

PASSIVE RESISTANCE IN 2BARUCH AND 4EZRA

**PASSIVE RESISTANCE IN 2BARUCH AND 4EZRA:
A STUDY IN THE SOCIAL SETTING OF APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE**

by

DOMINIC PULLANO

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

September 1987

Master of Arts (1987)
Religious Studies

McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Passive Resistance in 2Baruch and 4Ezra:
A Study in the Social Setting of Apocalyptic Literature

AUTHOR: Dominic Pullano

SUPERVISOR: Dr. E.P. Sanders

NUMBER OF PAGES: vi, 134

ABSTRACT

Recent biblical scholarship has discredited the historical reconstruction that a party founded by Judas of Galilee in 6C.E. and known as the Zealots led the revolt against Rome in 66-74 C.E. The demise of this reconstruction has opened the door for a reevaluation of Jewish nationalism in first century Palestine. In this study, I shall try to show that Jewish nationalism was not restricted to military opposition to Roman rule. Some Jews who swelled the ranks of the apocalyptic communities adopted a passive resistance stance to manifest their opposition to Roman rule. By examining the apocalyptic works of 2Baruch and 4Ezra, I shall strive to demonstrate that the two communities which were responsible for these two works resented Roman rule but chose to resist the Romans nonviolently.

The first chapter examines Jewish nationalism in first century Palestine. In the first sub-section, I look at the relationship between politics and religion in first century Judaism and argue that the Jews neither separated politics from religion nor understood this relationship as many modern scholars have described it. In the second sub-section of this chapter, I examine the recent reconstructions of Jewish nationalism. I also provide a critique of these reconstructions in which I argue that scholars have still given too much attention to military opposition to the detriment of other forms of resistance to Roman rule.

In the second chapter, I set forth the differences between apocalypse, apocalyptic eschatology, and apocalypticism. The study of the apocalyptic phenomenon has been subdivided into three areas and I explain the aims and the methods of each area while devoting the most space to my own area of study, Jewish apocalypticism. In addition, I include a brief overview of the major theories which have been proposed thus far in the study of Jewish apocalypticism.

In the third chapter, I include my social and historical analysis of 2Baruch and 4Ezra. In the first section, I focus on the laments of the human visionaries which demonstrate that the communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra resented Roman rule. In the second section, I analyse the replies of the heavenly intermediaries which highlight the strategy employed by these two communities in dealing with the Roman menace, namely, passive resistance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. E.P. Sanders for consenting to be my supervisor even though he had many other commitments. The advice and criticisms offered throughout every stage of the thesis were invaluable even though I did not always appreciate them because of my stubbornness. I also wish to thank Dr. Stephen Westerholm. His careful reading of the drafts and his many stylistic corrections made the completion of this thesis possible. I wish to thank Dr. Ben F. Meyer. He made my stay at McMaster University a very instructive experience and his encouragement and reassurances concerning my abilities spurred me on to complete this project.

Finally, I wish to thank my parents, Michele and Maria. The love that they have shown me and the many sacrifices that they have made for me will always be appreciated and hopefully returned.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Passive Resistance and Jewish Apocalypticism	1
The Political History of First Century Palestine and the Apocalyptic Phenomenon	17
CHAPTER I	20
Politics and Religion in First Century Palestine	20
Jewish Opposition to Roman Rule in First Century Palestine	25
CHAPTER II	49
The Present State of the Study of the Apocalyptic Phenomenon	49
A Review of Previous Scholarship in the Study of Jewish Apocalypticism	55
CHAPTER III	65
The Laments of Baruch and Ezra	65
The Consolation of the Divine Interlocutors	80
CONCLUSION	96
ENDNOTES	100
BIBLIOGRAPHY	125

INTRODUCTION

Passive Resistance and Jewish Apocalypticism

In 63 B.C.E., Pompey, a general in the Roman army, took advantage of the political instability within Palestine to incorporate Judea into the Roman Empire. But the establishment of Roman rule in Palestine was met with disfavour by many of the inhabitants of Judea. The subsequent two hundred years of Roman-Jewish relations demonstrate the intense opposition of many Jews to the Roman occupation of Palestine. From Pompey's takeover of Palestine to the Bar Kokhba rebellion in 132 C.E., there is continuous evidence of the Jewish dissatisfaction with Roman rule, as the Jews displayed their opposition with many, diverse methods.¹

The most dramatic expression of the Jewish opposition to Roman dominance was obviously the act of rebellion. The history of the Jews under Roman rule is dotted with a series of revolts. The Hasmonean rulers, who were made ethnarchs at the inception of Roman rule in Palestine, incited their subjects to revolt (see J.W. 1:160-178).² While the client king, Herod the Great, went to great lengths to suppress open warfare (see Ant. 15:365-369), opposition to his characteristically harsh reign erupted at his death, with several uprisings throughout Judea (see Ant. 17:206-298). Judas of Galilee led another revolt when Judea became a Roman province in 6 C.E. (see Ant. 18:3-10). Another rebellion was barely averted during the reign of the Roman Emperor, Gaius Caligula, when he tried to desecrate the Temple in Jerusalem by erecting an image of the god Jupiter in the sanctuary (see J.W. 2:184-203). The final Jewish rebellion against Rome was led by a messianic pretender by the name of Bar Kokhba in 132-135 C.E.

But the most noteworthy uprising which the Jews undertook began in 66 C.E. and lasted until 74 C.E. While the rebels met with initial success, the final results of the uprising were tragic and disastrous for the Jewish nation. In the course of the revolt, the Jews forfeited their most prized possession, the Temple in Jerusalem. The Jews also relinquished any semblance of self administration and lost their identity as a nation.

Not only are these rebellions prime examples of the Jewish opposition to Roman rule, but these revolts have also been the subject matter of many books and articles. Scholars of Jewish history have devoted much attention to these revolts and have spilt much ink to describe the causes, nature, and consequences of each revolt. Historians have also expended much energy in discussing the roles which the revolutionary movements³ — such as the "fourth philosophy" which Judas of Galilee is said to have founded, the Zealots, the Sicarii, and the revolutionary movements led by John of Gischala and Simon bar Giora — played in the hostilities against the Romans. The revolutionary figures and groups who provided the leadership for the revolts against Rome have also been placed in the limelight by historians.

The extensive exposure which the Jewish rebellions and revolutionary movements have received, however, has contributed to a general misconception about the nature of Jewish opposition to Roman rule. The many works dedicated to the Jewish rebellions have given the impression that revolt was the sole vehicle by which Jews chose to express their resentments towards the Roman occupation of Palestine. The overall sense that remains after scouring this vast literature concerning the Jewish rebellions is that the Jews were divided on the Roman question. Some Jews were able to live in harmony with the Romans, as long as certain fundamental Jewish customs were respected by the Romans. Other Jews,

who comprised the ranks of the revolutionary movements, because of their aberrant interpretation of the doctrine of God's sovereignty over Israel, were hostile towards the Romans and would not hesitate to use force to remove the Romans from Palestine. Scholars of Jewish history have depicted the attitude of the Jews towards the Roman sovereignty in stark terms. The Jews either supported the status quo or belonged to groups that would use military force to regain their independence. In this vein, M.J. Borg in his book about the historical Jesus wrote that

according to one common assumption, the only two options for a Jew in first century Palestine were violent revolutionary nationalism or a non-political stance.⁴

