ritual connotations that will be explored more fully in the next chapter, there is also an expectation that Baruch has the liturgical authority to command the tribes who have been exiled to use his letter in their fast day rituals.

The epistle serves as a message to all Jews, regardless of their temporal and geographic location, to be comforted because the eschaton is near. Baruch's message, a summing up of chapters 1–77, serves to encourage Torah observance and belief in the imminent eschaton, in addition to offering comfort to the reader. Baruch's authority is reinforced through the ability to write the letter and have it received as God's revelation, which is intended to encourage, guide, and comfort the Diaspora community, which, since the destruction of the temple, now also includes the Jews of Judaea.

5.4 Conclusion

The narrative of *2 Baruch* develops the character of Baruch as an exemplary leader: Baruch receives revelation, observes the law, awaits the eschaton and the life which can be had thereafter, and most importantly, teaches all of this information to his

[160] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 360.
[161] Whitters, *The Epistle*, 69–81.

community. Baruch's interactions with the inscribed community come after his own dialogue with and revelations from God; thus, unlike Ezra in *4 Ezra*, Baruch transmits all of his received knowledge, albeit in a different format than he himself received it. While Baruch must leave the people, he does not intend to leave them helpless, and instead guides them to look for, or potentially act as, leaders once he is gone. Thus even his last act, the writing of letters, is an act of authority in order to guide the people in his absence.

In 31:1–34:1, Baruch gathers together the elders to teach them about the eschaton, which is imminent. After he speaks with the elders, he goes on his way but is stopped by the community who fears that he is abandoning it. This section, like that in *4 Ezra* 5:16–20a, establishes the leadership structure as a hierarchy, with Baruch at the top, the elders, and the people; it also establishes that the people fear that Baruch will leave them. Thus the elders do not represent the same type of leadership that Baruch himself embodies. The people think that Baruch is leaving them; Baruch responds by reminding them of his own responsibilities to receive revelation from God on behalf of them.

The next time Baruch interacts with the people, he gathers together the elders, along with his eldest son and his friend Gedaliah, in order to tell them of his impending death and remind them of their role as the next authority figures after him. In order to do this, Baruch reminds them of what will happen at the end times, and of the leader's job of teaching the people because "when you instruct them, you will make them alive." The role of the leader, then, is to teach the people in order that they may stay alive in the eschaton. In order to do this, the people need to observe the law and believe that the end times are upon them. The elders are fearful that without Baruch, they will not suffice as leaders to keep the people from harm's way.

In chapter 77, Baruch speaks to the entire remnant that is left, not just the leaders. Baruch's demise/translation is imminent, and the people make one last request of him: that he writes a letter to their brethren in Babylon so that they may know how to live until the eschaton. Baruch agrees to do so, offering in addition to write to the nine-and-a-half tribes who are beyond the Euphrates. Baruch is able to reach these long lost tribes because of his own liminal state, poised somewhere between heaven and earth; he takes command of an eagle and sends an epistle of hope and consolation to them. This epistle is found in chapters 78–87 and reiterates Baruch's authority to all Jews, regardless of their temporal and geographic locations, by establishing Baruch's guiding words in Torah observance and belief in the eschaton.

The Apocalypse of the Cloud, which appears between Baruch's second and third interaction with the people, contains a review of the history of Israel that emphasizes good and bad leaders. While this section does not focus on Baruch's interactions with the people, it does reiterate the attributes that Baruch himself embodies as a good leader based on the bright waters: observance of commandments, piety, belief in the eschaton, and inquiry into the law. The dark waters represent periods of either no leadership or poor leadership, and highlight attributes of such: unrighteous acts and acting against God and cult.

Ultimately, with Baruch leaving the people in order to be taken up by God, just as Enoch and Elijah were, the elders and the community are concerned for their own ability to transition into the end times. At numerous times, Baruch reiterates that the people will not be left wanting leadership once Baruch is gone. Baruch's teachings to the elders, his firstborn son, and his friend Gedaliah suggest that he may be grooming them to lead the

people once he is taken up, but there are also numerous hints in the text that the next authority figure to rise up will be the messiah, and Baruch's lessons are serving as a transition to get the people to that time and place when they will no longer have to live in fear. What the text makes clear about any subsequent leaders is that they must be like Baruch: the people cannot survive without someone who is able to administer the law.

Chapter Six

The Historical Implications for Leadership as Portrayed in *2 Baruch*

6.1 Introduction

2 Baruch's narrative frame places the storyline well outside the late first century C.E., and instead hearkens back to the destruction of the first temple. However, since the text was written after the destruction of the second temple, and also *in response to* its destruction, *2 Baruch* represents a reaction to the contemporaneous situation in Judaea after the events of 70 C.E., including through its narrative a description of the exemplary leader of Baruch and concern over his replacement. Indeed, as I have shown in chapter two, anxiety around leadership was clearly present as early as the first half of the first century and as late as the Bar Kokhba revolt.[1] This chapter proposes historical conclusions about leadership during the period between the two revolts by suggesting that the portrayal of leadership in *2 Baruch* is representative of the author's specific agenda on how Jews should respond to the destruction of the temple, and what type of leader they should look to for guidance.

The previous chapter has focused on the literary analysis of *2 Baruch*. In it, I have shown that the leadership attributes emphasized by the text and idealized in the figure of Baruch are the leader's observation of the commandments, his belief in the imminence of the eschaton, and his ability to interpret and pass along this information to the people. In this chapter, I turn to the question of what information can be derived from *2 Baruch* about leadership in Judaea in the late first/early second centuries C.E.[2] Here I posit that *2 Baruch* intends to reach a wide audience in order promulgate the observance of the law and the impending arrival of the eschaton, which will offer the leadership replacement of Baruch with the figure of the messiah. This message serves

[1] I would venture that many New Testament texts similarly portray anxieties over authority, often over competing leadership (e.g. Galatians 2:4–14; Matthew 16:5–12; Revelation 2:1–3:22). Some early rabbinic texts, such as those explored in Naftali Cohn's recent monograph (*The Memory of the Temple and the Making of the Rabbis* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013]), also reflect concerns of authority. While a thorough analysis of New Testament and rabbinic texts is outside the scope of this project, the frequency with which these concerns appear suggest that the leadership question as portrayed in *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra* is not just a rhetorical device, but is representative of a larger crisis of leadership in Judaism during this period.

[2] For a discussion of the dating of *2 Baruch* see the previous chapter.

as non-militaristic polemics, encouraging its audience to look to the end times for the punishment of those who destroyed the temple by the messiah rather than taking matters into their own hands.

6.2 Socio-Historical Location of *2 Baruch*

As established in earlier chapters,[3] the ability to determine an approximate date for *2 Baruch* and to assign it a Judaean provenance provides a specific framework for the socio-historical location, upon which we can begin an analysis of the literary conclusions. Like *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch* inherited the uncertainty that the failed first revolt against the Roman Empire left in Judaea. Even Josephus does not provide us with a first-hand account of what Judaea was like after the destruction, since he lived and wrote in Rome under the patronage of the Roman imperial family following the war. Yet, while little is known about this time period and location, what evidence we do have suggests that Jewish leadership was in flux. Thus it is no surprise that *2 Baruch* offers its own view of what a leader should be, and to whom the people should turn when there is a question of who should take on roles of authority.

2 Baruch's pseudepigraphical setting after the destruction of the first temple suggests that the failed revolt, along with the loss of the temple, created for at least some Jews a discontinuity with the past in terms of religious praxis and belief. One thing *2 Baruch*'s pseudepigraphical setting attempts to do is to reestablish that continuity with the biblical past. This can be seen especially in the analysis of the genre of the review of the history of Israel, where *2 Baruch* endeavors to create a connection between the present crisis, the creation of the world, and the imminent eschaton. Just as God created the world, so too will God see the Israelites through until the end and beyond.

[3] See especially chapters two, four, and five.

The review of history in *2 Baruch* 53–76 highlights the features of ideal and flawed leadership, indirectly emphasizing the leadership attributes that the character Baruch himself embodies. Through appraisals of the leadership of persons from Israelite history such as Abraham, Moses, and Kings David, Solomon, Hezekiah and Josiah, the text emphasizes the attributes of commandment observance, piety, belief in the eschaton, and inquiry into the law, and reiterates them in the personage of Baruch. Likewise, the negative attributes highlighted in this generic review are acting against God's commandments and against cult, as reflected in the persons of Adam, the Egyptians, and Kings Jeroboam and Manasseh. In terms of the socio-historical location, *2 Baruch* highlights the attributes that were seen as contributing to the continuity of Israel in the face of the destruction of the second temple, focusing on order through the keeping of the Torah, study of the law, and belief in the imminence of the end times and through that the destruction of the wicked. Thus, according to *2 Baruch*, any subsequent leader should embody these attributes, and any person of authority who speaks against God's commandment or cult, or likewise does not study Torah or believe in the impending end times, should not be supported in positions of authority.

