

Torah and Temple in Judean Pseudepigrapha

From Jubilees to Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch

Lutz Doering

In this contribution, I shall consider the two key concepts of Torah and temple in Judean texts (referring here to texts both Jewish¹ and hailing from Judea) from the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. In doing so, I shall select one text from the middle of the Hellenistic period – the Book of Jubilees – and two from the early Roman period, probably following the destruction of the Jerusalem temple – Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch. All of these texts envisage a Jewish readership.² All of them are conventionally reckoned with the so-called Pseudepigrapha, that is, pseudonymous or anonymous literature relating to figures of Israel’s past, subsequently translated into Greek and other languages, and eventually collected and handed down by Christians. They are, more specifically, to some extent also comparable with respect to their genre: while Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch are prime examples of (late) Jewish apocalypses of the “historical” type, the Book of Jubilees, while representing a specimen of “rewritten scripture,” might also be considered a special case of “historical” apocalypse.³ In what follows, I shall first analyze the treatment

¹ In this article I am using “Jewish” in a broad sense, as being related to a group of people sharing a particular lifestyle, set of beliefs, and ethnic identification. In using this term, I am not making an argument about the existence of Jewish “religion” for the time under consideration, and while I recognize that the genealogical aspect was more central in the Hellenistic period, I do not here presuppose a move from “Judean” to “Jewish,” as suggested by Daniel R. Schwartz (see, e.g., his *Judaeans and Jews: Four Faces of Dichotomy in Ancient Jewish History* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014]).

² For Jubilees, we can assume that the implied readers are construed as “Judeans” in the geographical sense, while Second Baruch might also appeal to Jews in the diaspora, on account of its reference to the tribes in the “Babylonian” and “Assyrian” exile (see 2 Bar. 77:12, 17–19; and the letter to the nine and a half tribes in the “Assyrian” exile, 2 Bar. 78–86), the latter of which are also referred to in Fourth Ezra (see 4 Ezra 13:39–47).

³ See the evaluation by J. C. VanderKam, *Jubilees: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2018), 19–21 (“It is reasonable to use labels such as Rewritten Scripture or Apocalypse for the genre of Jubilees, as long as one recognizes that there are strengths and weaknesses connected with both of them” [21]). For the suggestion that Jubilees “subverts” the form of the apocalypse, see T. R. Hanneken, *The Subversion of the Apocalypses in the Book of Jubilees*, EJL 34 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012). J. J. Collins, “The Genre of the Book of Jubilees,” in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of J. C.*

of Torah and temple in each of these works and then make some comparative observations that also allow us to gauge some broad lines in which the roles of Torah and temple have developed in the course of the Hellenistic and early Roman periods.

1. Torah and Temple in the Book of Jubilees

1.1 Torah in Jubilees

The Book of Jubilees, probably dating from the middle of the second century BCE,⁴ presupposes *something like the Torah* in the sense of “Pentateuch.” It deems this Torah authoritative and calls it “the book of the first law” (*maṣḥafa ḥegg za-qadāmi*, Jub. 6:22), written down by the angel of presence substituting for God.⁵ Similarly, Jub. 30:12 refers to the Torah: “For this reason I [sc. the angel of presence] have written for you *in the words of the law* everything that the Shechemites did to Dinah and how Jacob’s sons said: ‘We will not give our daughter to a man who has a foreskin because for us that would be a disgraceful thing.’” At first sight, this looks like a rough quotation of Gen 34:14. However, the Ge‘ez and Latin versions of Jubilees clearly support the reading “daughter,” whereas all versions of Genesis have “sister.”⁶ Jubilees, then, does not formally cite the Torah here, and even full-fledged paraphrase of Torah wording is relatively rare throughout the book. Rather, the relation between Jubilees and the Torah qua Pentateuch can be characterized as “rewriting,” and hence Jubilees features, as I have already indicated, as a prime example of “rewritten scripture,” presenting a rewritten form of the material from Gen 1 to Exod 24, with a few glimpses beyond.

Yet, Jubilees also inscribes into this rewriting the legal ideology and selected halakic details championed by its author group. The setting of Jub. 1:1–4 is modeled after Exod 24:12–18, Moses’s ascent to Mount Sinai and his forty-day stay. Jubilees 1:1 rewrites the ambiguous phrase in Exod 24:12, “I will give you the tablets of stone *and* the law and the commandment,” as follows: “I will

VanderKam, ed. E.F. Mason et al., JSJSup 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 737–755, drawing on Prototype Theory, is prepared to regard Jubilees as “a marginal member of the genre apocalypse [...] without claiming that this is its only generic affiliation” (754). For the common assignment of Second Baruch, Fourth Ezra, and Jubilees to the “historical” type of apocalypses, see id., *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2016), 7–8.

⁴ Cf. the recent review in VanderKam, *Jubilees* (see n. 3), 25–38, where he opts for “a time not too far from the 160s – perhaps the 150s” as “most likely” (38) while criticizing theories of literary growth of the work after its basic composition. For the purposes of this contribution I shall consider Jubilees as a coherent work. See further below, n. 13.

⁵ Cf. VanderKam, *Jubilees* (see n. 3), 319.

⁶ The reading “daughter” might be influenced by Gen 34:8–9, where this term is used.

give you the two stone tablets, the law and the commandment.”⁷ Here, “the law and the commandment” seems to stand in apposition to “the two stone tablets,” hence probably making the entire phrase relate to the Torah.⁸ At the same time, however, according to Jubilees, Moses is shown *more things* on Mount Sinai: “the Lord showed him what (had happened) beforehand as well as what was to come. He related to him the divisions of the times for the law and for the testimony” (Jub. 1:4). A similar wording occurs in Jub. 1:26⁹ and is probably a self-reference to the Book of Jubilees, which incorporates, with the mention of “law” (תורה) and “testimony” (תעודה),¹⁰ both halakic matters and the account of preordained history.¹¹ Hence, Jubilees claims to contain *additional* materials not included in the Pentateuch, which were nevertheless shown to Moses by God and dictated to him through the angel. It is debated whether this literary strategy of Jubilees to insert itself into the Sinai narrative implies that the book would claim a *more original* authority than the Torah: after all, the first stone tablets, as the reader of Exodus knows, were smashed following the incident with the golden calf (Exod 32:19) and then replaced with another set (cf. Exod 34); this would make Jubilees, which results from Moses’s *first* stay on the mountain, notionally the *oldest remaining* account of the Sinaitic revelation.¹² Nevertheless, as we have seen, Jubilees calls the Torah “the book of the *first* law,” which apparently acknowledges the primacy of the Pentateuch.

One significant insertion into the rewritten account is the presentation of the Sabbath, not merely as God’s exemplary resting at the culmination of creation week, but also as a day to be observed in the future by the Israelites, in company with God and the higher angels. Jubilees 2:19–23 records God’s intention, on Creation Sabbath, to elect the people of Israel and to grant them to keep the Sabbath in company with himself and the higher classes of angels, and Jub. 2:24 appears to refer to the Sabbath, probably including its prescriptions, with the phrase “the testimony and the first law.” Moreover, in Jub. 2:26–33,

⁷ Translations from Jubilees follow VanderKam, *Jubilees* (see n. 3).