The error in this depiction of Jewish opposition towards Rome is that it is not nuanced enough. The records of Josephus and other intertestamental literature demonstrate that, between these two extreme positions, different segments of the Jewish population adopted other political programs. In particular, there is evidence within this literature that other Jews, besides the revolutionary movements, resented the Roman presence in Palestine. During this period of fervent Jewish nationalism, there arose in Palestine other resistance movements who were distinct from and had no affinities with the revolutionary movements and who could be distinguished from revolutionary movements on the question of violence. These resistance movements did not believe that violence and aggression would solve the problems posed by the Roman presence in Palestine. These movements were just as intent upon expelling the Romans as the revolutionary movements were, except they realized that the mighty Roman army could not be overcome by force. Consequently, alternative modes of showing opposition to Roman rule were developed by these nonviolent resistance movements.⁵ From the

writings of Josephus, for example, it is learnt that one nonviolent resistance movement chose protest as a means of effecting change in Judea during the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate (see J.W. 2:169-174). Other Jews hoped diplomacy might ameliorate the conditions within Judea. This type of nonviolent resistance was practiced by some Jews at the time Judea was made a province in 6 C.E. (see Ant. 17:299-315) and again during the upheaval caused by Gaius Caligula when he desired to desecrate the Temple (see J.W. 2:192-203).⁶

But the chief evidence for the existence of nonviolent resistance movements during the Roman occupation of Palestine is found in the intertestamental literature. The members of some nonviolent resistance movements were rather prolific writers and several of their literary compositions have been preserved. These works provide a solution to the problems which these movements faced as a consequence of the Roman occupation of Palestine. These movements forsook the military solution of the revolutionary movements and gave birth to a peculiar theological and political perspective whereby God, who possessed complete control over human affairs, would intervene in the immediate future to deliver Israel from the hands of the Romans. This religio-political perspective, which provides a nonviolent answer to the political concerns of the Jews of the second temple period, is more commonly referred to as apocalyptic eschatology, while the movement which adopted this world view has been identified as Jewish apocalypticism.⁷

While the notion that Jewish apocalypticism was a resistance movement might appear novel at first, the more qualified observation that the ideology of Jewish apocalypticism was politically susceptible is not altogether new. Many scholars have argued that politically oriented movements appropriated apocalyptic ideas to serve political ends.⁸ Some scholars of Jewish history, for example, have

argued that Jewish apocalypticism contributed to the outbreak of war against Rome in 66 C.E. R. Horsley, in an article about ancient Jewish banditry in which he attempted to show that banditry was a necessary stage in the development of revolutionary movements, wrote concerning Jewish apocalypticism that

the apocalyptic spirit is not necessarily a factor in the emergence of banditry generally. But as a pervasive mood in Jewish society at the time, especially in times of tribulation, popular apocalypticism was almost certainly an important, even decisive, factor in the escalation of Jewish banditry toward wider rebellion.⁹

Other scholars have maintained that Jewish apocalypticism was instrumental in sustaining the hopes of the revolutionaries during the Jewish revolt of 66-74 C.E. when all hope seemed lost. D.S. Russell suggested that

there can be little doubt that the Zealot party, for example, found in this literature just the kind of propaganda they needed to set alight the smouldering passions of their fellow countrymen. The Jewish War of A.D. 66-70 was fought in the confirmed belief that the people would witness the miraculous intervention of God as declared in the apocalyptic writings. Later still, in the revolt of A.D. 132-5 under Bar Kochba, it was again the apocalyptic hope which inspired the Jewish people to take up arms against their overlords.¹⁰

I have alluded to these hypotheses that have seen a relationship between Jewish apocalypticism and revolutionary movements in the hope of lessening the initial scepticism which might greet the idea that Jewish apocalypticism was a nonviolent resistance movement. Scholars have already detected a political component of a seditious nature in the message of Jewish apocalypticism. The message of Jewish apocalypticism certainly had the capacity of appealing to those Jews who were bent on challenging the foreign occupiers of Palestine. But while it has not been uncommon for scholars to argue for the political potentiality of the ideas of Jewish apocalypticism, many issues remain unresolved; in particular, to what degree was

Jewish apocalypticism compatible with the goals and methods of revolutionary movements?

To date those scholars who have found a political aspect to the message of Jewish apocalypticism have invariably proposed some sort of association between Jewish apocalypticism and the revolutionary movements. But the theory that revolutionary movements co-opted apocalyptic ideas for their own purposes does not seem to be confirmed by the evidence. This supposed connection between Jewish apocalypticism and revolutionary movements is merely another instance of what I noted earlier, namely, that scholars who have studied the various Jewish revolts against Rome assume that the sole form that opposition to Rome took was revolt. As the revolutionaries were the only Jews to object to Roman rule (so many scholars seem to have reasoned), the aversion in apocalyptic literature to foreign rule must point to some connection between revolutionary movements and apocalyptic literature.

This study, however, will attempt to refute both claims. Revolt was not the sole form of Jewish opposition to Roman rule nor did the message of Jewish apocalypticism serve as propaganda for the revolutionary movements. This study will attempt to show that Jewish apocalypticism was a nonviolent form of opposition to Roman rule and that it may thus be characterized as a passive resistance movement. Like the revolutionary movements, Jewish apocalypticism was primarily concerned with the problem of the foreign occupation of Palestine, for reasons which will be discussed in this study. But the two movements parted company when it came to providing solutions to the Roman menace. Jewish apocalypticism rejected any sort of violence as the means by which to handle the Romans and accepted methods which will also be the subject matter of this study.

The assertion that Jewish apocalypticism was used by passive resistance movements is equally a departure from previous scholarship in so far that it claims that the political orientation was the essential and defining feature of apocalyptic communities. Scholars who have affirmed that a political component can be traced in apocalyptic literature have done so as a mere afterthought or have buried the idea in a footnote. These scholars have not felt that the political component in the message of Jewish apocalypticism merited much attention because the political component was only a minor characteristic of Jewish apocalypticism and other characteristics were much more determinative of the message of Jewish apocalypticism.

In this study, however, I shall try to elevate the political component of Jewish apocalypticism to the distinguishing mark of these movements. The message of Jewish apocalypticism was not primarily a religious perspective which had the potential to be exploited by revolutionary movements. Apocalyptic eschatology was a political ideology in its own right, an ideology which was developed for the specific purpose of dealing with the religious and political crises which foreign governments, and even some Jewish governments, posed for Jewish nationalists. Jewish apocalypticism, which, not coincidentally, flourished during the period of fervent Jewish nationalism (170 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.)¹¹, was one of several options open to Jews who were tired of bearing the yoke of foreign oppression between the Seleucid and the Roman period of Jewish history.¹²

Stated otherwise, this study will attempt to describe this very elusive intertestamental phenomenon which scholarship has designated Jewish apocalypticism. Contrary to what might be expected, however, another study of the Sitz im Leben of the apocalyptic phenomenon is not superfluous nor has this topic been overworked. A new study of the social setting of apocalyptic literature

is needed for two reasons. First, as is generally the case with all literature under the purview of New Testament studies¹³, the analysis of the social and historical setting of apocalyptic literature has been largely ignored. The bulk of the scholarly intention has been reserved for either the study of form (apocalypse) or for the study of content (apocalyptic eschatology). Scholars have given only token recognition to the historical events and social realities which occasioned apocalyptic communities. As G.W.E. Nickelsburg has remarked,

most studies of apocalypticism have focused on genre and form or on theological content. Largely lacking in the scholarship, but highly desirable for a better understanding of the documents, are an analysis of the social and cultural factors that gave rise to this literature and its worldview, and an attempt to delineate the nature of the communities in and for which these documents were created.¹⁴