6.2.1 The Seven Elders and Socio-Historical Location

2 Baruch expresses a leadership hierarchy that may have been reflective of actual leadership in Judaea. In 31:1, Baruch calls together the elders of the people, an unspecific number of the elders, but likely representing the same elders as those who appear in the 44:1. The next time Baruch collects the elders in 44:1, Baruch assembles seven of the elders of the people, along with Baruch's eldest son and Baruch's friend Gedaliah. This collection of seven elders, as discussed in the previous chapter, has allusions to leadership under Moses in

Deuteronomy,[4] but likely also reflects accepted practices in the time of the writing of *2 Baruch*. Consider, for example, Josephus's own description of how he sets up leadership in the Galilee when he is sent there at the beginning of the revolt. Josephus establishes a group of seventy elders to act as magistrates for the entire region, and seven individuals in each city to handle local disputes.[5] Similarly, the Acts of the Apostles describes the establishment of seven leaders who, while below the twelve apostles in the hierarchy, are depicted as leaders of the early Jesus community in Jerusalem.[6] Later rabbinic materials also support the idea that there were seven elders.[7] The additional sources from both before and after the destruction of the temple support the idea that it was a common practice for seven mature men to be in positions of authority in cities in Judaea and the Galilee.

These seven-plus-two leaders employ the attributes that *2 Baruch* emphasizes through its discussion of ideal leadership in the Apocalypse of the Cloud; that is, they seem to observe the commandments, be pious, await the imminent eschaton, and perhaps most importantly, they seem capable of inquiry into the law. While in the narrative they are not able to communicate directly with God, *2 Baruch* implies that they have the capabilities to be good leaders. He insists that they should "admonish the people" so that the people will remain alive in the eschaton (45:1–2). However, even with Baruch's urging, these leaders plus Gedaliah and Baruch's

[4] See Deuteronomy 5:23, 27:1, 29:10, and 31:28; Josephus *Antiquities* 4.214. See also Murphy, *Structure and Meaning*, 131.
[5] Josephus *War* 2.569–571.
[6] Acts 6:2–6, "And the twelve called together the whole community of the disciples and said, 'It is not right that we should neglect the word of God in order to wait on tables. Therefore, brothers, select from among yourselves seven men of good standing, full of the Spirit and of wisdom, whom we may appoint to this task, while we, for our part, will devote ourselves to prayer and to serving the word.' What they said pleased the whole community, and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and the Holy Spirit, together with Philip, Prochorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, and Nicolaus, a proselyte of Antioch. They had these men stand before the apostles, who prayed and laid their hands on them."
[7] *b. Meg*. 26a; *y. Meg*. 74a. See also G. Alon, *The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age (70–640 C.E.)* (Trans. by G. Levi; Jerusalem: Magness, 1980–1984; Repr., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989) 178–9, who ends his discussion of the norm of a seven-man council by pointing out that while it may have been normal, it was never an exclusive practice.

unnamed eldest son, seem unable to accept the yoke of leadership in the place of Baruch (46:1–3). The inscribed fear here, as well as the people's concern over Baruch's leaving (32:8–33:3), shows how *2 Baruch* found a lack of viable options available for leadership, concluding in the emphasis on the eschaton and on the rise of the next potentially-messianic leader.[8] Thus, it seems likely that these concerns reflect an actual turn towards messianic expectation for proper guidance. That this anticipation existed during the writing of *2 Baruch* suggests that the author of *2 Baruch* and the intended audience had high messianic and eschatological hopes to solve the current crisis of authority in Judaea, and that current leadership options, while good enough (e.g. the seven elders in *2 Baruch*) were not the permanent solution.

6.3 The Polemics of the Author of *2 Baruch*

As I established in chapter four, neither *4 Ezra* nor *2 Baruch* should be considered sectarian in nature. Henze lays out five observations that scholars make about the intentions of the author of *2 Baruch*.[9] These observations are presented in order to show that *2 Baruch* is not a dissident document. I have summed up the five points below:

1. Nothing in *2 Baruch* suggests that it comes from a separatist author or community. Unlike some apocalypses that serve the purpose of constructing identity for a select group,[10] *2 Baruch* lacks the polemical language that creates firm distinctions between

[8] See chapter five.
[9] Matthias Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading 'Second Baruch' in Context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 231–240. Henze notes earlier that "we know almost nothing about its author, other than that the author was a critical thinker with an exceptionally creative mind, an accomplished writer, well versed in the Jewish Bible, nonpartisan, and intimately familiar with a wide range of early Jewish traditions, of which he made careful and deliberate use in composing his own work," (33). I would add that we know that the author was either a leader or was attempting to portray his agenda as a leader, and that the nonpartisan nature of his text was presented as one of at least two ways to approach Judaism after the destruction of the temple in 70 CE.
[10] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 232–233. The following is a select bibliography of scholars noting the distinct insider/outsider language in Jewish apocalyptic literature: J.H. Charlesworth, "The Triumphant Majority as Seen by a Dwindled Minority: The Outsider According to the Insider of the Jewish Apocalypses, 70–130" in *To See*

insiders and outsiders. This is especially clear in *2 Baruch*'s quietism with regards to the Roman Empire.[11]

2. The term "Israel" in *2 Baruch* is not limited to the remnant community with Baruch in the narrative, but constitutes recent proselytes and diaspora Jews as well.[12]

3. While *2 Baruch* is pseudonymously attributed to Baruch ben Neriah, there is no claim of a "self-segregated community"[13] founded by him. This suggests that author of *2 Baruch* does not claim to have scriptural authority but instead focuses authority on the Mosaic Torah with him as interpreter, a point that is confirmed by the oral nature of the teachings of Baruch in *2 Baruch*, where Baruch does not write anything down in the apocalypse beyond the epistle in chapter 78–87.

4. Neither does Baruch make any claim that his way of interpreting Torah is the *only* way: while Torah observance is central to *2 Baruch*, the narrative remains vague as to what the details of this observance may entail.

5. *2 Baruch* never distinguishes between secret and public teachings: all teachings are considered public.[14]

Ourselves as Others See Us:" Christians, Jews, and "Others" in Late Antiquity (eds. J. Neusner and E.S. Frerichs; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 285–315; J.J. Collins, "Pseudepigraphy and Group Formation in Second Temple Judaism," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997* (eds. E.G. Chazon and M.E. Stone; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 43–58; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "Religious Exclusivism: A World View Governing Some Texts Found at Qumran" in *Das Ende der Tage und die Gegenwart des heils: Begegnungen mit dem Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt: Festschrift für Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn zum 65.* (eds. M. Becker and W. Fenske; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 45–67; Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 91–190; García Martínez and F. García Martínez and M. Popović, eds., *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Gröningen* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 70. Leiden: Brill, 2008). Note that while some of this literature considers *4 Ezra* sectarian, I have established in chapter four that it is not, and it is intended to reach a wide audience.

[11] See below. Cf. F.J. Murphy, "*2 Baruch* and the Romans," *JBL* 104.4 (1985): 663–669.

[12] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 233.

[13] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 235.

[14] See my comments on this in chapter five, 5.3.1.

Little can be known about the actual author, but as Henze has pointed out through his five observations, certain features of *2 Baruch* suggest that the author sought to promote inclusivity for Jews through the observance of the Torah.

The growth of Baruch's audience throughout the narrative[15] also suggests a movement toward inclusivity, with the epistle marking the point where *all* Jews, *everywhere* are encouraged to observe Torah and await the eschaton. Baruch even shows concern for proselytes and those who have left the path of Torah observance:

> For behold, I see many of your people who separated themselves from your statutes and who have cast away from them the yoke of your Law. Further, I have seen others who left behind their vanity and who have fled under your wings. What will, therefore, happen with those? Or how will that last time receive them? (41:3–5)

Baruch here questions what will happen in the end times to those who have not remained true to the law, or for those who have "left behind their vanity," that is, have turned from idol worship in order to worship God. The author of *2 Baruch* intended to encompass as many Jews as possible in his plan for those who could be saved.