⁸ In contrast, rabbinic interpretation derived from the phrase in Exod 24:12 the notion that Moses received both the Written and the Oral Torah on Mount Sinai. For a late variant, see b. Ber. 5b: the “tablets” refer to the Decalogue, the “law” to the Pentateuch, the “commandments” to the Mishnah, the phrase “I have written” (as Exod 24:12 continues) to the Prophets and Writings, and “to teach them” to the Gemarah.

⁹ Here, the contents of what the angel of presence dictates to Moses are given as “what is first and what is last and what is to come during all the divisions of the times that are for the law and for the testimony and for the weeks of their jubilees until eternity.”

¹⁰ For Jub. 1:4, 4Q216 i 11 preserves the reading [לתורה]ה, for Jub. 1:26, 4Q216 iv 4 has [ולתעודה]ה.

¹¹ Thus C. Werman, “The תורה and the תעודה Engraved on the Tablets,” *DSD* 9 (2002), 75–103, here 84–85.

¹² Cf. J. C. VanderKam, “Moses Trumping Moses: Making the Book of *Jubilees*,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, ed. S. Metso, H. Najman, and E. Schuller, STDJ 92 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 25–44.

following a creation summary in Jub. 2:25 (cf. Exod 31:17), Moses (in the narrative setting on Mount Sinai) is ordered to command the Israelites to observe the Sabbath lest they incur the death penalty, with Jub. 2:29–30 detailing a list of Sabbath prohibitions, which is complemented by two further lists at the end of the book, at Jub. 50:8, 12. In my view, the author of Jubilees congenially rewrote Exod 31:13–17, equally situated at Mount Sinai, which connects the obligation to keep the Sabbath, threatening any transgression with capital punishment, with a summary of the creation account.¹³ These lists of Sabbath prohibitions do not at all look like the Qumran Sabbath texts and seem to be less developed. If we date Jubilees in the middle of the second century BCE, these lists may well reflect legal tradition antedating the Maccabean revolt, which was preserved by the milieu from which Jubilees arose.¹⁴

Another significant feature written into the rewriting of the first part of the Torah is a version of the 364-day calendar particularly interested in excluding the moon from being an operative factor (Jub. 6:32–38).¹⁵ As is well known,

¹³ Cf. L. Doering, “The Concept of the Sabbath in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange, TSAJ 65 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 179–205. – Matthew Monger has recently claimed that 4Q216 (4QJub^a) originally contained only Jub. 1–2, though without Jub. 2:25–33, while 4Q218 (4QJub^b) 1 1–4, containing Jub. 2:26–27, was part of a Herodian-period redactional expansion of such a short version: M.P. Monger, “4Q216: A New Material Analysis,” *Sem* 60 (2018), 309–333; id., “The Many Forms of Jubilees: A Reassessment of the Manuscript Evidence from Qumran and the Lines of Transmission of the Parts and Whole of Jubilees,” *RevQ* 30/112 (2018), 191–211, here 203, 208–209. I remain skeptical regarding this proposal. Whether Monger’s material reconstruction stands scrutiny remains to be seen, and even if it did, the redactional-critical suggestion would not necessarily follow, since such a short scroll might as well be the remainder of a larger scroll or an excerpt. In terms of content, the statement “This is the testimony and the fir[st] law [as it was sanctified and blessed on the seventh day]” (Jub. 2:24b according to 4Q216 vii 17, restored; against Doering, op. cit., 186–187 n. 35, and the article there quoted, the first word of the line should be read וְזֶה, “this,” not “and this”) is hardly a fitting end to the preceding section and belongs much more plausibly together with the section following (preserved in the Ethiopic), which concerns the communication of the Sabbath laws to Israel and concludes with a matching phrase: “This law and testimony were given to the Israelites as an eternal law throughout their history” (Jub. 2:33). This bracket is aptly noted by C. Werman, *The Book of Jubilees: Introduction, Translation, and Interpretation, Between Bible and Mishnah* [in Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2015), 163, 166. Monger thinks his hypothesis matches that of J. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*, JSJSup 156 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 35–37, although Kugel deems the phrase in Jub. 2:24b preserved in 4Q216 to belong with the interpolation, thus the proposals are not congruent. In turn, Kugel’s reasons for assuming an interpolation in Jub. 2:24–33 are weak; see the critique in VanderKam, *Jubilees* (see n. 3), 204–205.

¹⁴ For comprehensive analysis of these lists and their halakah, see L. Doering, *Sabbat: Sabbathalacha und -praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum*, TSAJ 78 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 59–62 (arguing for the traditional character of these lists), 70–108.

¹⁵ For the specific form of the 364-day calendar in Jubilees, see J. Ben-Dov and S. Saul-

such a calendar is particularly suited for a strict separation of annual festivals and the Sabbath.¹⁶ It is unclear whether a 364-day calendar operated at the temple any time in the second century BCE; if so, we would have to assume that it was tacitly intercalated in order to bring it in line with the true solar year. Depending on the historical circumstances, Jubilees would either protest against a recent calendar reform or propagate an alternative to the established calendar.

As opposed to the “belated” giving of the Torah on Mount Sinai according to the Pentateuch, Jubilees anchors the law in divine creation. The Creator, as a matter of fact, spoke Hebrew, the “language of creation” (Jub. 12:26), and thus the law set up by the Creator was engraved in creation from which it can be read off, as it were. This is what Enoch begins to do (4:17–19) and Noah picks up, who possesses a book on the division of the earth, writes down teachings about medicines, and gives “all the books that he had written” to his oldest son Shem (8:11–12; 10:13–14). This is why Abram is made to understand Hebrew, so that, apart from observing the course of the stars (12:16), he could read the Hebrew books of his forefathers (12:25–27; cf. 21:10); writing is continued by Jacob (32:26), who passes on “all his books and the books of his fathers to Levi” (45:16).¹⁷ Another repository is the heavenly tablets, containing inter alia laws, from which the angel of presence reads off his account to Moses.¹⁸ Additionally, the primordial figures and the patriarchs, as *exempla*, enact relevant parts of the law, such as purification from childbirth (3:8–14), circumcision (15:11–14, 23–27; 16:14), celebration of festivals in the 364-day calendar,¹⁹ or the laws of tithes (32:2–15). They also instruct their offspring on various legally relevant issues, such as removal of and abstention from blood (7:27–33; 21:16–20), sacrificial laws (21:7–15), separation from gentiles (22:16–24), or the practice of righteousness and fraternal love (36:3–6). All of these instances of “the law before Sinai” appear to reflect interaction with Hellenistic concepts of natural law, without showing the philosophical quality of natural law dis-

nier, “Qumran Calendars: A Survey of Scholarship, 1980–2007,” *CurBR* 7 (2008), 124–168, esp. 135–138.