As Nickelsburg's observation illustrates, very little work has been done to date on the social and historical setting of apocalyptic literature, as compared with the voluminous amount of material which scholars have produced on behalf of the study of genre and the study of ideology. What has been written usually only comprises a small section of a larger study and thus most research on this topic has been done piecemeal. Nickelsburg also added that

we have yet to see a full-scale and methodologically self-conscious study of the social setting of Palestinian Jewish apocalypticism.¹⁵

Secondly, not only has the study of the social setting been neglected, but what has been written about Jewish apocalypticism has proved to be inconclusive. No thesis which has been set forth thus far has settled the question. J. Barr, for example, has noted in a study which reviewed this field that "the attempt to define clearly the place of apocalyptic and its situation in life cannot be said to have been settled."¹⁶ There is, as yet, nothing approaching a consensus on this question of the social and historical setting of apocalyptic literature and hence this point is

still very much in the air. After surveying the opinions advanced by several scholars regarding the social setting of apocalyptic literature, K. Koch concluded, "Our survey indicates how completely obscure the sociological basis of the apocalyptic writings still is."¹⁷ Consequently, as very little has been written on this topic and no adequate solution has been found, a study of the social setting of apocalyptic literature is both required and desirable.¹⁸

The procedure by which I propose to demonstrate my claims is the following. In my examination of Jewish apocalypticism, I shall not treat all the extant apocalyptic writings in the intertestamental period. Instead, I shall confine my investigation to only two apocalyptic works. The reasons for adopting this course of action are primarily restrictions of time and space that dictate that this study have a narrow scope. But, this procedure will be pursued on more viable grounds as well. I shall restrict my consideration to a limited number of apocalyptic works in the hope of avoiding certain shortcomings inherent in survey studies which present an overview of the apocalyptic phenomenon.¹⁹ In any case, specialists in the field have abandoned this sweeping and general approach to the study of the apocalyptic phenomenon and seem content to analyse one or two apocalyptic works at a time.

The direction which the study of the apocalyptic phenomenon assumed in past years has recently come under severe attack. It was the custom of survey studies to define the apocalyptic phenomenon by compiling a list of its characteristic features. These lists would indiscriminately combine the literary features and the theological beliefs of apocalypses and other intertestamental literature. The aim of this enterprise was to reproduce the typical apocalyptic writing. More recent scholarship, however, has levelled a number of formidable criticisms against this approach.²⁰ One criticism concerned the inability of a list to bring out the distinctive character of apocalyptic literature. Invariably, the individual items on

the lists were common features of most religions of the Hellenistic period. Hence, the lists were unable to convey what made the apocalyptic phenomenon unique in comparison with other religious forms in the Greco-Roman period. J.Z. Smith took exception to survey studies for the ensuing reason:

I agree with Betz and von Rad that apocalypticism cannot be reduced to a mere catalogue of elements such as secret or heavenly books, journeys to heaven by a sage, etc., as these motifs can be found within the archaic religions of the Near East and are typical of all modes of Hellenistic religiosity.²¹

More recent scholarship has also dispensed with the approach followed by survey studies because the paradigms produced by these works rarely resembled any of the extant apocalyptic writings. Inevitably, most of the extant apocalyptic works would lack one or more of the features included in the paradigm. Due to the multifarious nature of apocalyptic literature, the authors of survey studies would incorporate characteristics which only certain works shared and not others. Consequently, the paradigms of survey studies were frequently untypical of the surviving apocalyptic works. Authors of survey studies were destined to failure from the outset because apocalyptic literature just does not lend itself to being described by means of a list. This criticism of the list approach was expressed aptly by P.D. Hanson:

The attempt to understand the apocalyptic phenomenon has been inhibited by repeated efforts at definition through the compilation of lists of characteristics which supposedly constitute an apocalyptic writing. Not only do such lists indiscriminately mix the three levels mentioned above (apocalypse, apocalyptic eschatology, and apocalypticism), but they include features which are randomly distributed among the writings in question. . . . Lists, be they of literary features or of concepts, are too abstract to define such a living entity.²²

My own criticism of the list approach centers on the use it made of the primary sources. The objective of the survey study was to provide the reader with

an overview of a religious phenomenon as discerned from the surviving texts. It was the practice in survey studies for the authors to make a general and sweeping statement about the whole of the apocalyptic phenomenon. Then, in order to substantiate these claims, the authors would quote a brief passage or two from one or another apocalyptic work, or they would simply list a series of references. In other words, the role which apocalyptic writings played in survey studies was extremely limited and there was no attempt made in survey studies to analyse the individual apocalyptic writings in and for themselves.

The function which the primary sources assumed in survey studies was flawed because of the lack of restraints placed on the authors of survey studies. As the primary sources were used exclusively as evidence to support wider claims about the apocalyptic phenomenon, the authors of survey studies could include or ignore whichever passages they wanted. In survey studies, it was up to the discretion of the author to ascertain which texts were characteristic of the apocalyptic phenomenon and which texts had little to contribute to our understanding of the apocalyptic phenomenon. The apocalyptic works were only given the floor, if at all, when the author so chose.

Since the authors of survey studies could arbitrarily pick and choose which passages to include as evidence, this procedure created two problems for the study of the apocalyptic phenomenon. First of all, the methodology followed by scholars in survey studies allowed them to concoct any image of the apocalyptic phenomenon simply by emphasizing certain texts and playing down other texts. Survey studies, therefore, were like " — a child's box of letters with which we can spell any word we please."²³ The reason a number of different pictures have been drawn of the apocalyptic phenomenon, which has been one of the major problems plaguing this area of study, is directly attributable to the faulty methodology

employed in survey studies. Secondly, as the authors of survey studies did not allow the apocalyptic writings to speak for themselves, I am convinced many essential features of the apocalyptic phenomenon have been overlooked. Many characteristics of the apocalyptic phenomenon have not come to light because the passages which deal with these features have not been consulted or have not been given ample exposure by most scholars.

In any event, the awareness of the inadequacies of the survey study and the list approach has given rise to a new method of examining the apocalyptic phenomenon which is particularly suitable for my purposes. Many specialists in the field no longer attempt to discuss every aspect of the apocalyptic phenomenon in only one study. Nor do they attempt to take stock of the entire corpus of apocalyptic literature in every one of their studies. Instead, many scholars are now producing treatises which deal with only a limited area of the apocalyptic phenomenon and which refer to only one or two apocalyptic writings. It is now quite common in the field of the apocalyptic phenomenon for scholars to give their monographs a limited scope and to exemplify their opinions with reference to only one or two apocalyptic works. In such studies, the authors will normally begin by stating their thesis. They will present their own viewpoints on a specialized problem within the field of the apocalyptic phenomenon. These scholars will then conclude their studies by turning to one or two apocalyptic writings to test their thesis. They will analyse one or two apocalyptic writings in order to observe whether these works confirm or deny their opinions on the limited topic.²⁴

M. Knibb based one of his articles, entitled "Apocalyptic and Wisdom in 4Ezra"²⁵, on this approach. As the title of the article suggests, Knibb was interested in examining the relationship between the apocalyptic phenomenon and the Israelite wisdom tradition. In particular, Knibb tried to refute von Rad's

argument that the origins of the apocalyptic phenomenon can be traced back to the Israelite wisdom tradition.²⁶ Moreover, Knibb supported his views only with examples from the apocalypse of Ezra.²⁷ Knibb justified his use of this approach by arguing:

It seems to me that what is needed at present is a series of detailed discussions of the characteristics of the individual apocalyptic writings. Only when this task has been undertaken will it perhaps be possible to write about apocalyptic in more general terms.²⁸