Just as the author promotes inclusivity through the narrative, the author also promotes pacifism by claiming that the wicked—in the narrative, the Babylonians, but in the historical setting, the Romans—would be judged in the eschaton. The author of *2 Baruch* is careful to note that those who destroyed the temple will indeed be punished;[16] see especially chapters 39–40, where the messiah puts the last leader of the fourth kingdom to death, and chapters 72–74, where the messiah destroys those nations who have ruled over Israel. These examples show that it is God, through his agent the messiah, who will judge and punish the Babylonians. However, just as God intends to punish the Babylonians, God makes it clear that the Babylonians' punishment of Israel is God's plan. This is stated outright in the narrative prologue to *2 Baruch* when God

[15] See my analysis in chapter five, 5.3.5.
[16] Murphy was the first to point this out in his article "*2 Baruch* and the Romans."

tells Baruch that it is God's will that Zion be destroyed; the Babylonians only serve as God's instrument. Thus, *2 Baruch* reasons, if God is the reason for the current crises, the people have no reason to resent the conquerors of Jerusalem, as they were only God's agents. Similarly, the author is careful to point out that a focus on revenge is the wrong path, upon which the remnant Jews should not tread. God tells Baruch: "For why do you look for the decline of your enemies? Prepare your souls for that which is kept for you, and make ready your souls for the reward which is preserved for you" (52:6–7). In other words, God is telling Baruch, and through Baruch the people, to turn away from vengeful thoughts and actions and instead to become reflective upon what needs to be done in order to survive to the end times.[17] Punishment will be exacted on the enemies of the Jews, but it will be done through the divine will during the eschaton.

The author, then, seems to be promoting an inclusive and non-militant attitude. This attitude may best be considered by situating it in the midst of two failed revolts: the previous revolt against Rome from 68–73 C.E., and the upcoming Bar Kokhba in 132–135 C.E.[18] Placing the author of *2 Baruch's* agenda in the midst of these uprisings offers another view of the leadership emphasized in *2 Baruch*: Baruch is a learned leader, a follower of Torah, and committed to acting as the liaison between God and the people. What Baruch is not, however, is militaristic or exclusive. Junghwa Choi has noted that, among the types of leadership models available in Judaea between 70 C.E. and 135 C.E., the warrior leader was a potential type that could have existed.[19] If the two revolts were promoted[20] by militaristically-inclined Jews and both found enough supporters to make the beginnings of the revolts a success, then it can be

[17] Murphy, "*2 Baruch* and the Romans," 663–664.
[18] There is, of course, the Diaspora uprising from 115–117 C.E., but there is too little information on that revolt available to note any potential connection between it and *2 Baruch*.
[19] Junghwa Choi, *Jewish Leadership in Roman Palestine from 70 CE to 135 CE* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 176–179.
[20] I intentionally avoiding using the word "started" here, since I have shown in chapter two that the causes of the first revolt were quite complex, and we do not know the exact situation that started the Bar Kokhba revolt. However, we do know that there were Jews who continued to respond in a militaristic fashion after the start of both revolts.

concluded that there were Jews who promoted and supported military action against the Romans. If this is indeed the case, the non-militant and inclusive polemics of *2 Baruch* may in fact be directly in conversation with the attitudes of those who sought the military action against the Romans after the destruction; it may be this latter group that won out and incited the Bar Kokhba revolt. Thus the leadership promoted in *2 Baruch* represents a non-militaristic attitude, noting that the enemies of Israel will be punished with the coming of the messiah.

6.4 The Audience of *2 Baruch*

If the author intended to speak against a militaristic approach to Judaism in Judaea, then the openness and inclusivity of the narrative audience is likely a reflection of the actual intended audience of the apocalypse. The epistle serves as an excellent case study to discuss the audience—both inscribed and actual—of *2 Baruch* as a whole. This is because, while the epistle does not share the same details and structure that the apocalypse proper has, it functions as a summary,[21] thus providing emphases on the portions of the apocalypse that the author himself chose.[22]

Following the opening of the epistle, the author describes the removal of the holy vessels from the temple and the destruction of the temple, all done by angels, in order to show that it was God and not the Babylonians who was actually responsible for the punishment of the exile.[23] Here the author writes: "For truly I know that the inhabitants of Zion were a comfort to you. As long as you knew that they were happy, this was more important than the affliction you endured being separated from them" (80:7). The author is acknowledging the importance of the temple

[21] P. Bogaert, *Apocalypse de Baruch, introduction, traduction du syriaque et commentaire* 2 volumes (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1969), I.76–77.
[22] F. J. Murphy, *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 25.
[23] As noted above in the discussion of *2 Baruch* being a non-militaristic text.

and land[24] in the consciousness of the Diaspora. However, since the destruction, this common denominator between the Jews of the land and the Jews of the Diaspora has been erased: no longer can the Jews of the Diaspora claim their association with the temple or the land, nor can those remaining in Judaea function in terms of the temple cult. With the destruction of the temple, the separation between the Jews within the land and the Jews outside of the land becomes inconsequential. According to the epistle, the "inhabitants of Zion" are now in exile too (80:7).

This situation presents the need for a renegotiation of Jewish identity, at least according to *2 Baruch*: all Jews are now exilic Jews and need to be reminded of how to maintain their identity. The author encourages his audience, that is, *all* Jews, that they can maintain their identity without land or temple through following the law and awaiting the impending eschaton. The intended audience of the epistle, then, is the diaspora Jewish population, a population that the author fears may be in danger of assimilation since the destruction of the second temple. Unique to *2 Baruch*, however, is the identification of all Jews, including those still living in the land, as part of the Diaspora.

As established in chapter one, and reiterated throughout this project, an analysis of genre provides insight into the function of the text. The genre of the epistle of *2 Baruch* can be identified as a Diaspora letter,[25] which further supports my hypothesis that the letter, and the apocalypse as a whole, has an intended audience of all Jews everywhere, who are now part of the Diaspora. A Diaspora letter, according to Whitters, represents "the need for reinforcing Jewish

[24] The issue of temple and land is complex in *2 Baruch*; see Liv Ingeborg Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).
[25] See Mark Whitters, *The Epistle of Second Baruch: A Study in Form and Message* (New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 86. See also Lutz Doering, "Jeremiah and the "Diaspora Letters" in Ancient Judaism: Epistolary Communication with the Golah as a Medium for dealing with the Present"; Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 365–6. Whitters also identifies the epistle as a festal letter,

identity among surrounding hostile societies,"[26] a description which is easily applied to Judaea during this period: post-second temple destruction, and shortly before the Bar Kokhba revolt, where the need for a document that would both reinforce and guide Jewish identity seems essential. Diaspora letters share four major characteristics: [27]

1) They are written in Greek.

2) They are pseudepigraphic.

3) Their addressees are spread out over a large geographic area.

4) The letters address issues of Jewish identity within a non-Jewish setting.

These characteristics are useful in identifying a Diaspora letter, although I disagree with Whitters' first point. The assignment of a particular language to this genre seems limiting and unnecessary, especially once one considers how common translations were, and how much reception history plays in the roles of the texts we now have.[28] The epistle of *2 Baruch* could be called a Diaspora letter,[29] and the author's ultimate goal as such would be to "unify the beliefs and customs of disparate Jewish communities"[30] within the Diaspora, and thus to renegotiate the boundary of said communities. If the author could convince his broad audience of Jews to await the eschaton, which is imminent, and to do so through the proper observance of Torah, the leadership crisis would then be solved through the coming of the messiah. This new leader would judge the nations, and those who had ruled over Israel would be killed by the sword *by the messiah* (cf. *2 Baruch* 72:1–6).

[26] Whitters, *The Epistle*, 86.
[27] Whitters, *The Epistle*, 86.
[28] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 365.
[29] Other examples of Diaspora letters include Jeremiah 29:1–23, Baruch 6, 2 Maccabees 1.1–9; 1.10–2.18; *Paralipomena Jeremiae*, the Epistle of James, and possibly 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C[d] [4Q389] I.
[30] Whitters, *The Epistle*, 111.

6.6 Conclusion: The Portrayal of Leadership in *2 Baruch* and its Implication for Leadership in the Post-Destruction Period

The author's concern for the maintenance of Jewish law suggests that there must have been either real or imagined despair over the observance of the commandments in the time following the destruction. As a leader in the narrative, Baruch addresses this issue, urging continued observance and high eschatological expectations; according to *2 Baruch* the only viable explanation for and response to the destruction of the temple is an understanding that the destruction and subsequent events are God's will, and God would only allow such a thing if the eschaton was near. Therefore, according to the narrative, the solution is to follow the law and anticipate that quite shortly the balance of the universe will be set right by God through the end times and the coming of the messiah. This understanding reinforces the contemporaneous situation with the biblical past, emphasizing the continuity of Israel in the face of crisis. Any subsequent leader should, therefore embody these same ideals taught by Baruch, as I have shown above.

The narrative itself provides access to a sampling of potential leaders: the seven elders, Baruch's eldest son, and his friend Gedaliah. While this leadership structure seems to reinforce an actual hierarchy in Judaea from biblical times into the rabbinic period, the leaders as presented in *2 Baruch* do not seem to be able to act as replacements for Baruch once he is gone. Instead, I argue that a combination of lack of appropriate leadership to follow Baruch combined with the imminence of the eschaton as taught by Baruch encourages the audience to look to the advent of the messiah to solve the current crisis of authority in Judaea.