¹⁶ There would be minimal overlap during the *hōl ha-mō’ed* days; see Doering, *Sabbat* (see n. 14), 109.

¹⁷ See K. Müller, “Die hebräische Sprache als Textur der Schöpfung: Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis von Tora und Halacha im Buch der Jubiläen,” in *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition: Festschrift für Johann Maier zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. H. Merklein, K. Müller, and G. Stemberger, BBB 88 (Frankfurt am Main: Hain, 1993), 157–176. Cf. VanderKam, *Jubilees* (see n. 3), 1114–1116, who points out that “the ancestral literature was passed along in the priestly line” (1115).

¹⁸ See F. García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the *Book of Jubilees*,” in id., *Between Theology and Philology: Contributions to the Study of Ancient Jewish Interpretation*, ed. H. Najman and E. Tigchelaar, JSJSup 162 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 51–69.

¹⁹ Jub. 6:17–19; 15:1; 22:1–6; 44:1–4 (Shavu’ot); 6:28–31 (“memorial festivals” at the beginning of the four seasons); 16:20–31; 32:4–7 (Sukkot); 32:27–29 (‘Aseret); 18:18–19 (Maṣṣot); 49:1–14, 22–23 (Pesah and Maṣṣot).

courses in the Greek-speaking world.²⁰ Nevertheless, the adoption of natural law concepts provides legitimation and authority for the laws championed by Jubilees: The law of nature is none other than the law of the Israelites.

In some places Jubilees shows awareness of the difference between the contents of the law and the timing of its revelation. Thus, in Jub. 33:15–16 Reuben is excused for sleeping with the concubine of his father because the law had not been completely revealed by his time. Similarly, the choice of the legal material included in Jubilees is partly determined by the ambit of the Torah sections rewritten, though, as mentioned, some glimpses beyond Exod 24 are included.²¹ This accounts for the specific shape of certain halakic topics and even their absence. Thus, there is no consistent inclusion of ritual impurity, though, for example, the Protoplasts observe the purification periods for the parturient according to Lev 12:4–5.²² In sum, Jubilees develops a program for all of Israel according to a strict, reformist, and priestly informed approach to the Torah, which puts a prime on the holiness of the people, on their separation from gentiles, on the abstention from blood, and on the legitimation of the priesthood by pre-Aaronite figures such as the patriarchs. This is not a sectarian approach, though one that *views the Torah from the angle of its specific halakic legacy*.

1.2 The Temple in Jubilees

All of this has consequences for the way the temple is presented in Jubilees. First of all, the Jerusalem temple is a future reality from the Sinaitic narrative perspective of Jubilees. Therefore, we find only scattered references to the temple in this book. At several passages, however, Jubilees predicts its defilement. Jubilees 1:7–14 develops a scenario of idolatry and lawlessness, which includes abandonment of God's statutes, commandments, covenantal festivals, Sabbaths, holy things, tabernacle and temple (1:10)²³ and leads to the disper-

²⁰ Cf. C. E. Hayes, *What's Divine about Divine Law? Early Perspectives* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), esp. 5, 54–89, 103–105.

²¹ See esp. Exod 31:13–17, reflected in Jub. 2:17–27; Num 9:10–13, reflected in Jub. 49:9, 11; Deut 16:1–9, reflected in Jub. 49:16–21; cf. more generally the festal calendars in Exod 34:16–28 and Deut 16:1–17. In addition, several aspects of the Holiness Code are referred to, e. g., Lev 19:2 (cf. Jub. 16:26); 19:17–18 (cf. Jub. 36:4); as well as the measures against “moral” impurity, e. g., Lev 21:9 (cf. Jub. 20:4; 30:7; 41:17, 28); 18:21; 20:2–5 (cf. Jub. 30:7–10). On Lev 12:4–5, see presently.

²² Cf. 4Q265 frag. 7: forty days for a male, eighty days for a female child, before they are brought into the garden of Eden; potentially this reflects an old view that not only the mother (obviously absent here) but the children too have to await the respective periods. See L. Doering, “Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, ed. G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 261–275, here 262–264 (with further literature).

²³ For the reference to the tabernacle alongside the temple, cf. VanderKam, *Jubilees* (see n. 3), 151, pointing to the “pseudepigraphic setting of the book” before the entry to the land of Canaan.

sion of the Israelites among the nations (1:13). This is followed by a period of return and restoration (1:15–19), in which the Israelites will be transformed into a righteous plant, and God will build his temple among them and will live with them (1:17). This can be considered a typically Deuteronomistic schema, and it might relate to the first temple, the exile, and the restoration. It cannot be excluded, however, that statements about forgetting statutes, commandments, festivals, Sabbaths, and also the temple are transparent for the time of the author(s) and their first readers. In fact, Jub. 1:23–29 speaks again of a return of the people to God and follows this up with a prediction of perfect harmony between God and Israel, with Zion and Jerusalem becoming “holy,” and the onset of a new creation with the eschatological “temple of the Lord” on Mount Zion. Another passage that is relevant here is Jub. 23:15–25. Here it is said of wicked Israelites that they “will defile the holy things of the holy one²⁴ with the impure corruption of their contamination” (23:21). God will punish them and arouse the sinful nations against them (23:22–23). But then one group, called “the children,” will begin to study the laws, seek the commandments, and return to the right way (23:26). Evil will be absent. This might refer to the Hellenizers in Jerusalem and the subsequent formation of pious resistance²⁵ or, as Menahem Kister has suggested, the beginnings of the Essene sect,²⁶ though it is difficult to pinpoint the statements firmly in historiographical terms. Finally, in Jub. 30:15 defilement of the sanctuary is announced in the context of the rejection of mixed marriages (here with Shechem and Dinah); mention is made of “those who do impure things and who defile the Lord’s sanctuary” and “those who profane his holy name,” actions that – if silently passed over – will lead to the condemnation of the entire nation. Again, this might have the Hellenizers in view, but we should also note the intertextual trigger: closing ones eyes, defiling the sanctuary, and profaning God’s name feature in Lev 20:3–4, which Jubilees appears to draw on in its rewriting.²⁷

Thus, there is some insinuation that the temple in the time of Jubilees has been defiled, but this does not necessarily imply a *categorical* critique of the temple.²⁸ After all, Jub. 50:10–11, following a passage previewing life in the

²⁴ Eth. *qeddesāta qeddus*, not normally used for the holy of holies, hence perhaps referring to the sanctuary in general; cf. VanderKam, *Jubilees* (see n. 3), 691.

²⁵ Cf. F. Schubert, *Tradition und Erneuerung: Studien zum Jubiläenbuch und seinem Trägerkreis*, Europäische Hochschulschriften 3/771 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1998), 124–151, who views an overlap between the circles of these “children” and those fleeing to the desert according to 1 Macc 2:29–38.