G.W.E. Nickelsburg employed a similar approach to his article "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1Enoch 6-11."²⁹ In this treatise, Nickelsburg was concerned with the role of myth in the apocalyptic phenomenon. But to substantiate his claims, Nickelsburg analysed only a portion of the Book of Watchers (1Enoch 6-11). In the same article, Nickelsburg made the astute comment that

the past decade has witnessed a wide-ranging debate on the subject of 'apocalyptic' and 'apocalypticism'. If one thing is certain in that debate, it is the lack of consensus as to the origins and essence of the subject matter under consideration. This state of affairs signals the pressing necessity to return to the painstaking work of analyzing the ancient texts themselves. Our concern here is with a portion of one such text.³⁰

These remarks by both Knibb and Nickelsburg represent the growing consensus among scholars that the only way to remedy the confusion which currently reigns in the field of the apocalyptic phenomenon is to start the whole enterprise anew, beginning with an individual examination of the primary sources. Nickelsburg is once again instructive in this regard when he stated:

When the individual documents have been studied in their own right, we can begin to compare them with one another and to seek possible interrelationships.³¹

The constructive feature of the test case approach, therefore, is that scholars have the opportunity to scrutinize the individual texts in greater detail. Scholars

employing this approach can give more careful scrutiny to the individual apocalyptic works when they have only one or two works vying for their attention. I shall be using this approach because even the sociological and historical analysis of the apocalyptic phenomenon can benefit immensely by a more detailed investigation of the individual texts.³² A. Yarbro Collins, for instance, has explained that

since a consensus has not yet been reached on the definition of the literary genre apocalypse or the phenomenon of apocalypticism, generalizations about the function of apocalypticism would be premature at this stage of the discussion. The most appropriate approach for the present seems to be the investigation of the function of particular apocalyptic writings in their historical setting.³³

Accordingly, the two apocalyptic works to which I shall have recourse in order to test my thesis about the political orientation of apocalyptic communities are commonly referred to as 2Baruch and 4Ezra.³⁴ The apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra were composed sometime after the Jewish revolt of 66-74 C.E.³⁵ and both writings are reflections on the problems which faced the Jewish community after the devastating rebellion.³⁶ The years following the revolt against Rome in 66-74 C.E. were rather turbulent for the Jewish community in Palestine. Not only did the Jews have the monumental task of reconstructing their community from the rubble which remained after the insurrection without many of their principal symbols of unity, such as the Temple in Jerusalem or administrative control of their homeland. Just as significantly, the defeat at the hands of the Romans gave rise to many theological crises for the Jewish community. The Jewish community, for example, had to resolve why God would allow his chosen people to suffer so ignominiously. Some Jews also wondered whether the defeat indicated that God had forsaken Israel as his chosen people altogether. These deliberations over the significance of the vanquishment led the authors of 2Baruch and 4Ezra to expound

the problems which confronted the Jewish community. The apocalypses of 2Baruch and 4Ezra were written to respond to the difficulties and challenges which the Jewish people encountered after the unsuccessful revolt.

As 2Baruch and 4Ezra flowed from the catastrophic events which befell the Jewish nation as a result of the revolt against Rome in 66-74 C.E., they will make excellent specimens for an investigation into the role of apocalyptic communities in political affairs. These works, as responses to a political event, will betray much data about the political perspective and involvement of the communities which stood behind both works. Owing to the intimate relationship between 2Baruch and 4Ezra and the Jewish revolt, these two books will go a long way in settling my contention that apocalyptic communities were opposed to Roman rule in Palestine, yet at the same time, distinct from and unaffiliated with the revolutionary movements.

My analysis of 2Baruch and 4Ezra for historical information about the nature of the resistance to Roman rule in Palestine will be guided by two considerations. First, I shall look at the attitude of the authors of 2Baruch and 4Ezra toward the gentiles. The authors of 2Baruch and 4Ezra grappled with the theological implications of the gentile domination of God's chosen people in this age and speculated on the fate of the gentile nations in the age to come. I shall try to discern the political perspective of the apocalyptic communities which produced and read 2Baruch and 4Ezra, therefore, from the authors' remarks about the gentiles, generally, and the Romans, specifically. Second, I shall focus my attention on the authors' understanding of Israel as I sift through 2Baruch and 4Ezra. The authors of 2Baruch and 4Ezra struggled with the relative insignificance of Israel in comparison to other nations of the world and predicted that Israel would hold a place of honour among the nations in the world to come.

Consequently, I shall attempt to discern the political tendencies of the apocalyptic communities in which 2Baruch and 4Ezra originated from the authors' conceptions of Israel's role in world history.

Furthermore, my analysis of 2Baruch and 4Ezra will be organized along the lines of the dialogue format which is found in both works.³⁷ The dialogue format in 2Baruch and 4Ezra consists of a discourse, which sometimes can get rather heated, between a human seer and a divine interlocutor. The human seer initiates the conversation by bringing a complaint to, or by asking a question of, the divine interlocutor. The angel replies to the queries either verbally or through a vision which the angel subsequently interprets for the human seer. My examination of 2Baruch and 4Ezra, therefore, will keep in sight this question and answer structure of these two apocalyptic works. First, I shall analyse the complaints and questions of the human agent which contain indications of the historical and social environment of the communities behind these works. One of the major complaints, for instance, of the human character was that the gentiles prospered unjustly at the expense of God's chosen people, Israel. Secondly, I shall consider the retorts of the divine interlocutor in both 2Baruch and 4Ezra. The divine interlocutor attempted to assuage the worries of the human agent by promising him that God would intervene in human history quite soon. The angel assured the human agent that he would initially witness the triumphal appearance of the Messiah and his kingdom. The Messiah would conquer the gentile nations that in this age had lorded it over Israel. The Messiah would also make Israel the dominant world empire by establishing his kingdom in place of the gentile kingdoms. The divine interlocutor then predicted that the reign of the Messiah would be followed by the eschaton. At the eschaton, the Jews would be raised by God to a new heavenly existence while the gentile nations would receive everlasting punishment.

A reasonable examination of the dialogue format, therefore, will reveal the rather negative attitude the authors of 2Baruch and 4Ezra possessed of the gentile nations who had ruled over Palestine. It will also reveal the authors' longing for the political supremacy of Israel over all other nations. This analysis will demonstrate the wishes of the authors for the political downfall of the gentile nations by divine intervention (not military force) and the ascendancy of the Jewish nation to political prominence through the miraculous endeavours of the Messiah. These theological and political views will suggest that the apocalyptic communities behind 2Baruch and 4Ezra qualify as nonviolent or passive resistance movements and this analysis, in turn, may act as a tentative or initial attempt to substantiate the more general claim that apocalyptic communities were politically motivated.³⁸

The Political History of First Century Palestine and the Apocalyptic Phenomenon

In the preceding introduction, I coalesced two areas of research which traditionally have not been associated. The political history of first century Palestine and the apocalyptic phenomenon have, except tangentially, been studied in isolation from each other. My contention that Jewish apocalypticism was a nonviolent resistance movement transcends the normal limits of the study of Jewish apocalypticism and spills over into the domain of Jewish political history during the second temple period. Moreover, many of the comments which I made in the introduction presuppose certain knowledge about both these areas of research. Many of my arguments may only be fully appreciated when viewed against the backdrop of the previous history of these separate areas of study. In the introduction, I also took the liberty of criticizing certain positions which are integral to the research presently being carried out in either the study of the

apocalyptic phenomenon or in the field of the political history of first century Palestine. Yet, both my presentation of these views and my appraisal of them were rather sketchy and require further elaboration.