In awaiting the imminent arrival of the eschaton, the narrative also seems to urge an avoidance of any human authority figure that promotes military action as a response to the

current situation. *2 Baruch* emphasizes that the enemies of Israel will indeed be properly punished, but only by the messiah. Therefore, while a warrior leader was one type of potential leader available in Judaea after the destruction,[31] *2 Baruch*'s polemics rallies against this type of leader, specifically through the presentation of the ideal figure of Baruch as a learned leader who dissuaded military action through his emphasis on Torah observance and expectations of the end times when the messiah would come to take action. This message, too, was meant to reach the full audience of Jews, both those still in Judaea and those in the Diaspora. The epistle of Baruch serves as the ultimate messenger, reaching all Jews, everywhere, and sharing the significance of Baruch's interpretation of the destruction of the temple and the coming authority of the messiah.

[31] Choi, *Jewish Leadership*, 176–179.

Conclusion:

Crises of Leadership *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*

Moving with confidence from the narrative to the historical world requires caution, especially when dealing with texts from antiquity.[1] The apocalypse is a particularly challenging genre from which to move from a literary analysis to the reconstruction of the socio-historical world. This is due in part to the use of both pseudepigraphy and symbolism in the narrative, often making it difficult to draw conclusions about the actual context in which the apocalypse was written. However, conclusions may still be drawn, albeit cautiously, since "every artifact is the product of social interaction; some theory of society, appropriately complex and nonreified, must therefore be involved in the act of interpretation."[2] That is, artifacts—including the ancient apocalypses presently under analysis—can offer insights into the complexities of the society that produced them.

This project approached the idea of leadership in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* inductively. Both apocalypses present an obvious leader to the inscribed audience through the figures of Ezra and Baruch, each highlighting his authority by establishing an inscribed hierarchy within the community. In both texts, the communities express concern over the looming death of their leader, and both texts end with the translation of the leader to heaven, stated or implied.[3] That *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* both construct a narrative frame that is concerned with the status of leadership is not merely coincidence. I have argued throughout this project that the literary concern with leadership is reflective of a socio-historical problem in Jewish society after the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E., that the anxieties expressed in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* therefore reflect actual anxieties of Jewish communities in Judaea following the destruction, and

[1] F.J. Murphy makes a similar point about *Pseudo-Philo* (*Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1993], 262).
[2] S. Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 2.
[3] *4 Ezra* 14:50; assumed in *2 Baruch* 76:3–5.

that the texts have proposed unique solutions to the problem.

The first Jewish revolt against Rome (66–72 C.E.) and the Bar Kokhba revolt (132–135 C.E.) serve as reference points in the socio-historical discussion of leadership. While not the only cause of the first revolt, competing authority figures and lack of consistent leadership contributed to the revolt itself. Much of the reason for the insecurity around leadership in Judaea during this time can be derived from a ruling class in Judaea established under Roman guidelines of land ownership. While this arrangement had worked in other Roman provinces, monetary wealth had never been the main guidelines for Jewish leadership, and therefore the authority structure was fragile. Cultural tensions between Jews and non-Jews and inept Roman governors, combined with civil unrest and issues of class, meant that authority figures rose and fell quickly once the war started, with no one leader or group remaining in control for long. After the war ended, between mass destruction and social disorder, the leadership situation was in crisis mode; two leadership patterns remained: 1) some people who were leaders before the war remained to lead the Jewish community after it, and 2) there was a dearth of leadership, which opened the space for new leaders to rise. While it is likely that some combination of both of these options is what happened after the war, the overall situation was not stable.

We know specifically from the Bar Kokhba revolt that the situation was still in crisis up through the middle of the second century. Bar Kosiba rose up as a leader among Jews in Judaea, leading a third Jewish revolt against Rome, the second in Judaea, and initially succeeding in his task to once again gain Jewish independence. While our evidence from the Bar Kokhba revolt is minimal, the documentary and material remains portray Bar Kosiba as a domineering leader, attempting to maintain complete control over all matters related to military, religious observance, and economic issues. As I argued in chapter two, it may be that many of the Jews remaining in

Judaea rallied around him because other possible leaders were not viewed as effective in terms of action. This proposed reasoning becomes especially alluring when placed up against the non-militarist view of leadership as presenting in *2 Baruch*. This view found in *2 Baruch* encourages the audience to await the eschaton for the leadership of the messiah, who will act with divinely sanctioned military might against the enemies of the Jews; thus a human military leader such as Bar Kosiba may have been the against whom the polemics of Baruch were directed.

What the placement of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* between these two events does is to produce an historical framework in which we can analyze the portrayal of leadership, bringing the literary analysis into conversation with the socio-historical world. *4 Ezra* presents Ezra as an exemplary leader, drawing upon the discourses of Moses, Job, Ezekiel, and Daniel in addition to the traditions already associated with the biblical Ezra. Within the text of *4 Ezra*, Ezra's predominant leadership role is as the interlocutor between the community and God. While the community fears Ezra's absence, they also recognize and respect his requests to seek out answers on their behalf. All of Ezra's interactions with the heavenly realm, I argue, ultimately serve the community, and this is shown through the climax of *4 Ezra* in chapter 14, where Ezra is finally able to pass along his revelations to the people through the public and secret books. Ezra's ascension takes place only after he has left them with the written guidelines.

It is clear from the narrative of *4 Ezra*, I have argued, that the solution offered by Ezra is meant to reach a wide audience. While the secret books offered by Ezra at the end of *4 Ezra* are said to be kept for an otherwise unidentified group called "the wise," I have shown that this language is meant to lend legitimacy to the pseudepigraphic text of *4 Ezra*, rather than identify a sectarian group. The narrative promotes a leader who is learned in the correct interpretation of scripture—including both the 24 public books, a reference to what became the Hebrew Bible,

and the secret books—as well as a leader who awaits the impending eschaton. This conclusion is intended for a wide audience, and the narrative of *4 Ezra* attempts to tell the readers that in order to survive in the eschaton they should have a leader who embodies the same attributes as the inscribed Ezra.

In *2 Baruch*, Baruch receives revelation, observes the law, awaits the eschaton, and most importantly, acts as the teacher of his revelations to his community. Initially Baruch discusses the revelations with just the elders, then the elders plus two additional men, and finally the entire community. The hierarchal structure of *2 Baruch* shifts as the text progresses, where Baruch instructs an increasingly wider audience, ending with two epistles that encompass all Jews, everywhere; this progressive inclusivity sets up Baruch as the leader of Jewish communities no matter where they are located. Baruch's leadership skills are also stressed through the Apocalypse of the Cloud, a sub-section of *2 Baruch* that contains a review of the history of Israel in the form of an apocalyptic revelation. The leadership attributes of Baruch in this apocalypse are reinforced through their application to other good leaders in this sub-section, as Baruch embodies all the ideals that are highlighted in these good leaders throughout Israel's history. The Apocalypse of the Cloud also assists in the establishment of ideal attributes of any subsequent leaders following Baruch, namely, the messiah. Perhaps even more than in *4 Ezra*, the narrative of *2 Baruch* emphasizes the leader's impending death and the community's fear of his absence. I show that the narrative is ambivalent about who will follow in Baruch's footsteps as leader of the community: if it is a human leader, it is no one that currently resides in the community. Instead, the text may be highlighting the divine messiah as the next leader.

Like *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*'s intended reach is broad. This, I argue, is tied specifically to the message that the leadership attributes that Baruch embodies are not to be found in any current

historical leader. Instead, the message that *2 Baruch* promotes is that the intended audience should look toward the impending eschaton for the leadership of the messiah. This focus on the messiah is tied up with what I argue is *2 Baruch*'s non-militaristic agenda, which encourages its readers to await the messiah for the punishment of those who have destroyed Zion, rather than to take violent action against the enemies of Israel. Thus, with the broad intended audience and the focus on the messiah and the eschaton, *2 Baruch* attempts to persuade its reader to avoid armed conflict with the Romans and look to the messianic leader, who will arrive soon to punish the wicked; any human leader who promoted physical violence against the Roman would thus not be a good leader, according to *2 Baruch*.