²⁶ M. Kister, “Towards the History of the Essene Sect: Studies in the Animal Apocalypse, the Book of Jubilees, and the Damascus Document,” *Tarbiz* 56 (1986–1987), 1–18. The passage in Jub. 23:14–31 is sometimes seen as a redactional addition, e. g., by C. Berner, *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubiläen: Heptadische Geschichtskonzeptionen im Antiken Judentum*, BZAW 363 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 239–254.

²⁷ Cf., e. g., VanderKam, *Jubilees* (see n. 3), 831–832.

²⁸ Contra J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, “Visions of the Temple in Jubilees,” in *Gemeinde ohne*

land of Israel, routinely mentions “offerings and sacrifices for the days and Sabbaths [...] in the sanctuary of the Lord your God” as the one type of “work” permitted on the Sabbath, and thus reckons with the functioning of the temple. It seems that Jubilees’ criticism is directed at the *administration* rather than the *institution* of the temple. But it is clear that the temple is not simply affirmed as the well-operating center of Judean life, while at the same time its crucial position is affirmed and predicted for the future. In part this is done via an *Urzeit-Endzeit* correspondence.²⁹ In Jub. 4:26 Moses is told that “there are four places on earth that belong to the Lord: the Garden of Eden, the mountain of the east,³⁰ this mountain on which you are today – Mount Sinai – and Mount Zion (which) will be sanctified in the new creation for the sanctification of the earth.” Similarly, Noah knows that the garden of Eden, Mount Sinai, and Mount Zion “were created as holy places.” As the laws of impurity apply to the garden of Eden, so Mount Zion will resume its place of holiness with the eschatological sanctuary that corresponds to the primordial sanctuary in Eden. This view of Jubilees should be compared with the Temple Scroll (11QT^a 29:9–10), which links “the day of creation” (יום הברייה) with the creation of the temple of the Lord forever. However, while the eschatological sanctuary provides a critical standard, Jubilees probably implies hopes for a correct operation of the temple even before the new creation.

2. Torah and Temple in Second Baruch and Fourth Ezra

With these two Pseudepigrapha we move forward probably some 250 years in time. Despite Martin Goodman’s demurrals regarding the date of Second Baruch,³¹ I still find a date in the period after 70 CE, probably in the decades before or after 100 CE, most likely for both Second Baruch and Fourth Ezra. Although the Qumran texts have suggested that a figure like Jeremiah could well feature as the hero of pre-70 texts, and hence the same could go for his scribe

Tempel/Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum, ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer, WUNT 118 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 215–227.

²⁹ For an overview of such a correspondence in some Pseudepigrapha and related texts, see L. Doering, “*Urzeit-Endzeit* Correlation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Pseudepigrapha,” in *Eschatologie/Eschatology: The Sixth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium; Eschatology in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Tübingen, September, 2009), ed. C. Landmesser, H.-J. Eckstein, and H. Lichtenberger, WUNT 272 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 19–58.

³⁰ The identification of this mountain is debated; see discussion in VanderKam, *Jubilees* (see n. 3), 262.

³¹ M. Goodman, “The Date of 2 Baruch,” in *Revealed Wisdom: Studies in Honour of C. Rowland*, ed. J. Ashton, *Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* 88 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 116–121.

and companion Baruch, there are good reasons to conclude that Second Baruch presents the crisis ensuing from the destruction of the first temple as transparent for the situation of the book several decades after the temple destruction of 70 CE. Moreover, 2 Bar. 32:2–4 appears to refer to both the Babylonian *and* the Roman destructions of the temple.³² For Fourth Ezra, a date towards the end of, or even following, the rule of Domitian is conclusively suggested by the vision of the three-headed and many-winged eagle in 4 Ezra 11–12.³³

2.1 Torah in Second Baruch

In Second Baruch, “law” (Syr. *nāmōsā*), first and foremost, refers to the Mosaic Torah.³⁴ However, different from Jubilees, the communication of the Torah on Mount Sinai plays a little role, as does the Exodus narrative. Mount Sinai is mentioned only once (2 Bar. 4:5), as the place where God showed Moses the likeness of the tabernacle, and it is hinted at with the phrase “when he took Moses to him”³⁵ at 2 Bar. 59:3, followed by the things God disclosed to him (59:4–11). More important for Second Baruch is the Book of Deuteronomy: The covenant between God and Israel is modeled after that of Deuteronomy,

³² The chief argument for Goodman’s claim that “we cannot show that 2 Baruch was composed or circulated among Jews after 70 CE” (Goodman, “Date” [see n. 31], 121) is that 2 Bar. 32:2–4, apart from referring to the Babylonian and Roman destructions of the temple, also refers to its eschatological renewal “in glory,” which on the account of the latter “must include at least some prophecy [...] so it seems quite possible that the rest of Baruch’s gloomy predictions were prophecy also” (118). But this does not necessarily follow: The expectation of an eschatological renewal of Zion is a trope found in several Second Temple Jewish texts (see, e.g., above, at the end of § 1.2), hence can be regarded an eschatological expectation in its own right, which could well coexist with an *ex eventu* prediction of the destruction of the second temple. For the interpretation of these verses, see further below, at n. 42. For the date of Second Baruch, see also M. Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading Second Baruch in Context*, TSAJ 142 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 25–34, who suggests an author “living a generation or two after the Jewish War of 68–73 CE” (32).

³³ So also Goodman, “Date” (see n. 31), 117. The heads apparently refer to the three Flavian emperors. There is some debate whether the text should be dated to the end of Domitian’s reign (so M. E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990], 10) or, since 4 Ezra 12:2, 28 mentions the demise of the last head, to the period following his reign (so J. Schreiner, *Das 4. Buch Esra*, JSHRZ 5/4 [Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1981], 301).

³⁴ For law in Second Baruch, see also M. Desjardins, “Law in 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra,” *SR* 14 (1985), 25–37, here 26–31, 36–37, as well as R. L. Harris, “Torah and Transformation: The Centrality of the Torah in the Eschatology of 2 Baruch,” *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 10 (2019), 99–114. The term *nāmōsā* occurs in 2 Bar. 3:6; 15:5; 17:4; 19:3; 32:1; 38:2, 4; 41:3; 44:3, 7, 14; 46:3–5; 48:22, 24 (*bis*), 27, 38, 40, 47; 51:3–4, 7; 54:5, 14; 57:2; 59:2, 4, 11; 66:5; 67:6; 77:3, 15 (*bis*), 16; 84:2, 5, 8–9; 85:3, 14.