At this point, therefore, I would like to review some of the key issues which are currently being debated in these two areas of concentration. I shall take the opportunity to supply some of the information which I presupposed in the introduction. In addition, I shall fill out some of the contentious issues I raised in the last section with greater detail and sophistication. With these refinements in argumentation, I hope to clarify many of the points I made above and, at the same time, render my forthcoming analysis of 2Baruch and 4Ezra more intelligible.

In the section on politics in first century Palestine, I shall concentrate on two topics. First, my claim that the historical provenance of apocalyptic communities is to be located in the struggle between the Jews and their foreign overlords in the Greco-Roman period is predicated on a particular understanding of the nature of politics and religion in this time period. As a result, I shall expound the relationship between politics and religion in first century Palestine, especially as my views about this relationship contrast with those commonly held by modern scholars. Second, I shall continue my analysis of Jewish opposition to Roman rule. In this examination, I shall take up anew my contention that revolutionary movements and methods have been emphasized to such an exaggerated degree in the scholarly literature that the other forms of opposition to Roman rule have been eclipsed.

In the section on the apocalyptic phenomenon, I shall describe the recent changes which this field of study has undergone. During the course of the last fifteen years, the apocalyptic phenomenon has been sub-divided into three distinct areas of study. Specialists in this field now distinguish between apocalypse (the

study of form or genre), apocalyptic eschatology (the study of content or ideology), and apocalypticism (the study of social setting). I shall try to delineate the scope and concerns of each level of study. But more importantly, I shall discuss in greater detail what constitutes the major focus of this work, the study of Jewish apocalypticism.

CHAPTER I

Politics and Religion in First Century Palestine

A.W. Watts, a professor of comparative religions, discussed the relationship between western and eastern "religions" in the article on religion in the Funk and Wagnalls Encyclopedia.¹ In this article, Watts argued that occidental and oriental systems of belief cannot be collated under one umbrella term like religion, "because of the important differences of function among the various systems known."² The author explained that the belief systems of the east play a different role in their societies from the role enjoyed by Christianity and Judaism in western civilization. Consequently, the author maintained that the term religion should be reserved for the belief systems of the west exclusively.³ Furthermore, the author of this article explained how it came to pass that these distinct phenomena were integrated under a single heading. Watts wrote:

It is a historical accident that the earliest European students of foreign or primitive cultures used the term "religion" for phenomena of which they had only a rudimentary knowledge. They jumped to the conclusion that other cultures must have institutions of the same type and function as Christianity or Judaism in their own culture.⁴

I have introduced Watts' argument regarding the differences between western and eastern "religions" or belief systems into this study because there is a valuable lesson to be learnt from it about the relationship between politics and religion in second temple Judaism. Not only is it the case that eastern or primitive religions do not always have the same standing in their society or culture as the position which Christianity and Judaism enjoy in western countries of the twentieth century. But, I would argue that the role which Christianity and Judaism play in twentieth century, western civilizations may not be the same role which these

religions had at other periods during their history. Watts' argument is not limited to foreign or primitive contexts, but it is also applicable to Christianity and Judaism in different historical periods.

In my opinion, one aspect of first century Judaism and Christianity which is distinct from Judaism and Christianity in the twentieth century concerns their respective relationships to politics. In industrialized, western nations, religion and politics have been perceived as two distinct and mutually exclusive spheres of human activity. In modern western culture, religion and politics are to be kept isolated as far as possible, and neither religion nor politics should interfere with the affairs of the other. Modern Christian and Jewish institutions, by and large, adopt the posture that the correct response to the state is passive submission. The only opposition Jews or Christians are to demonstrate against a lawful government is in the eventuality that the state tries to meddle in the affairs of the synagogue or church. The synagogue or church is to resist any and all encroachments of the state on their freedom of belief. Barring such interference, religious individuals should submit dutifully to the state.⁵

Another characteristic of twentieth century, western religions is that they are concerned with individuals. The function of religion is to serve the spiritual needs of the individual and it is not to take any active role in the social, economic, or political needs of the community. The goal of a religion is purely to act as a vehicle by which individuals might be saved. Finally, a prominent feature of the leading religious institutions in capitalist societies of the twentieth century involves their supernatural bearings. Christianity and Judaism perceive a dichotomy between the transcendental sphere and the terrestrial plane. These religions find ultimate purpose and meaning in the heavenly or the spiritual realm

as strictly mundane affairs are thought to be frivolous when weighed against the backdrop of eternity.⁶

The separation of church and state which characterizes twentieth century, western religion is not, however, an accurate barometer for the relationship which existed between politics and religion in first century Palestine. In addition, Judaism was not directed exclusively to the spiritual needs of its individual members as is the case in the modern, western world. There was a more intimate relationship between politics and religion in the first century C.E. because Judaism was endowed with a collective orientation. Judaism focused mainly on the needs of the Israelite nation. Since Jews viewed themselves as a nation, they formulated beliefs which touched upon all various aspects of national existence, including politics. Judaism was interested in terrestrial and historical occurrences such as politics inasmuch as the nation of Israel thrived in this context. A corollary to the above observation that Judaism focused on a political collectivity is that it had only an incidental interest in the spiritual edification and salvation of the individual souls of its members. Divine redemption consisted in atonement for a specially chosen nation which was to be experienced in this world, not just in some heavenly plane. Jews conceptualized salvation as an infusion of divine power into the terrestrial sphere, such as the political arena, for the benefit of a clearly designated group, the nation of Israel.

The close bond between politics and religion, moreover, has not gone unnoticed by many scholars of first century Judaism. Biblical scholars have sensed that Jews in first century Palestine perceived political involvement in a different light than twentieth century Judaism and Christianity and they have further remarked that religion and politics were closely associated in first century

Palestine. It is not uncommon in historical studies about first century Palestine to come up against statements such as the following by E. Mary Smallwood:

The problem in Judea was that to the Jews religion and politics were inextricably bound up together as two facets of a single way of life...⁷

While scholars have recognized that, unlike twentieth century western religion, politics was closely related to religion in first century Palestine, it is not altogether clear to me whether they have appreciated the full implications of this observation. There are, in my opinion, two problems with the way modern scholars have represented the relationship between politics and religion in first century Palestine. The first problem involves consistency. Scholars, such as Smallwood, who have noticed that politics and religion were closely connected in first century Judaism have not uniformly carried out this observation through their entire work and have, as a result, developed some contradictory arguments. Smallwood, for example, could maintain that the Romans administered the province of Judea after 6 C.E. by giving the procurators jurisdiction over political affairs and by allowing the Jewish Sanhedrin to retain their traditional authority over religious matters.⁸ But, if, as she claimed, politics and religion were indistinguishable in Palestine, how were the Romans able to give the Jewish Sanhedrin authority over religious matters only? Or again, even after making the statement quoted above, Smallwood can still write that the Pharisees did not mind Roman rule provided the Romans permitted them to practice their religion.⁹ But if religion and politics were "two facets of a single way of life", how was it possible that the Pharisees were only interested in practicing their religion to the exclusion of politics? As I hope these two examples illustrate, scholars such as Smallwood have suspected that there is some variation between the first century Jewish view of politics and religion from

politics. I shall propose in this study that first century Judaism, but more importantly, apocalyptic communities understood the connection between politics and religion in radically different terms than twentieth century Christianity or Judaism. I shall attempt to demonstrate that what we moderns refer to as politics and religion were inseparably bound up to one another, influenced each other, and were indistinguishable from each other in first century Palestine and in the thinking of apocalyptic communities. The realities which the terms politics and religion convey in industrialized capitalist societies enjoyed a very intimate association in first century Palestine and in the world view of apocalyptic communities. I shall also attempt to demonstrate that my depiction of the relationship between politics and religion in first century Palestine is somewhat different from the prevalent scholarly views. While my above statements about the intimate association between politics and religion in first century Palestine sound very similar to Smallwood's, I mean something a little different, as I hope my analysis of 2Baruch and 4Ezra will show.