The conclusions offered here support my primary thesis that there was no standard measure of authority in Judaea after the destruction; instead competing types of leaders can be found through the extant literary and material evidence, reflecting societal instability. This conclusion speaks directly against the idea that there was an easy segue between pharisaic Jewish leadership before the destruction and rabbinic leadership after the destruction. This model, popular in the late twentieth century, has fallen out of favour due to more nuanced readings of the primary sources.[4] My project contributes to this continued discussion by offering a careful reading of two texts that have been primarily ignored in the reconstruction of the social and historical worlds following the destruction of the temple, namely *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*.[5] Finally, my analysis of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* offers not just a description of what types of leadership were available after the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E.;[6] it further provides evidence that in

[4] See, for instance, Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society,* 3, 103–104; Junghwa Choi, *Jewish Leadership in Roman Palestine from 70 CE to 135 CE* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 14–15.
[5] For instance, Choi only mentions the apocalypses in two places and does not utilize them for his descriptions of leadership options after the destruction; *Jewish Leadership*, 169, 190–191. Similarly, Schwartz (*Imperialism and Jewish Society*) barely references either book in his consideration of imperial dominion over Jewish society in Judaea, and even then it is primarily in the footnotes.
[6] As per Choi's thesis in *Jewish Leadership*.

Judaea in the period following the destruction of the temple, there were competing ideals of leadership which posed problems to which Jewish communities felt compelled to respond in texts such as *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*.

Bibliography

Ancient Texts and Commentaries

Agourides, S. "Apocalypse of Sedrach." Pages 605–613 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 Volumes. Edited by James. H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

Aune, David E. "Revelation." *Word Biblical Commentary* 52a–c. Edited by D. Hubbard et al. Dallas: Word Books, 1997.

Bensly, R.L., ed. *The Fourth Book of Ezra, the Latin Version from the MSS*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895.

Bidawid, Raphaël J. "4. Esdras." Peshitta Institute. IV, 3. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Bogaert, Pierre. *Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch: Introduction, Traduction du Syriaque et Commentaire*. 2 Volumes. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1969.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. G.R. Beasley-Murray, trans. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.

Charles, R. H. *The Apocalypse of Baruch: Translated from the Syriac*. London: A. & C. Black, 1896. Reprint. Eugene, Or.: Wipf & Stock, 2005.

———. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* Volume II. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.

Charlesworth, James H. editor. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 volumes. Princeton Theological Seminar Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1995.

———. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* 2 Volumes. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

Collins, John Joseph. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Mark: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Cotton, Hannah and Ada Yardeni, eds. *Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek Documentary Texts from Nahal Hever and Other Sites*. DJD 27. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Grenfell, Bernard P. and Arthur S. Hunt. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 3. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1903.

Gurtner, Daniel M. *Second Baruch: A Critical Edition of the Syriac Text*. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.

Harrington, Daniel J. "Pseudo-Philo: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 297–377 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 2: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom, and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Ed. J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1985.

Josephus. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. LCL Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.

Klijn, A. F. J. "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch." Pages 615–652 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments.* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

Martínez, Florentino G. and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vol. Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998.

Metzger, B. M. "The Fourth Book of Ezra," Pages 516–559 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments.* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

Stone, Michael Edward. *Fourth Ezra.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

———. "Greek Apocalypse of Ezra." Pages 561–579 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Edited by James. H. Charlesworth: New York: Doubleday, 1983.
Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *1 Enoch 91–108*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.
Tov, Emanuel, ed. and trans. *The Book of Baruch*. Texts and Translations 8. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975.
Tromp, Johannes. *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
Philo. Translated by F.H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958.
Yadin, Yigal, Jonas C. Greenfield, Ada Yardeni and Baruch Levine, eds. *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters: Hebrew, Aramaic and Nabataean-Aramaic Papyri*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002.

Modern Sources

Alon, Gedalia. *The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age (70–640 C.E.)*. Translated by G. Levi. Jerusalem: Magness, 1980–1984. Repr., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.
Anderson, Gary A. Review of Rivka Nir*, The Desturction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*. *Journal of Religion* 85 (2005): 155–57.
———. "The Status of the Torah before Sinai: The Retelling of the Bible in the Damascus
Covenant and the book of *Jubilees*." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994): 1–29.
Arnal, William E. "The Rhetoric of Marginality: Apocalypticism, Gnosticism, and Sayings Gospels." *Harvard Theological Review* 88 (Oct 1995): 471–94.
Atiya, Aziz Suryal. *Arabic Manuscripts of Mount Sinai: a Hand-List of the Arabic Manuscripts and Scrolls Microfilmed at the Library of the Monastery of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1955.
Aune, David E. *Apocalypticism, Prophecy, and Magic in Early Christianity*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
Avigad, Nahman. *Hebrew Bullae from the Time of Jeremiah: Remnants of a Burnt Archive*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1986.
Beckwith, Roger T. *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1985.
Beebee, Thomas O. *The Ideology of Genre: A Comparative Study of Generic Instability.* University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994.
Bergren, Theodore A. "Ezra and Nehemiah Square off in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." Pages 340–65 in *Biblical Figures outside the Bible*. Edited by M. E. Stone. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998.
Bilde, P. "The Causes of the Jewish War According to Josephus." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 10 (1079): 179–202.
Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.
———. *Ezra-Nehemiah*. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1988.
Bogaert, Pierre. "Le personage de Baruch et l'histoire du livre de Jérémie: Aux origins du livre de Baruch." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate*

Studies 7 (1974): 19–21.
Box, G. H. *The Ezra-Apocalypse*. London: Pitman and Sons, 1912.
Boyarin, Daniel. "The Yavneh-Cycle of the Stammaim and the Invention of the Rabbis." Pages 237–90 in *Creation and Composition: The Contribution of the Bavli Redactors (Stammaim) to the Aggada*. Edited by Jeffrey L. Rubenstein. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
Brandenburger, Egon. *Adam und Christus: Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm 5:12–21 (1 Kor 15)*. WMANT 7. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.
———. *Die Verborgenheit Gottes im Weltgeschehen: das literarische und theologische Problem des 4. Esrabuches*. ATANT 68. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981.
Breech, Earl. "These Fragments I have Shored Against my Ruins: The Form and Function of *4 Ezra*." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92/2 (1973): 267–74.
Brockington, Leonard H. "The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." Pages 835–895 in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. Edited by Hedley Frederick D. Sparks. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984; Repr., Pages 97–142 in *Apocalyptic Literature: A Reader*. Edited by Mitchell G. Reddish. Nashville: Abingdon, 1990.
Brown, Cheryl Ann. *No Longer Be Silent: First Century Jewish Portraits of Biblical Women*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.
Brueggemann, Walter. "The 'Baruch Connection': Reflections on Jer 43:1–7." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 405–20.
Brunt, P. A. "Josephus on Social Conflicts in Roman Judaea." *Klio* 59 (1977): 149–53.
———. *Roman Imperial Themes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
Burkes, Shannon. "'Life' Redefined: Wisdom and Law in Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 63 (2001): 55–71.
Charlesworth, James. H., ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
———. "The Triumphant Majority as Seen by a Dwindled Minority: The Outsider According to the Insider of the Jewish Apocalypses, 70–130." Pages 285–315 in *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us:" Christians, Jews, and "Others" in Late Antiquity.* Edited by Jacob Neusner and E. S. Frerichs. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985.
———. "In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation." Pages 20–43 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth and C.A. Evans. JSPS 14. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
———. "From Jewish Messianology to Christian Christology: Some Caveats and Perspectives." Pages 225–264 in *Judaism and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
Choi, Junghwa. *Jewish Leadership in Roman Palestine from 70 CE to 135 CE*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
Cohen, Shaye J. D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999.
———. "The Significance of Yavneh: Pharisees, Rabbis, and the End of Jewish Sectarianism." Hebrew Union College, Annual 55 (1984): 27–54.
———. *Josephus in the Galilee and Rome: his Vita and Development as a Historian*. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
Cohn, Naftali S. *The Memory of the Temple and the Making of the Rabbis*. Philadelphia:

University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998.
———. "The Idea of Election in *4 Ezra*." *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 16 (2009): 83–96.
———. "Introduction: Toward the Morphology of a Genre." Pages 1–20 in *Semeia 14: Apocalypse: Morphology of a Genre*. Edited by John J. Collins. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979.
———. "'He shall not judge by what his eyes see': Messianic Authority in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 153–55.
———. "Testaments." Pages 325–55 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
———. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
———. "Pseudepigraphy and Group Formation in Second Temple Judaism." Pages 43–58 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
Collins, John J. and George W.E Nickelsburg, eds. *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Scholars Press, 1980.
Collins, John J. and George W.E Nickelsburg. "Introduction." Pages 1–12 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by John J. Collins and George W.E. Nickelsburg. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Scholars Press, 1980.
Cotton, Hannah. "The Bar Kokhba Revolt and the Documents from the Judaean Desert: Nabataean Participation in the Revolt (*P.Yadin* 52)." Pages 133–152 in *The Bar Kokhba Revolt Reconsidered*. Edited by Peter Schäfer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
Cowley, A. E., *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1923.
Cribiore, Raffaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
Daschke, Dereck. *City of Ruins: Mourning the Destruction of Jerusalem through Jewish Apocalypse*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
Davies, P.R. "The Social World of Apocalyptic Writings." Pages 251–71 in *The World of Ancient Israel*. Edited by R. E. Clements. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
Davila, James. *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* Leiden: Brill, 2005.
de Jonge, Marinus. *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*. Van Gorcum's Theologische Bibliotheek 25. Assen: Van Gorcum & Co., 1953.
Deines, Roland. *Die Gerechtigkeit der Tor aim Reich des Messias. Mt 5, 13–20 als Schlüsseltext der matthäischen Theologie*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 177. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
Derrida, Jacques. "The Law of Genre." Pages 219–31 in *Modern Genre Theory*. Edited by David Duff. Harlow, UK: Longman, 2000.
———. *Of Grammatology.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1976.
DesCamp, Mary Therese. *Metaphor and Ideology: Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and Literary*