³⁵ Translations from Second Baruch follow M. E. Stone and M. Henze, *4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: Translations, Introductions, and Notes* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013).

with 2 Bar. 19:1 even citing Deut 30:19, “See, I have put before you life and death.” A related wording is found in 2 Bar. 84:2 (in the epistle). In line with the Deuteronomistic schema deployed in Second Baruch, Israel’s suffering is explained as divine chastisement: In sinning, Israel chose death, but if she repents God will remove her curses and restore her blessings.³⁶ These blessings do no longer concern prosperous life in *this* world but are concerned with eschatological reward. Hence, Torah obedience is crucial for Israel’s eschatological future but also for the fate of the individual at resurrection. In Second Baruch, only “those who are now righteous in my Torah, those who have had understanding in their lives, and those who have planted in their heart the root of wisdom” (2 Bar. 51:3) will be resurrected and transformed into a glorious, angelic life, while those who have “rejected my Torah and have stopped their ears so that they would not hear wisdom or receive understanding” (51:4) will be transformed into disfigured forms (51:2–12). The latter will certainly be the fate of the sinful nations (82:3–9), but there are also “many of your [sc. God’s] people who have withdrawn from your statutes (*qyāmayk*)³⁷ and have cast from them the yoke of your Torah (*nīreh dnāmōsāk*),” as there are “others who have abandoned their emptiness and have fled under your wings” (41:3–4); thus, Second Baruch reckons with both disobedient Israelites and obedient proselytes, whose respective status will be determined by their adherence to the Torah or lack thereof.

Second Baruch applies to the Torah the traditional metaphor of a “lamp” (*šrāgā*):³⁸ In bringing the Torah to the seed of Jacob, Moses “lit a lamp for the nation of Israel” (17:4).³⁹ Related is the motif of “light” (*nuhrā*): In lighting the lamp, Moses “took from the light” (18:1), which presents Moses as the transmitter rather than the originator of the light. The Torah gives off “that light in which nothing can stray” (19:3). The motif complex of lamps and light points to a sapiential concept of Torah, connecting it with creation. Several passages correlate Torah and wisdom (38:2, 4; 48:24; 51:3), as in Sir 24 and the wisdom poem of Bar 3:9–4:4. God “enlightens” the darkness for those “who have subjected themselves in faith to you and to your Torah” (2 Bar. 54:5). Specifically, there are some – though few – who “resemble” Moses (18:1) in lighting lamps, while many have taken “from the darkness of Adam” (18:2). For Second Baruch, as well as for Fourth Ezra (see below), transgression originated with Adam, who “brought death upon all who were not in his time” (2 Bar. 54:15).

³⁶ Cf. Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism* (see n. 32), 208, 218–220.

³⁷ The plural *qyāmayk* (thus probably at 2 Bar. 41:3, despite lack of *syāmē* in MS 7a1) occurs also at 2 Bar. 48:22 and 82:6 and probably means “my statutes” rather than “my covenants.”

³⁸ Cf. Ps 119:105; 36:10; Prov 6:23.

³⁹ According to 2 Bar. 59:2, at the time of Moses and his generation “the lamp of the eternal Torah enlightened all those who sat in darkness.” For the motifs of lamp and light, see also Harris, “Torah and Transformation” (see n. 34), esp. 101–103, 106–108, 110–112.

Different from Fourth Ezra, the focus here is on mortality. Moreover, each transgression is a fresh act, so that “each of us has become our own Adam” (54:19). Moreover, there is the option to choose for oneself “the praises to come”; the person “who trusts will receive a reward” (54:15–16). The people complain to Baruch that shepherds, lamps, and springs have vanished, but Baruch affirms that “shepherds, lamps, and springs come from the Torah. And though we pass on, the Torah abides” (77:15). Hence, Baruch calls the people to follow and study the Torah; there will always be sages and sons of the Torah (46:4–6). In fact, the Torah and God are the *only ones* to rely on. While “we were in our land,” Baruch writes to the northern tribes in the epistle, we had helpers who “helped us when we sinned, and they interceded on our behalf with him who made us.” But now, after the loss of the land and of Zion, there is nothing “except the Mighty One and his Torah” (85:1–3). The reward will indeed be better than what has been lost because, as we have already seen earlier with respect to the resurrection, it concerns “incorruptible” things (85:5).

Given the crucial role of the Torah and the commandments of God,⁴⁰ it is striking that hardly any material details of law observance are mentioned. Instead, the dominant mode in which Torah is presented is *paraenesis* exhorting readers to keep it. One might interpret this as an *inclusive* approach: Different from Jubilees, the author does not emphasize one specific halakic view. In the epistle, Baruch calls for the study “of the commandments of the Mighty One”; he also says that before his death he “will set before you some of the commandments of his judgment” (84:1). What he says, however, is again fairly general: “Remember Zion and the Torah, also the Holy Land, and your brothers, and the covenant, and your fathers, and the festivals, and the Sabbaths do not forget” (84:8). What, then, is the Torah in Second Baruch? It looks as if it were mainly based on the Pentateuch or perhaps a larger set of Hebrew scriptures. But 2 Bar. 84:9 also says, “And pass this letter *and the traditions (mašmānwāteh)*⁴¹ of the Torah on to your sons after you, as your fathers have also passed [them] on to you.” This suggests that the Torah is transmitted within a *wider set of legal traditions*, which Baruch tacitly presupposes and into which he notably inserts his own epistle.

2.2 The Temple in Second Baruch

The temple in Second Baruch is, first of all, the *object of destruction* by the Chaldeans (i.e., Babylonians), an event narrated dramatically in 2 Bar. 6–8; 80:1–5. The destruction appears to last for a long time; the priests are called to cast the temple keys “to the height of the heavens” (10:18). In the difficult

⁴⁰ For the latter, apart from *qyāmā* (pl.; see above), *pūqdānā* is frequently used; e.g., 2 Bar. 44:3; 57:2; 61:6; 77:4; 79:2; 84:1 (*bis*), 7.

⁴¹ Thus the reading in the integral form of the epistle in Codex Ambrosianus, whereas the stand-alone epistle has the singular, “tradition” (*mašmānūteh*).

passage 2 Bar. 32:2–3 there seems to be a hint at both the Babylonian and the Roman destructions of the temple: “(2) Because after a short time, the building of Zion will be shaken, in order to be built again. (3) But that building will not remain, but will again be uprooted after a time and will remain desolate until the time.” The first “shaking” refers to the Babylonian destruction, the “rebuilding,” to the construction of the second temple, and the subsequent “uprooting,” to the Roman destruction of the latter.⁴² Similarly, 2 Bar. 68:5–7, in the interpretation of the vision of the cloud and the black and bright waters, mentions the rebuilding of Zion, the resumption of the offerings, the return of the priests, and the arrival of the nations to glorify her, though less fully as in the beginning; this quite clearly also refers to the second Jerusalem temple.⁴³

The ruined temple is also the place to which Baruch returns to lament (10:5; 34:1; 35:1). Moreover, Baruch is “standing on Mount Zion” when he hears the divine word initiating the dialogue on time and theodicy (13:1), and he returns to this place when he prays (21:2–3; 48:1 in connection with 47:2); in fact, it is here that Baruch “saw” the heaven open (22:1) and that he “saw” his two major visions, the vision of the forest, the vine, and the spring (cf. 36:1) and the vision of the cloud and the black and bright waters (cf. 53:1 in connection with 52:8; 47:2). Thus, the space of the destroyed temple⁴⁴ is also the *place of Baruch’s revelations*. This creates an unmistakable link between the past that is now lost and the esoteric information about the future that Baruch receives.