Jewish Opposition to Roman Rule in First Century Palestine

If one wanted to write a handbook for budding, young academics about poor scholarship and blunders to avoid in scholarly research, the history of the study of Jewish opposition to Roman rule would prove to be a most valuable case study. The study of the political history of first century Palestine may, not unfairly, be described as a comedy of errors. It has not been uncommon for scholars in this field of study to propagate as fact, merely on the pretext of scholarly consensus, arguments which were blatantly inaccurate. Very recently, however, some scholars have begun to amend the errors which previous generations of scholars had introduced into this field of research. Nevertheless, the amount of revision which

is required in this area of concentration before the nature of Jewish opposition to Roman rule is reasonably depicted is still quite monumental. In this section, therefore, I shall give a brief summary of the history of this field of study which will be followed by an outline of the present state of the question. I shall conclude this section with a critique of this current reconstruction of the political history of first century Palestine, while at the same time offering my own interpretation of the evidence. Specifically, I shall focus on those views of Jewish opposition to Roman rule which have contributed to the failure of recognizing apocalyptic communities for what they were, passive resistance movements.

As recently as the middle sixties, eminent scholars like M. Hengel¹², W.R. Farmer¹³, S.G.F. Brandon¹⁴, and C. Roth¹⁵ have argued that the revolt by the Jews against Rome in 66-74 C.E. was led by one movement. This hypothesis stated that the Jews were initially incited to revolt against Rome in 6 C.E. by Judas of Galilee. In 6 C.E., the Romans decided, due to Archelaus' ineffectual rule, to alter the form of the administration of Judea from a vassal kingdom to a province. As Judea was to come under direct Roman rule, Augustus ordered that a census be taken of the new province. For Judas of Galilee, this census was unacceptable as it ostensibly denied the sovereignty of God over both the land and people of Israel. The census inspired Judas, with the help of Zaddok the Pharisee, to found a sect whose main platform was to reaffirm God's political authority over Israel by ousting the Romans.

The hypothesis continued that Judas' call to rebellion was destined for failure in 6 C.E. Notwithstanding this initial setback, however, the new movement which became known as the Zealots—while the most extreme faction within this movement was referred to as the Sicarii—continued to prosper. The ideas formulated by Judas and espoused by the Zealots infiltrated the Jewish community

with increasing rapidity. Through the efforts of the Zealots, the fever of revolt spread throughout the Jewish community in the period of 6 to 66 C.E. In 66 C.E., the desire to rebel was so pervasive in Palestine that the Zealots had little difficulty in starting a full-scale revolution.

The process of revising this account of Jewish history, which borders on the fictitious, was set in motion by S. Zeitlin¹⁶ and later popularized by M. Smith¹⁷ and M. Borg.¹⁸ These scholars wrote very convincing articles exposing some of the fundamental inaccuracies of the above rendition of history. Zeitlin, Smith, and Borg pointed out that Josephus did not attribute the revolt of 66-74 C.E. to the efforts of one movement and that Josephus never identified Judas' "fourth philosophy" with the Zealots. They indicated, moreover, that Josephus did not describe the origins and early activity of the Sicarii until the mid-fifties and that Josephus never referred to any group as the Zealots until the autumn of 68 C.E. when the revolt had long been under way. Consequently, the Sicarii and the Zealots were two different revolutionary movements, not two designations for the same movement. Zeitlin, Smith, and Borg concluded in their studies that the cause for the revolt cannot be blamed on only one group and that a movement known as the Zealots did not exist prior to the outbreak of war in 66 C.E.

Morton Smith ascribed these glaring errors to the influence of certain respected scholars like E. Schürer. These noted scholars argued for the above version of the events in their own studies and other scholars merely followed suit.¹⁹ I would trace the above misinterpretation of the events to a problem which still persists in the study of the political history of first century Palestine: an unsophisticated use of the writings of Josephus. Scholars who accepted the above version of Jewish history relied too heavily on the passage in the Jewish Antiquities²⁰ where Josephus recounted the actions of Judas of Galilee in 6 C.E.

in Jerusalem. In the period between 44 C.E. to 66 C.E., many isolated acts of sedition were perpetrated and the appearance of the Sicarii also added fuel to the fire. The period was also characterized by the appointment of many incompetent procurators. Their lack of respect for the religious sensitivities of the Jews accelerated the spread of revolutionary sentiment and activity among the Jews. By 66 C.E., the relationship between the two sides had degenerated to such an extent that war was inevitable.²⁵

Once the war started in earnest, the Jewish revolutionaries did not represent a united front against the Romans. Instead, Rhoads and Smallwood have suggested that the war years witnessed the proliferation of revolutionary movements. The Jewish revolutionaries fought just as much among themselves as against the Romans. The Zealots originated in this period and used the Temple as their fortress.²⁶ Josephus recorded the presence of two revolutionary movements led by charismatic figures. John of Gischala forged a revolutionary movement out of the refugees from Galilee who had fled to Jerusalem.²⁷ Simon bar Giora commanded his own movement which provided the most effective military resistance to Rome during the revolt.²⁸ Finally, the Idumeans also formed a distinct revolutionary movement when they came to the aid of their Jewish compatriots.²⁹ In the end, the defeat of these movements and of the Jewish war effort was the product of the infighting among these movements as much as it was that of the Roman military superiority.³⁰

Another noteworthy contribution to the study of Jewish opposition to Roman rule has been made by R. Horsley. Besides articles concerning messianic movements³¹ and the Sicarii³², Horsely has used his sociological expertise to analyse Josephus' use of the term "brigand" (lēstai). Horsley rejected the view that the term brigand was employed by Josephus merely as a disparaging term for the

topic the animosity displayed by the Jews towards the Romans tend to concentrate on the period between 6 to 74 C.E. Josephus, however, recorded the upheaval caused by numerous revolutionary movements prior to 6 C.E. In addition, historians are cognizant of this revolutionary activity which was launched before Judas of Galilee arrived on the scene. But scholars merely treat these events as background information in introductory sections.³⁵ Historians, as a rule, have not correlated material about revolutionary activity in the first century B.C.E. with that of the first century C.E. to arrive at a more comprehensive depiction of Jewish intolerance to the Roman hegemony over Palestine.³⁶ No doubt, this lack of interest in the revolutionary activity of the first century B.C.E. is a vestige of Schürer's suggestion that the Jews were complaisant subjects of the Roman Empire until Judas of Galilee introduced his revolutionary program into Jewish society. Consequently, while historians like Rhoads and Smallwood are better informed about first century B.C.E. political history, the significance of these events have escaped them due to the common perception that opposition to Roman rule is synonymous with the name of Judas of Galilee.³⁷ If, however, we take the revolutionary activity which preceded Judas of Galilee seriously, as I shall do shortly, a very different picture emerges of Jewish opposition to Roman rule and of revolutionary movements.