Methods through a Cognitive Lens. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
Desjardins, Michel. "Law in 2 Baruch and *4 Ezra*." *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 14 (1985): 25–37.
Dimant, Devorah. "The Testament as a Literary Form in Early Jewish Pseudepigraphical Literature." *World Congress of Jewish Studies* 8 (1982): 79–83.
DiTommaso, Lorenzo. "Dating the Eagle Vision of 4 Ezra: a New Look at an Old Theory." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 10 (1999): 3–38.
———. "Who is the 'I' of *4 Ezra*?" Pages 119–33 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*. Edited by Matthias Henze, Gabriele Boccaccini with Jason M. Zurawski. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
Doering, Lutz. "Jeremiah and the "Diaspora Letters" in Ancient Judaism: Epistolary Communication with the Golah as Medium for Dealing with the Present." Pages 43–72 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretation*. Edited by K. De Troyer and A. Lange. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2005.
———. "The Epistle of Baruch and its Role in *2 Baruch*." Pages 151–73 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*. Edited by Matthias Henze and Gabriele Boccaccini with the collaboration of Jason M. Zurawski. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
Duff, David, ed. *Modern Genre Theory*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited, 2000.
Ego, Beate. Review of Rivka Nir, *The Desturction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 116 (2004): 470.
Ego, Beate, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer, eds. *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community Without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Seiten: WUNT, 1999.
Esler, Philip F. "The Social Function of *4 Ezra*." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 53 (1994): 99–123.
Flannery-Dailey, Frances. *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras*. Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2004.
Fraade, Steven D. "The Temple as a Marker of Jewish Identity Before and After 70 CE: The Role of the Holy Vessels in Rabbinic Memory and Imagination." Pages 237–265 in *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*. Edited by L. I. Levine and D. R. Schwartz. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
Foucault, Michel. "What is an Author?" Pages 205-22 in *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology.* Edited by J. D. Faubion; Translated by R. Hurley. 2 vols. New York: The New Press, 1998.
Frankfurter, David. "Introduction and Annotations to the Revelation to John." Pages 463–498 in *The Jewish Annotated New Testament*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine and Marc Zvi Brettler. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
Freyne, Sean. "The Charismatic." Pages 223–258 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by John J. Collins and George W.E. Nickelsburg. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Scholars Press, 1980.
Fulton, Deirdre, N. "Esdras, First Book of." Pages 597–598 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.

Gamble, Harry J. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
García Martínez, Florentino and Mladen Popović, editors. *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Gröningen*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 70. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
Ginzberg, Louis, and Stern, David. *Legends of the Jews*. Volumes 1 and 2. 2nd Edition. Dulles, Va.: Jewish Publication Society, 2003.
Goodblatt, David. *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
———. "'The Title Nasi' and the Ideological Background of the Second Revolt." Pages 113–132 in *The Bar-Kokhva Revolt: A New Approach*. Edited by in Aaron Oppenheimer and Uriel Rappaport. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 1984. [Hebrew].
———. *Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
Goodman, Martin. "Current Scholarship on the First Revolt." Page 15–25 in *The First Jewish Revolt: Archaeology, history, and ideology*. Edited by A. M. Berlin and J. A. Overman. London: Routledge, 2002
———. *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt Against Rome A.D. 66–70*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
———. "Texts, Scribes and Power in Roman Judaea." Pages 99–108 in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*. Edited by A. K. Bowman and G. Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
———. "Religious Variety and the Temple in the Late Second Temple Period and its Aftermath," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 60 (2009): 202–213.
———. "Sadducees and Essenes after 70 CE." Pages 347–56 in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*. Edited by S. E. Porter, P. Joyce, and D.E. Orton. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
Goren, Yuval and Eran Arie. "The Authenticity of the Bullae of Berekhyahu son of Neriyahu the Scribe." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 372 (2014): 147–58.
Grabbe, Lester L. "Chronography in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch." Pages 49–63 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Kent H. Richards. SBLSP 20; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
———. "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 4 (1989): 27–47.
———. "Josephus and the Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 231–46.
Gunkel, Hermann. "Das vierte Buch Esr." Pages 231–402 in Vol. 2 of *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des alten Testaments*. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Tübingen: Mohr, 1900.
Gurtner, Daniel M. "The 'Twenty-Fifth Year of Jeconiah' and the date of *2 Baruch*," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (2008): 23–32.
Habel, Norman C. "The Form and Significance of the Call Narrative." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 77 (1965): 297–323.
Hadot, Jean. "Le problème de l'Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch d'après un ouvrage recent." *Semitica* 20 (1970): 59–76.
Hallbäck, Geert. "The Fall of Zion and the Revelation of the Law: An interpretation of *4 Ezra*." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 6 (1992): 263–92.

Harnisch, Wolfgang. *Verhängnis und Verheißung der Geschichte: Untersuchungen zum Zeit- und Geschichtsverständnis im 4 Buch Esra und in der syr. Baruchapokalypse*. FRLANT 97; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.

———. "Der Prophet als Widerpart und Zeuge der Offenbarung: Erwägungen zur Interdependenz von Form und Sache im Iv. Buch Ezra." Pages 461–93 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

Harrington, Daniel J. "Baruch, First Book of." Pages 425–426 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.

———. *Invitation to the Apocrypha*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

———. "Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33 (1971): 1–17.

———. "The 'Holy Land' in Pseudo-Philo, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch." Pages 661–672 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by S. Paul, R. Kraft, L. Schiffman and W. Fields. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.

Hayman, A. P. "The Problem of Pseudonymity in the Ezra Apocalypse." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 6 (1975): 47–56.

Hayward, C.T. Robert. "The Vine and its Products as Theological Symbols in First Century Palestinian Judaism." *Durham University Journal* 82 (1990): 9–18.

Hecke, Pierre van Hecke, "Pastoral Metaphors in the Hebrew Bible and in its Ancient Near Eastern Context." Pages 200–217 in *The Old Testament in its world: Papers Read at the Winter Meeting, January 2003, the Society for Old Testament Study and at the Joint Meeting, July 2003, the Society for Old Testament Study and het Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland en België.* Edited by Robert P. Gordon and Johannes C. de Moor. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Hellholm, D. *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and in the Near East.* Second Edition. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.

Hempel, Charlotte. "Damascus Document." Pages 511–512 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the early Hellenistic Period*. 2 volumes. London: SCM Press, 1974.

Henze, Matthias. "Torah and Eschatology in the *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*." Pages 201–215 in *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by G. Brooke, H. Najman and L. Stuckenbruck. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008.

———. *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading 'Second Baruch' in Context.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

———. "*Fourth Ezra* and *Second Baruch*: Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First Century Apocalyptic Literature." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131 (2012): 181–200.

———. Review of K. M. Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution*. *Journal of Religion* 90 (2010): 65–66.