Part of this information is that 2 Bar. 32:4, 6 announce a glorious renewal of “Zion” and a new creation.⁴⁵ Using the motif of the *tabnit* (“pattern,” Exod 25:9), 2 Bar. 4:3 claims that the physical temple is “not the one revealed with me, the one already prepared here when I intended to make Paradise.” Rather, after showing the latter to Adam, Abraham, and Moses, God keeps it with him as also paradise (4:1–6). Thus, an *eschatological temple*, here too conceptualized in an *Urzeit-Endzeit* correspondence, is expected to follow the current pe-

⁴² Thus Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism* (see n. 32), 193–195, who takes the imperfect *etaph ‘al netzī’* in 2 Bar. 32:2 as “present perfect”: “has been shaken,” so that it “currently lies in ruins” (194). A different, though overly complicated solution has been proposed by P. Bogaert, *L’Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch*, 2 vols., SC 144/145 (Paris: Cerf, 1969), 1.422–424. According to Bogaert, 2 Bar. 32:2 refers to the Roman destruction of the temple (whose effects are still visible), v. 3, however, to the future destruction of the *Messianic* temple, after which the renewal in glory and the new creation follow. As Henze rightly states, there is no hint elsewhere in Second Baruch that the Messianic age is ended with a temple destruction: only 4 Ezra 7:29 – not Second Baruch – speaks of the death of the Messiah.

⁴³ Cf. Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism* (see n. 32), 193 n. 27.

⁴⁴ For the ambiguity of the term “Zion” in Second Baruch, with an overlap between temple, city, and people, see L.I. Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch*, JSJSup 129 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 35–36.

⁴⁵ Contrast H. Najman, *Losing the Temple and Recovering the Future: An Analysis of 4 Ezra* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 122, who claims that “there is no mention in 2 Baruch of the heavenly Temple’s ultimate revelation on earth.”

riod of the physical temple being in ruins. This eschatological temple is probably related to the paradisiac world still invisible according to 2 Bar. 51:8–14, which the righteous will inherit. Thus, the second temple, which was already less glorious than the first and is now lost, is bracketed by the expected resumption of the initial model of the temple.

2.3 Torah in Fourth Ezra

In Fourth Ezra, “law” – *lex* in the Latin, *nāmōsā* in the Syriac, *ḥegg* in the Ethiopic version, reflecting Greek νόμος and ultimately תורה in the (probably) Hebrew original – is a multifaceted term.⁴⁶ It occurs numerous times throughout the composition.⁴⁷ In addition, there are a number of other terms that refer to aspects or individual commandments of the law; in the Latin version, the most important ones are *constitutio* (4 Ezra 7:11; cf. 7:44–45), *diligentia* (3:7, 19; 7:37), *dispositio* (4:23;⁴⁸ cf. 8:23), *legitima* (pl., 7:24; 9:32; 13:42), *mandatum* (3:33, 35–36; 7:72), *sponsio* (5:29; 7:46; cf. 7:24),⁴⁹ and *via* (7:79, 88; 14:31).⁵⁰ Since *lex* is used in parallel with some of them,⁵¹ it is fair to say that “law” in Fourth Ezra means “primarily the Torah with its individual prescriptions.”⁵² In most cases, however, *lex* seems to refer to a corpus of legal tradition wider than written scripture,⁵³ although the latter is clearly in view in 4 Ezra 4:23 (“the Torah of our fathers has been made of no effect and the written covenants no longer exist”) and 14:21 (“for your law has been burned”).⁵⁴

⁴⁶ For law in Fourth Ezra, see also Desjardins, “Law” (see n. 34), 31–37; J. Kerner, *Die Ethik der Johannes-Apokalypse im Vergleich mit der des 4. Esra*, BZNW 94 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998), 177–182; S. Beyerle, “Du bist kein Richter über dem Herrn”: Zur Konzeption von Gesetz und Gericht im 4. Esrabuch,” in *Recht und Ethos im Alten Testament – Gestalt und Wirkung: Festschrift für Horst Seebass zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. S. Beyerle, G. Mayer, and H. Strauss (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999), 315–337.

⁴⁷ Lat. *lex* occurs at 4 Ezra 3:19–20, 22; 4:23; 5:27; 7:17, 20, 24, 72, 79, 81, 89, 94, 133; 8:12, 29, 56; 9:11, 19, 31–32, 36–37; 13:38, 54; 14:21–22, 30. Cf. Kerner, *Ethik* (see n. 46), 177.

⁴⁸ Here: *dispositiones scriptae*, “written covenants,” with *dispositio* probably rendering διαθήκη; cf. Syriac ad loc.: *dīyateqes*.

⁴⁹ In the first two passages, the Syriac renders *sponsio* with *pūqdānayk*, “your commandments,” and *pūqdānek*, “your commandment,” respectively; cf. also the other versions. In 4 Ezra 7:24, the Syriac reads *qyāmaw*, which might mean “his statutes” here; see above on Second Baruch; the Georgian has the equivalent of *mandata*, whereas other versions have “covenant.”

⁵⁰ This term is also used with a wider meaning in Fourth Ezra, e. g., 4 Ezra 5:1; 7:23.

⁵¹ Namely, with *diligentia* (4 Ezra 3:19), *dispositio* (4:23), *legitima* and *sponsio* (7:24), as well as *mandatum* (7:72).

⁵² Kerner, *Ethik* (see n. 46), 177: “[...] wird [...] deutlich, daß mit Gesetz primär die Tora mit ihren Einzelbestimmungen gemeint ist” (similarly p. 181).

⁵³ Cf. Kerner, *Ethik* (see n. 46), 178, according to whom Fourth Ezra deems “alle alttestamentlichen, antik-jüdischen Gesetzesinhalte” as binding.

⁵⁴ Translations from Fourth Ezra follow Stone and Henze, *4 Ezra and 2 Baruch* (see n.

The proclamation of the Torah at Mount Sinai is referred to at 4 Ezra 3:17–19; 14:4–6; further references to the giving of the Torah in the desert, following the exodus, are found in 4 Ezra 9:31–32 and 14:30. According to 4 Ezra 9:31, the divine law is sown into the Israelites and will bring fruit. When Ezra later asks to rewrite it (see below), he does so in order that “men may be able to find the path” (14:22), that is, it is assumed that the law can generally be kept. However, the fathers did not keep it in the past (9:32; 14:29–35). The attitude towards the law is decisive for how a person fares after death (7:79–99): The souls of those who have despised the law “shall not enter into treasuries but shall immediately wander about in torments” (7:80), whereas the souls of the righteous who have “laboriously served the Most High, and withstood danger every hour, that they might keep the law of the Lawgiver⁵⁵ perfectly” (7:89), shall enter into their designated treasuries and be glorified. The presentation suggests that at least the latter are conceived as Israelites; and the context shows that at least part of the unjust are Israelites as well, as the angel denies the possibility that on judgment day (righteous) fathers might be able to intercede for their sons, children for their parents, etc., that is, within one and the same family (7:102–105).