The first period of concentrated Jewish revolutionary activity occurred immediately after Rome came to occupy Palestine. Before Herod the Great assumed control of Palestine as a vassal king for the Romans, various groups with a seditious nature arose in the peripheral regions of Palestine. Herod and his brother Phasaël came to the fore of the political life of Palestine by eliminating the opposition to Roman rule which manifested itself at this time (see J.W. 1:206//Ant. 14:160). In 47 B.C.E., Herod captured the most celebrated of the early

revolutionary figures, Ezeckias the "brigand-chief", and his "large horde" (J.W. 1:204// Ant. 14:159). In 42 B.C.E., Phasael put down an insurrection led by Helix. Helix tried to avenge the execution of Malichus, who had poisoned Herod's father Antipater because of his pro-Roman disposition (J.W. 1:236-238// Ant. 14:294-296). Finally, Herod and Phasael were forced to take action on a large number of "country-folk" who had come to a feast in Jerusalem armed and ready for battle (J.W. 1:253-254// Ant. 14:337-341).

Much anti-Roman sentiment also came out into the open in 40 B.C.E. when the Parthians seized Palestine from the Romans for a brief time (J.W. 1:248-270//Ant. 14:330-369). In response to the takeover, the Roman authorities declared Herod king of Palestine and supplied him with troops to recapture Palestine (J.W. 1:282-285// Ant. 14:377-389). Among the many problems which Herod faced in his bid to restore Palestine to the Roman fold was the unwillingness of many Jews to revert to their former status as subjects of the Roman Empire. Herod arrested "cave-dwelling brigands" at Arbela (J.W. 1:304-313// Ant. 14:413-430). Included in this group of brigands at Arbela was a family of nine whom Herod had exterminated because they staunchly "preferred death to captivity" (J.W. 1:312// Ant. 14:429-430). After Herod had managed to retake Galilee, he left one of his generals, Ptolemy, in charge of the area. But shortly thereafter, a group of Galileans rebelled, killing Ptolemy, and forcing Herod to return to quell the new disturbances (J.W. 1:314:316// Ant. 14:431-433). If that was not enough, other Galileans took up arms anew before Galilee was securely under Roman control (J.W. 1:325-327// Ant. 14:450).

The records of Josephus indicate that open, military opposition to Roman rule did not rear its head during Herod's long reign. Herod took many precautions to ensure that open warfare did not break out (see Ant. 15:365-372). Herod ruled

may have been more devastating for the Jewish nation. Certainly, there is a greater quantity of evidence for this revolt, given Josephus' peculiar affinity with the revolt and there is much more scholarly interest in this revolt because of its connections with the growth of Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism. Nonetheless, none of these factors warrant the scholarly practice to monopolize the discussion of the Jewish opposition to Roman rule with the revolt of 66-74 C.E. A comprehensive examination of the Jewish opposition to Roman rule should treat every known instance of revolutionary activity. When the broader question of Jewish opposition to Roman rule is addressed, the revolt of 66-74 C.E. should be examined in conjunction with all other outbursts of revolutionary activity. When the revolt of 66-74 C.E. is the sole object of attention, on the other hand, a more discriminating analysis should only take into consideration those incidents which contributed directly to the outbreak of the revolt. The events which led to the revolt in 66 C.E. can be traced back to the deterioration of the relationship between the Jews and the Roman procurators beginning in the late forties. Historians should not go any further back in time because the previous rebellions were all self-contained incidents, as was the revolt of 66 to 74 C.E. All revolutionary activity preceding the great rebellion was not some sort of preparation or build-up for the revolt of 66-74 C.E.

The evidence of the revolutionary activity prior to 6 C.E. also calls into question some common assumptions about the nature of revolutionary movements. Scholars have often argued that it was possible for revolutionary movements to be highly complex structures and to thrive for long stretches of time during the Roman occupation of Palestine. Many scholars, for example, have identified the movement established by Judas of Galilee with the Sicarii.⁴⁰ If this identification is correct⁴¹, then this movement would have endured in Palestine from 6 C.E. to

their tragic last stand at the fortress of Masada in 74 C.E., and even later in Egypt. The events of the first century B.C.E., however, indicate that Jewish revolutionary movements were characterized by a transitory and ephemeral nature. The life span of most revolutionary movements was only as long as it took the Romans to supply their representatives with sufficient force to crush the revolutionaries. Most revolutionary movements in Palestine seem to have gone through roughly similar stages. Revolutionary movements had their origins and formative period in times of political flux. When the Roman administrators were incompetent and unable to maintain effective control of Palestine, the revolutionaries would take advantage of the chaotic political climate to rebel. But once the Romans brought in reinforcements, the revolutionaries would prove to be no match for the Romans. Normally, the Romans would quickly suppress any revolutionary outbursts and cripple the revolutionary movements, forcing them to disband. After the revolutionary movements had been put down and the Roman representatives were able to reassert their position in Palestine, neither was it a viable option to take up the struggle anew, nor was it possible for revolutionary movements to exist in any meaningful sense. Inevitably, there were still those who resented the Roman presence in Palestine. But they were unable to mobilize themselves into any kind of vigorous opposition — at any rate, not until the next period of disorder — due to the tenacious Roman security.

The above observations about the existence of revolutionary activity prior to 6 C.E. lead directly into the second area which is in dire need of further revision in the account of Jewish opposition to Roman rule delineated by Rhoads and Smallwood, the figure of Judas of Galilee. Schürer's version considered Judas to be the founder of the sole revolutionary party in Palestine and, as a result, most scholars who continue to treat this question accord Judas of Galilee a preeminent

status in the rise of Jewish dissension towards Roman authority. While more recent scholarship does not maintain that Judas founded the Zealot party, the notion that he was an innovator persists even in the updated version.

Historians have based their claims about the priority of Judas in the events leading up to the revolt in 66-74 C.E. on a number of statements made by Josephus in the Jewish Antiquities. When Josephus reached the point in the Jewish Antiquities about the census and Judas' violent reaction to the census in 6 C.E., he interrupted the flow of the narrative to initiate a long digression about the Jewish "philosophies". Josephus wrote that "the Jews, from the most ancient of times, had three philosophies pertaining to their traditions, that of the Essenes, that of the Sadducees, and thirdly, that of the group called the Pharisees" (Ant. 18:11). Then Josephus asserted that "Judas and Saddok started among us an intrusive fourth school of philosophy. . . ." (Ant. 18:9). Josephus also claimed that this "innovation and reform in ancestral traditions" instigated by Judas (Ant. 18:9) "sowed the seed from which sprang strife between factions and slaughter of fellow citizens" (Ant. 18:8). Similarly, Josephus remarked that "these men [Judas and Saddok] sowed the seed of every kind of misery, which so afflicted the nation that words are inadequate" (Ant. 18:9).

Historians such as M. Smith and Rhoads have interpreted these statements as signifying that Judas' "fourth philosophy" acted as a catalyst for all the ensuing revolutionary movements.⁴² Judas' significance in the growth of Jewish disdain for Roman rule in Palestine was that he furnished the other revolutionaries with the rationale for rebelling. Judas formulated the principles upon which all other revolutionary movements were inspired to take up arms against the Romans. While Judas did not have any direct association with most of the revolutionary movements which appeared after 6 C.E., the ideology to which these groups

adhered and the program which they followed derived ultimately from the ideas promulgated by Judas at the time of the census. Judas' "philosophy" or world view caused many Jews to question their allegiance to Rome and it was not until Judas developed his coherent doctrine about God's sovereignty over Israel that the Jews were set on a collision course with the Romans. M. Smith has couched this argument in the following terms:

we have already seen that Josephus' statements about Judas indicate only that he set the example and provided the rationale for resistance to Rome, not that he founded the Zealot party. . . ⁴³