———. Review of Rivka Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 15 (2006): 145–8.
———. "From Jeremiah to Baruch." Pages 157–77 in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and J. M. Lieu. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2006.
———. "Qoheleth and the *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*." *Vetus Testamentum* 58 (2008): 28–43.
Henze, Mathias and Gabriele Boccaccini with Jason M. Zurawski, editors. *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall.* Leiden: Brill, 2013.
Herr, Moshe David. "The Identity of the Jewish People Before and After the Destruction of the Second Temple: Continuity or Change?" Pages 211–36 in *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*. Edited by L. I. Levine and D. R. Schwartz. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
Hezser, Catherine. *The Social Structure of the Rabbinic Movement in Roman Palestine*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Messia Judaeorum*. Leipzig: Reisland, 1869.
Hogan, Karina Martin. *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution*. Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2008.
———. "The Preservation of *4 Ezra* in the Vulgate: Thanks to Ambrose, Not Jerome." Pages 381–402 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*. Edited by M. Henze and G. Boccaccini, with Jason M. Zurawski. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
Horsely, Richard A. "Power Vacuum and Power Struggle in 66–7 C.E." Pages 87–109 in *The First Jewish Revolt: Archaeology, History, and Ideology*. Edited by A. M. Berlin and J. A. Overman. London: Routledge, 2002.
Jeska, Joachim. *Die Geschichte Israels in der Sicht ds Lukas: Apg 7, 2b–53 und 13, 17–25 im Kontext antik-jüdischer Summarien der Geschichte Israel.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.
Jacobson, Howard. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. 2 volumes. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
Kabisch, Richard. *Das vierte Buch Esra auf seine Quellen untersucht*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1889.
Kasher, Aryeh. *Jews and Hellenistic Cities in Eretz-Israel: Relations of the Jews in Eretz-Israel with the Hellenistic Cities during the Second Temple Period (332 BCE–70 CE)*. *TSAJ* 21; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990.
Kee, H.C. "The Man in Fourth Ezra: Growth of a Tradition." Pages 199–208 in *SBL 1981 Seminar Papers*. Edited by K. H. Richards; Chicago: Scholars Press, 1981.
Klausner, Joseph. *The Messianic Idea in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah.* Translated by W.F. Stinespring. New York: Macmillan, 1955.
Klijn, A.F. J., ed., *Der lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra*. TU 131. Berlin: Akademie, 1983.
Knibb, Michael A. "Apocalyptic and Wisdom in 4 Ezra." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 13 (1982). Repr. pages 271–288 in *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
Kolenkow, Anitra Bingham. "The Fall of the Temple and the Coming of the End: The Spectrum and Process of Apocalyptic Argument in 2 Baruch and Other Authors." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 21 (1982): 243–50.

———. “The Literary Genre ‘Testament.’” Pages 259–267 in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters*. Ed. Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
———. “An Introduction to *2 Baruch* 53, 56–77: Structure and Substance.” PhD diss., Harvard, 1972.
Kraft, Robert A. “‘Ezra’ Materials in Judaism and Christianity.” *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Band 19.1:119–36. Part 2, *Principat*, 19.1. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1979.
Kugel, James L. *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
———. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.
Kugler, Robert A. “Testaments.” Pages 1295–1297 in *Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.
Laato, Antti. “The Apocalypse of the Syriac Baruch and the Date of the End.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (1998): 39–46.
———. *A Star is Rising: The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of the Jewish Messianic Expectations*. Atlanta, Ga., Scholars Press, 1998.
Leiman, Shnayer Z. *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture*. Hamden: Archon, 1976.
Levine, David. “Between Leadership and Marginality: Models for Evaluating the Role of the Rabbis in the Early Centuries CE.” Pages 195–210 in *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*. Edited by L. I. Levine and D. R. Schwartz. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
Lewis, Jack P. “What Do We Mean by Jabneh?” *Journal of Bible and Religion* 32 (1964): 125–32.
Lichtenberger, Hermann. “Zion and the Destruction of the Temple in *4 Ezra* 9–10.” Pages 239–49 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel.* Edited by H. Lichtenberger. Tübingen: Mohr, 1999.
Lied, Liv Ingeborg. *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008.
———. “Recent Scholarship on *2 Baruch*: 2000–2009.” *Catholic Biblical Review* 9 (2011): 238–76.
———. Review of Rivka Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 50 (2005): 403–5.
Longenecker, Bruce, W. “Locating 4 Ezra: A Consideration of its Social Setting and Functions.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 28 (1997): 271–93.
———. *Eschatology and the Covenant: A Comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1–11*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 57. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
Mack, Burton L. *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira’s Hymn in Praise of the Fathers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
Marginalia Review of Books. “Jew and Judean: A Forum on Politics and Historiography in the Translation of Ancient Texts: Have scholars erased the Jews from Antiquity?” *Marginalia Review of Books*, Last modified 26 August 2014. Accessed January 14, 2015. http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/jew-judean-forum.
Marrou, Henri Ireńeé. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by G. Lamb. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956.

McDonald, Lee M. *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995.
McLaren, James S. *Turbulent Times? Josephus and Scholarship on Judaea in the First Century CE*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 1998.
Meade, David G. *Pseudonymity and Canon*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1986.
Meeks, Wayne A. and Robert Louis Wilken. *Jewish and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Comman Era*. Missoula: Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978.
Mendels, Doron. *Identity, Religion and Historiography*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
———. *Memory in Jewish, Pagan and Christian Societies of the Graeco-Roman World*. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
———. *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism.* New York: Doubleday, 1992.
———. *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987.
Meshorer, Ya'akov. "The Coins of Aelia Capitolina." Pages 183–193 in *History of Jerusalem*. Edited by Y. Tsafrir and S. Safrai. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 1999.
Michel, Hans-Joachim. *Die Abschiedsrede des Paulus an die Kirche Apg. 20,17–38: Motivgeschichte und theologische Bedeutung*. SANT 35. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1973.
Mildenber, Leo. *The Coinage of the Bar Kokhba War*. Aarau, Frankfurt: Verlag Sauerländer, 1984.
Millard, Alan. *Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus*. New York: New York University Press, 2000.
Moehring, Horst R. "The Acta Pro Judaeis in the Antiquities of Flavius Josephus." Pages 124–158 in *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty.* Vol. 3. Edited by J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
Murphy, Frederick J. "2 *Baruch* and the Romans." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (Dec. 1985): 663–69.
———. *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
———. "Biblical Antiquities (Pseudo-Philo)." Pages 440–42 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.
———. Review of Rivka Nir, *The Desturction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 66 (2005): 326–27.
Mussies, G. "When Do Graecism Prove that a Latin Text is a Translation?" Pages 100–119 in *Vruchten van de Uithof: H.A. Brongers FS.* Utrecht: Theologisch Institut, 1984.
Myers, Jacob M. *Ezra. Nehemiah.* Anchor Bible. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, 1965.
Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
———. "How Should we Contextualize Pseudepigrapha? Imitation and Emulation in *4 Ezra*." Pages 535–543 in *Past Renewals: Interpretative Authority, Renewed Revelation and the Quest for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity*. JSJSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 2010. Reprinted from pages 529–536 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honor of Florentino García Martínez*. JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007.
———. "Traditionary Processes and Textual Unity in *4 Ezra*." Pages 99–117 in *Four Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*. Edited by Matthias Henze and Gabriele Bocaaccini with the collaboration of Jason M. Zurawski. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

———. “Configuring the Text in Biblical Studies.” Pages 3–22 in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*. 2 volumes. Edited by Eric F. Mason, Samuel I. Thomas, Alison Schofield, and Eugene Ulrich. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
———. “Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and its Authority Conferring Strategies.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 30 (1999): 379–410.
———. “Between Heaven and Earth: Liminal Visions in 4Ezra.” Pages 153–167 in *Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World*. Edited by Tobias Nicklas, Joseph Verheyden, Erik M.M. Eynikel, and Florentino García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
Neusner, Jacob. *A History of the Jews in Babylonia*. 5 volumes. Leiden: Brill, 1965–1970.
———. *In the Aftermath of the Catastrophe: Founding Judaism, 70–640*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2009.
Neusner, Jacob, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerichs, eds. *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
Newsom, Carol A. “Spying out the Land: A Report from Genology.” Pages 19–30 in *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies.* Semeia Studies 63. Edited by Roland Boer. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.
———. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 52. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
Nickelsburg, George W. E. “History-Writing in, and on the Basis of, the Jewish Apocalyptic Literature.” Pages 79–104 in *Historical Knowledge and Biblical Antiquity*. Edited by J. Neusner, B. Chilton and W. S. Green. Dorset, UK: Deo Publishing, 2007.
———. “Good and Bad Leaders in Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*.” Pages 49–65 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by John J. Collins and George W.E Nickelsburg. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Scholars Press, 1980.
———. “Religious Exclusivism: A World View Governing Some Texts Found at Qumran.” Pages 45–67 in *Das Ende der Tage und die Gegenwart des heils: Begegnungen mit dem Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt: Festschrift für Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Michael Becker and Wolfgang Fenske. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 44. Leiden: Brill 1999.
———. “Narrative Traditions in the Paraleipomena of Jeremiah and 2 Baruch.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 35 (1973): 60–68.
———. *1 Enoch 1: a Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36, 81–108*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
Nir, Rivka. *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
Oegema, Gerbern S. *Apocalyptic Interpretation of the Bible: Apocalyptic and Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism, the Apostle Paul, the Historical Jesus, and their Reception History*. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
———. *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from Maccabees to Bar Kochba*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
Perdue, Leo G. “Baruch among the Sages.” Pages 260–90 in *Uprooting and Planting: Essays on Jeremiah for Leslie Allen*. Edited by John Goldingay. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
Phang, Sara Elise. “Military Documents, Languages, and Literary.” Pages 286–305 in *A Companion to the Roman Army*. Edited by Paul Erdkam. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
Pollard, John. *Birds in Greek Life and Myth*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977.