Alongside this rather particularistic, Israel-centered notion of Torah, however, Fourth Ezra claims that there had been a law from the beginning: already Adam transgressed the *constitutiones* of God (7:11). In an anthropologically important section about the fashioning of the human being, the author also states that God “instructed him in your [sc. God’s] law” (8:12), which suggests that the law is directed to all human beings. Moreover, Ezra says at 4 Ezra 5:27, notably in the context of Israel’s election, that God has given Israel the Torah “which is approved by all” (Lat. *ab omnibus probatam*, Syr. *d’etbeher men kul*), which also hints at a wider appeal of the law beyond Israel. Finally, one might understand those who “have trampled upon” (*conculcaverunt*) the righteous (5:29; 8:57), “were contemptuous of the law” (8:56), and “opposed your commandments” (5:29),⁵⁶ as coming from the nations.

In this respect, Karina Hogan has suggested⁵⁷ that Ezra and the archangel Uriel, in their dialogues, represent two different notions of תורה. In both, תורה is connected with wisdom, though in Ezra’s dialogue contributions it retains a covenantal link. An example of this link is Ezra’s statement in his initial complaint. Asking, “Are the deeds of Babylon better than those of Zion?” (4 Ezra 3:31), he adds, “When have the inhabitants of the earth not sinned in your sight? Or what nation has kept your commandments so well? You may indeed find individual men who have kept your commandments, but nations you will

35), though with modifications regarding the rendering of the second person singular (“you” instead of “thou”).

⁵⁵ Lat. *legislatoris legem*. Syriac and Ethiopic have relative clauses.

⁵⁶ On the meaning of *sponsionibus* here, see above, n. 49. Stone translates “thy Torah.”

⁵⁷ K. M. Hogan, “The Meanings of *tôrâ* in 4 Ezra,” *JSJ* 38 (2007), 530–552.

not find” (3:35–36). The Torah is accessible to individual gentiles but in total is bound up with Israel, who, their sins notwithstanding, are still better than the gentiles. We have already mentioned Ezra’s reference to Israel’s election and gift of the Torah in 4 Ezra 5:27. Uriel, in contrast, so Hogan claims, propagates a more universal notion of law, as in 4 Ezra 7:21: “For God commanded those who came into the world, when they came, what they should do to live and what they should observe to avoid punishment,” though in what follows the angel appears to speak about Israel who “scorned his law, and denied his covenants” (7:24). There are further statements by Uriel that seem to suggest a universal law, for example 4 Ezra 7:72, where it is said of “those who dwell on earth” that “though they had understanding they committed iniquity, and though they received the commandments they did not keep them, and though they obtained the law, they dealt unfaithfully with what they received.” All of this suggests that there is some connection with concepts of “natural law” here. As in Jubilees, the details fall far short of, for example, the Stoic discourse on natural law as preserved in Greek and Latin sources, though there is clearly an engagement with universal law.⁵⁸

While Hogan has certainly sharpened our view of Torah in Fourth Ezra, one might, however, question the neat distribution of covenantal versus universal to the two figures in this analysis. The anthropological reflections in Fourth Ezra serve to address the issue of the fate of *Israel* and the destruction of *Zion*.⁵⁹ Nowhere does Uriel positively state that the gentiles keep the law. The angelic interlocutor may conceptualize the law somewhat more strongly in anthropological terms than Ezra, but one can ask whether the author really stages two different תורה traditions, as Hogan claims,⁶⁰ one covenantal like Sir 24 or Bar 3:9–4:4, and the other one non-covenantal like Ps 119. In fact, the anthropological argument is first introduced by the figure of *Ezra* when he points to Adam’s “evil heart” (*cor malignum*). “For the first Adam,” says Ezra, “burdened with an evil heart, transgressed and was overcome, as were also all who were descended from him. Thus the disease became permanent; the Torah was in the people’s heart along with the evil root, but what was good departed, and the evil remained” (4 Ezra 3:20–21). Although the Torah here apparently refers to the Mosaic law, and “people” (Lat. *populi*, Syr. *d’ammā*) to Israel, Ezra in fact says that both Adam *and all his descendants* transgressed.⁶¹ Conversely, *Uriel* states that the Messiah-Son of Man on top of Mount Zion will reprove the nations for their ungodliness and “destroy them without effort by the Torah”

⁵⁸ Cf. Beyerle, “Konzeption von Gesetz und Gericht” (see n. 46), 322–334. Hayes’s treatment is far too brief: Hayes, *What’s Divine* (see n. 20), 133 n. 55 (“In 4 Ezra [...], knowledge of a cosmic order does not lead inevitably to a universalism but is linked to a radical particularism”).

⁵⁹ So Stone, *Fourth Ezra* (see n. 33), 61.

⁶⁰ Hogan, “Meanings” (see n. 57), 539, 544, 546, 551.

⁶¹ We also recall that Ezra is presented as labeling the Torah “approved by all” (5:27).

(13:38). The reading is uncertain (based on Syr. *bnāmōseh*)⁶² but – if upheld – implies that the Messiah-Son of Man will judge the nations by the law, likely referring to the (covenantal) Torah here. Obviously, this will uplift all those within Israel that *do* obey the Torah. Moreover, Uriel refers to the ten northern tribes who migrated “to a more distant region, where no human race had ever lived, that there at least they might keep *their statutes* (Syriac and Ethiopic: *their law*) which they had not kept in their own land” (13:41–42).⁶³ This again shows that Uriel, too, may focus on Israel’s covenantal law.

To be sure, due to the anthropological skepticism expressed in the book, Fourth Ezra has a pessimistic view also of the efficacy of the Torah. Different from the view in Second Baruch, according to which there used to be shepherds, lamps, etc. (above §2.1), the Torah in Fourth Ezra apparently *failed* to orientate Israel in the past. Ezra’s strong probing of Uriel’s arguments thus entails also the ineffectiveness or even loss of the Torah (cf. 4 Ezra 4:23). However, Ezra’s encounter with the woman in 4 Ezra 9:38–10:28 is a turning point,⁶⁴ which allows him finally to accept Uriel’s perspective by taking his cue from the heavenly and future reality rather than the earthly and present. This becomes clear in 4 Ezra 14:28–36, where Ezra, having once again recapitulated the law transgressions of the forefathers, continues, thereby echoing Uriel’s themes,⁶⁵ “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 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” (14:33–35).

It is also in this context that we find Ezra in the role of the new Moses. The Torah, so we hear, “has been burned, and so no one knows the things which have been done or will be done by you” (4 Ezra 14:21; cf. also 4:23). Part of what is mentioned as contents of the Torah is God’s deeds; but the following

⁶² The Latin manuscripts have *et legem*, “and the law,” and the Ethiopic reads *mesla xati’atomu*, “with their sins.”

⁶³ The term for “their statutes” in Latin is *legitima sua*, whereas Syriac has *nāmōshōn* and Ethiopic *heggomu*, “their law.”

⁶⁴ Cf. for different nuances regarding this turning point, E. M. Humphreys, *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse and the Shepherd of Hermas*, JSPSup 17 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 57–81; L. T. Stuckenbruck, “Ezra’s Vision of the Lady: The Form and Function of a Turning Point,” in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, ed. M. Henze and G. Boccaccini, collaboration by J. M. Zurawski, JSJSup 164 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 137–150; Najman, *Losing the Temple* (see n. 45), 92–122.

⁶⁵ Cf. J. M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2015), 281–283; cf. id., “The Gift and Its Perfections: A Response to Joel Marcus and Margaret Mitchell,” *JSNT* 39 (2017), 331–344, here 333–334, where he justifies the notion of Ezra’s progression to resolution against the skeptical reading by J. Marcus, “Barclay’s Gift,” *JSNT* 39 (2017), 324–330, here 327–328.

verse also states that Ezra volunteers to write up the Torah again so “that human beings might be able to find the path, and that those who wish to live in the last days may live” (14:22).⁶⁶ Rather than bemoan the loss of the law, Ezra himself becomes the mediator of the Torah. Filled with wisdom and understanding, he dictates ninety-four books in forty days (14:39–44). He is commanded by God to make public the twenty-four books forming the Hebrew Bible and to let the worthy and unworthy read them, but to keep the seventy for the wise among his people (14:45–46). This suggests two things: first, as Hindy Najman has aptly noted, *a shift in focus towards the Torah*;⁶⁷ second, *a confirmation that Torah in Fourth Ezra is wider than the Pentateuch or the Hebrew Bible*, with the additional revelation here being accessible only to an esoteric group of initiates.⁶⁸ It is likely that the esoteric books reflect the shift in the book towards the new eon, the incorruptible world that is disclosed to Ezra, but the Mosaic theme in this chapter also suggests a link with the law.

2.4 The Temple in Fourth Ezra

As to the temple in Fourth Ezra, the first striking observation is that the book speaks more about *Jerusalem or “Zion”* than about the temple in particular.⁶⁹ David was ordered to build Jerusalem, the city of God, and to bring offerings in it (4 Ezra 3:23–24); only the Syriac and Armenian versions, as well as Latin manuscript L, with differences in detail, mention specifically the temple. Fourth Ezra shares the tradition of the heavenly “pattern” and its connection with the garden of Eden, though again the text is less outspoken about the temple (“And you did lead him into the garden which your right hand had planted before the earth appeared,” 3:6). In 4 Ezra 7:26, at the coming of the signs, “the city which now is not seen shall appear”⁷⁰ – again, the city rather than the temple in particular,⁷¹ although the latter is very likely included in “Zion” prepared and (re-)built, as for example in the New Jerusalem text from Qumran (11Q18).

Moreover, Ezra is ordered to come to a field of flowers “where no house has been built” (4 Ezra 9:24), where he famously encounters the weeping woman, and it is here that in consoling her he extensively recounts the destruction of Jerusalem, including the temple, its celebrations, its holy vessels and holy things, the burning to death of the priests, and the exile of the Levites, but al-

⁶⁶ *Nota bene*, we find here too the use of “human beings” for Israelites, who must be implied by the written law.

⁶⁷ Cf. Najman, *Losing the Temple* (see n. 45), 125: “a version of Judaism that is shifting its focus from Temple to Torah.” See further below, §2.4.

⁶⁸ These books may have included Fourth Ezra as well. Cf. 4 Ezra 12:36–38 and Stone, *Fourth Ezra* (see n. 33), 439.

⁶⁹ In the Latin version, *templum* occurs only in 4 Ezra 10:21; see below.

⁷⁰ For the reading here (with Arabic 1, Armenian), see Stone, *Fourth Ezra* (see n. 33), 202.

⁷¹ See also 4 Ezra 8:52; 13:36.

so the suffering of the people more widely and the loss of Zion's seal of glory (10:21–23). It is then that the woman transforms into a city (10:25–27), because the woman is indeed “Zion,” as Uriel comments (10:44). Uriel also explains the previous command to go on an empty field for “no work of man's building could endure in a place where the city of the Most High was to be revealed” (10:54). We have already identified Ezra's encounter with the woman as the turning point of the book that makes Ezra amenable to Uriel's apocalyptic perspective.

Thus, the transformation of the lady points Ezra beyond the earthly reality towards the reality of the new eon. As Najman suggests, the perspective of Fourth Ezra implies a “reboot” of the Second Temple period in which the second temple plays hardly any role⁷² and which *re-orientates its readers towards the future reality of the heavenly city, including its temple*. However, it is also this empty field where Ezra receives the vision of the eagle (11:1–12:3) and the vision of the son of man (13:1–13)⁷³ and where he transforms into the medium through which the new and enhanced Torah is dictated (14:37–41).⁷⁴ This too underscores the *shifting of focus in Fourth Ezra from temple to Torah*, to be understood in the enriched and supplemented form as outlined above.

3. Conclusion

Torah and temple are by no means obvious and static notions in the Judean Pseudepigrapha under scrutiny here. In all of them, though in different ways, Torah includes *more* than the Pentateuch or the Hebrew Bible, and there is an attempt to correlate the covenantal, particularistic Torah with universal notions of natural law, though again this is achieved in different ways. In the later Pseudepigrapha, the focus is less on halakah, and in Fourth Ezra part of the revelation is esoteric. In all three texts, the temple is not Judea's central institution simply taken for granted. In each of them, there is a link with paradise and hence an *Urzeit-Endzeit* correlation. Jubilees probably reckons with *a temple operating along the lines of its halakah* in advance of the eschatological temple and the new creation, and also *inculcates its readers more widely with its halakically enhanced notion of Torah*. In both Second Baruch and Fourth Ezra, which look back at the destruction of the second temple, *the temple expected belongs to the heavenly realm and the center stage is taken by the focus on a reconceptualized Torah*. The details, however, are different in these two later Pseudepigrapha: Fourth Ezra appears more reticent about the second temple and focuses on an esoteric supplementation of the Torah, while Second Baruch more clearly acknowledges the lost reality of the second temple and seeks com-

⁷² Cf. Najman, *Losing the Temple* (see n. 45), 1–25.

⁷³ See the details on the location in 4 Ezra 10:51–54, 58–60; 12:51; 13:47.

⁷⁴ See 4 Ezra 14:37: “we proceeded to the field, and remained there.”

fort in a paraenetically actualized Torah. And yet, how differently these compositions might develop the themes of Torah and temple, they nevertheless share a number of traditions and conceptions about them; Torah and temple remain focal points of the imagination of these texts and contribute to the shaping of Jewish identity and self-perception. Thus, while we might well speak of “varieties” of Judaism in this respect, partly separated by centuries, there is probably no warrant for speaking of distinct “Judaisms”⁷⁵ here.

⁷⁵ An option hesitantly – or probingly – suggested by the subtitle of the Berlin conference, “Torah, Temple, Land: Ancient Judaism(s) in Context.”