Popkes, Wiard. “Leadership: James, Paul, and their Contemporary Background.” Pages 323–354 in *The Missions of James, Peter, and Paul: Tensions in Early Christianity*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig Evans. Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2005.
Porton, Gary C. “The Grape-Cluster in Jewish Literature and Art of Late Antiquity.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 27 (1976): 159–76.
Propp, Vladimir. “Fairy Tale Transformations.” Pages 50–67 in *Modern Genre Theory*. Edited by David Duff. Essex: Pearson Education Limited, 2000. Reprinted from *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Third edition. Edited by Ladislav Matejka and Krystyna Pomorska. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1971, 94–114. First published as ‘Transformacii volshebnyx skazok’ in *Poetika*, 4 (1928): 70–89. Translated by C.H. Severens.
Pucci Ben-Zeev, Miriam. *Jewish Rights in the Roman World: The Greek and Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
Rajak, Tessa. “Was there a Roman Charter for the Jews?” *Journal of Roman Studies* 74 (1984): 107–123.
———. *Josephus, the Historian and his Society*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
Rappaport, Uriel. “Jewish-Pagan Relations and the Revolt Against Rome in 66–70 CE.” Pages 81–95 in *The Jerusalem Cathedra: Studies in the History, Archaeology, Geography and Ethnography of the Land of Israel* Volume I. Edited by Lee I. Levine. Jerusalem: Izhak Ben Zvi Institute, 1981.
———. “The Jewish Leadership in Jerusalem in the First Part of the Great Revolt (66–68 CE).” Pages 75–83 in *The Ancient Period*. Edited by Isaiah Gafni. Vol. 1 of *The Congregation of Israel: Jewish Independent Rule in its Generations*. Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 2001. [Hebrew]
Reynolds, Benjamin E. “The Otherworldly Mediators in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*: A Comparison with Angelic Mediators in Ascent Apocalypses and in Daniel, Ezekiel, and Zechariah.” Pages 175–193 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*. Edited by Matthias Henze and Gabriele Boccaccini with the collaboration of Jason M. Zurawski. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
Roddy, Nicolae. “‘Two Parts: Weeks of 7 Weeks’: The End of the Age as *Terminus ad Quem* for 2 Baruch*.” Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 14 (1996): 3–14.
Rooke, Deborah W. *Zadok’s Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
Rohrbaugh, Richard L. “‘Social Location of Thought’ as a Heuristic Construct in New Testament Study.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30 (1987): 103–119.
Rubenstein, Jeffrey L. “Social and Institutional Settings of Rabbinic Literature.” Pages 58–74 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature*. Edited by Charlotte E. Fonrobert and Martin S. Jaffee. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
Safrai, Zeev. “The Gentile Cities of Judea: Between Hasmonean Occupation and the Roman Liberation.” Pages 63–90 in *Studies in Historical Geography and Biblical Historiography: Presented to Zecharia Kallai*. Edited by Gershon Galil and Moshe Weinfeld. Boston: Brill, 2000.
Sayler, Gwendolyn B. *Have the Promises Failed? A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch*. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984.
Schäfer, Peter. *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
Schreiber, B. M. “The Week and Sabbath in Judaean Desert Documents.” *Scripta Classica*

Israelica 17 (1998): 102–114.
Schwartz, Daniel R. *Judeans and Jews: Four Faces of Dichotomy in Ancient Jewish History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.
Schwartz, Seth. *Imperialism and Jewish Society 200 B.C.E. To 640 C.E.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
Sheinfeld, Shayna. "Who is the Righteous Remnant in Romans 9–11?: The Concept of Remnant in Early Jewish Literature and Paul's Letter to the Romans." In *Paul the Jew: A Conversation between Pauline and Second Temple Scholars*. Edited by Carlos A. Segovia and Gabriele Boccaccini. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, *forthcoming*.
———. "The Euphrates as Temporal Marker in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch,*" *Journal for the Study of Judaism, forthcoming*.
———. "The Pseudepigrapha in Current Research." *Religion Compass* 7/5 (2013): 149–56.
———. Review of Dereck Daschke, *City of Ruins: Mourning the Destruction of Jerusalem through Jewish Apocalypse*. Leiden: Brill, 2010, *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha,* forthcoming.
———. Review of Junghwa Choi. *Jewish Leadership in Roman Palestine from 70 CE to 135 CE*. Leiden: Brill, 2013. *Journal for the Study of Judaism,* forthcoming.
———. "Oral Performance and the Function of *4 Ezra*." *Biblical Performance Criticism* (15 February 2013). Accessed 7 April 2015. http://www.biblicalperformancecriticism.org/index.php/20-full-text-articles/202-oral-performance-and-the-function-of-4-ezra.
Smallwood, E. Mary. *The Jews under Roman Rule: from Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
Smith, Morton. "Jewish Life in the Persian Period." Pages 219–78 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism Volume 1: The Persian Period*. Edited by W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
Stevens, Marty E. *Leadership Roles in the Old Testament: King, Prophet, Priest, and Sage*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2012.
Stone, Michael Edward. "A Reconsideration of Apocalyptic Visions." *Harvard Theological Review* 96 (2003): 167–80.
———. "The City in *4 Ezra*." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126 (2007): 402–7.
———. "Reactions to the Destruction of the Second Temple: Theology, Perception and Conversion." *Journal for the Study of Judaism In the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 12 (1981): 195–204.
———. "The Messiah in 4 Ezra." Pages 209–24 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner *et al*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987.
———. "The Metamorphosis of Ezra: Jewish Apocalypse and Medieval Vision." *Journal of Theological Studies* 33 (1982): 1–18.
Stone, Michael E., Aryeh Amihay, and Vered Hillel, editors. *Noah and his Book(s)*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 28. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
Strack, Hermann L. and Gunter Stemberger. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "'Reading the Present' in the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch* 85–90)." Pages 91–102 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the*

Contemporary by means of Scriptural Interpretations. Edited by K. De Troyer and A. Lange. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
Taylor, Joan. "The Women 'Priests' of Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa*: Reconstructing the Therapeutae." Pages 102–122 in *On the Cutting Edge: The Study of Women in Biblical Worlds; Essays in Honor of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza*. Edited by Jane Schaberg, Alice Bach, and Esther Fuchs. New York: Continuum, 2004.
Teeter, D. Andrew. "Scribes and Scribalism." Pages 1201–1204 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
"The Soncino Talmud on CD-ROM." *Judaic Classics Library*. Davka Corporation Version 2.2. 2001. Print ed.: Isadore Epstein, ed., *The Babylonian Talmud*. 30 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1990.
Tiller, Patrick A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature: 1993.
Tsafrir, Yoram. "Numismatics and the Foundation of Aelia Capitolina—A Critical Review." Pages 31–6 in *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered*. Edited by Peter Schäfer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
van Ruiten, Jacques T.A.G.M. *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26–25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14–23:8*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
VanderKam, James C. *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
———. "Judaism in the Land of Israel." Pages 57–76 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
———. *From Revelation to Canon*. Leiden: Brill, 2002
Violet, Bruno. *Die Esra-Apocalypse (IV Esra), Band 1: Die Überlieferung.* GCS 18. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910.
———. *Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt*. GSC 32. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924.
Walton, Steve. *Leadership and Lifestyle: the Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
Warren, Meredith J.C. *My Flesh is Meat Indeed: A Non-Sacramental Reading of John 6*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.
———. "'My Heart Poured Forth Understanding': *4 Ezra*'s Fiery Cup as Hierophagic Consumption." *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* (March 2015). Accessed 7 April 2015. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0008429814566212. □□□
———. "Hierophagy: Transformational Eating in Ancient Literature." Advanced Draft.□
Whitters, Mark F. *The Epistle of Second Baruch: A Study in Form and Message*. New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
———. "Some New Observations about Jewish Festal Letters." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32 (2001): 272–88.
———. "Testament and Canon in the Letter of Second Baruch (2 Baruch 78–87)." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 12 (2001): 149–63
Willett, Tom W. *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
Wise, Michael O. "Bar Kokhba Letters." Pages 418–21 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early*

Judaism. Edited by J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.
Wright, Benjamin. "Book of Ben Sira." Pages 436–438 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.
———. *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, volume 131. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
Wright, J. Edward. "The Social Setting of the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 16 (1997): 81–96.
———. *Baruch Ben Neriah: From Biblical Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003.
Wyrick, Jed. *The Ascension of Authorship: Attribution and Canon Formation in Hellenistic, Jewish, and Christian Traditions*. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature 49. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
———. "Pseudepigraphy," Pages 1114–1117 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.
Zurawski, Jason M. "Ezra Begins: *4 Ezra* as Prequel and the Making of a Superhero." Pages 289–304 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures*. Edited by Eibert Tigchelaar. BETL 270. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.