This interpretation of Josephus' comments about Judas in the eighteenth book of the Jewish Antiquities, however, is not without its difficulties. If the records of Josephus are accurate and revolts took place before and after the reign of Herod the Great, then it is very unlikely that Judas was the first Jew to devise a revolutionary ideology. The revolutionaries who were active prior to 6 C.E. must have had reasons or convictions which inspired them to venture upon a military expedition. The earlier radicals must have been moved to take up arms against Rome by a revolutionary ideology. Rebels do not normally put their lives on the line in the battlefield unless they believe in some sort of cause.⁴⁴ Moreover, it would even seem doubtful that Judas formulated an ideology different from previous revolutionary ideologies and that only his ideology animated the revolutionary movement after 6 C.E. As revolutionary activity was rather steady from Pompey's takeover to the reign of Hadrian, it would appear that there were certain common causes and underlying factors behind this revolutionary activity. The reasons which induced Judas to rebel were probably very similar to those of the previous revolutionary movements. All Jewish insurrectionists in the Roman era lived in the same ethos and shared a common understanding of the world around

them. All Jewish revolutionaries were influenced by the same belief system, Judaism, and they all lived in roughly similar circumstances and the same historical context. Given the common historical, intellectual, and religio-political milieu in which revolutionary movements thrived, the ideological component of the various revolutionary movements would seem to be cut from the same cloth. For example, both the revolutionaries at Arbela (J.W. 1:312) and Judas of Galilee (Ant. 18:4-5) "preferred death to captivity".

If Judas neither inaugurated the only revolutionary movement to rebel against Rome nor gave birth to the first revolutionary ideology, what, then, do Josephus' remarks in the Jewish Antiquities pertaining to Judas and his responsibility for the revolt in 66-74 C.E. signify? For a proper understanding of Josephus' allegations about the prominence of Judas in later events, it should be noted initially that these comments are to be found only in the Jewish Antiquities. Josephus painted a very different picture of Judas in the Jewish War. In the Jewish War, Josephus only mentioned that Judas "incited his countrymen to revolt" sometime in the procuratorship of Coponius and gave a brief résumé of the major tenets of the new movement which Judas founded (J.W. 2:118). Josephus concluded this section with the observation that Judas' sect had "nothing in common with the others"; this functioned as a transitional phrase for his discussion of the three Jewish parties (J.W. 2:118). The only details which can be inferred about Judas from this concise account are that Judas was the originator of an unorthodox sect which rebelled against Rome at some point after 6 C.E. The results of this rebellion and the subsequent fate of this movement are passed over in silence by Josephus. There is also a conspicuous absence of any reference to Judas' influence on later history in this passage. From the account in the Jewish War, there is nothing to indicate that Judas was of any significance to the war of 66-74 C.E.⁴⁵

In these selections, Josephus was quite keen on insisting that "reforms in ancestral tradition" were to blame for the revolt in 66-74 C.E. and not Judaism proper. The question which this insistence provokes is why was it necessary for Josephus to make such a spirited defense of Judaism?

M.J. Borg gave a very reasonable reply to this query:

But at the same time, he (Josephus) is concerned to demonstrate that the rebels were not true Jews; that it would be important for him to make such a case is clear if one considers the perils to which the Diaspora would have been subjected if the Mediterranean world had assumed that rebellious Judaism was essential Judaism. Hence Josephus assigns the source of rebellion to a small group of lèstai, portrayed as common bandits and murders.⁴⁹

It would appear, in accordance with Borg's observations, that Josephus availed himself of the events in 6 C.E. to refute certain accusations which most assuredly would have been levelled at the Jews and Judaism after the war of 66-74 C.E. Josephus' defense of Judaism in the Jewish Antiquities would indicate that in some quarters the ancestral traditions of the Jews were being blamed for the revolt against Rome after 74 C.E. Following the war, the allegation may have circulated that Judaism rendered Jews unable to submit to foreign potentates and hence the tenets of Judaism had roused the Jews to take up arms against the Romans. There may even have been suspicions on the part of some Roman officials that Judaism continued to pose a threat to Roman security and they were perhaps keeping the Jews under close scrutiny. As Borg suggested, it is quite conceivable that the Jews who inhabited the Roman Empire were exposed to danger and persecution after the revolt of 66-74 C.E. because Roman authorities may have imagined that the ancestral traditions of the Jews made them a highly volatile nation.

The precarious circumstances to which the Jews were subjected after 70 C.E., therefore, probably account for Josephus' remarks about Judas in the Jewish

Antiquities. In this passage, Josephus was trying to refute the allegation that Judaism proper instigated the war against Rome. Josephus included a description of the three Jewish parties immediately following his account of Judas of Galilee, which at first glance appears to be out of place, because he wanted to juxtapose traditional Judaism with Judas' "hitherto unknown philosophy". On the one hand, Josephus wished to inform the detractors of the Jews that the belief system which did spark the revolt, Judas' "fourth philosophy", was not typical of Judaism but represented an aberration in ancestral traditions. On the other hand, Josephus wished to illustrate that the beliefs of the traditional Jewish parties were essentially innocuous and could co-exist quite amicably with Roman rule. In this passage from the Jewish Antiquities, Josephus tried to counter the accusation that traditional Judaism caused the instability in Palestine by arguing that some Jews began to resent being a dominated nation only after Judas had transformed the beliefs of their forefathers. Josephus, with his depiction of Judas as the founder of an intrusive philosophy which led to the revolt, attempted to assure the proper Roman officials that any allegations about Judaism's subversive nature were unfounded.

In other words, Josephus attributed to Judas the distinction of being the archetypal revolutionary figure because Josephus wished to shift the blame for the revolt away from the Jewish people and their traditions onto Judas and his "philosophy". Josephus, who in general tried to absolve the Jewish nation and its institutions for the revolt, made Judas a scapegoat. As Rhoads remarked

Josephus' attempts to attribute the founding of a sect to Judas of Galilee in A.D. 6 may simply have been a function of his apologetic desire to blame the war upon a small group of innovative Jews — thereby exonerating the Jewish populace as a whole.⁵⁰

Judas was merely a convenient target for Josephus' apologetical needs as Judas was the last revolutionary figure before the mid-fifties when the events that led to the revolt in 66-74 C.E. commenced in earnest. Since Judas' revolt in 6 C.E. was the closest in time to the revolt in 66-74 C.E., Josephus was able to maintain more convincingly that the ideals which prompted the revolt in 66-74 C.E. were recent in origin and hence not representative of traditional Judaism.

There is, however, no historical foundation for Josephus' portrayal of Judas as an innovator and as a principal cause for the revolt in 66-74 C.E. An accurate account of Judas of Galilee may be reconstructed when the account of Judas in the Jewish War is correlated with the evidence of pre-6 C.E. revolutionary activity and with the information about Judas in the Acts of the Apostles (5:37). Judas, as the historical narrative in Josephus' writings corroborates, was just one more in a long line of revolutionary figures who arose during the Roman occupation of Palestine. From the Jewish War, it can be inferred that Judas inaugurated a movement which rebelled against Rome shortly after Coponius became the first administrator of the new province of Judea. Finally, the Acts of the Apostles supplies the data that Judas' movement went the way of most other movements in Palestine; it was quickly scattered at the death of its founder.⁵¹

The final aspect of the political history of first century Palestine which I shall consider in this section entails the modes of resistance selected by those Jews who repudiated Roman rule. In the account disseminated by Schürer, the Zealots were the only group in Palestine who could not tolerate the Roman sovereignty over Palestine. Consequently, the form of resistance which the Zealots employed, namely military opposition, was the only form of resistance adopted by Jews against Roman rule. Unfortunately, historians such as Rhoads and Smallwood who tried to revise Schürer's account were unable to put completely from their minds

this suggestion that violence was the only solution which Jews retained to manifest their opposition to Roman rule. Rhoads and Smallwood recognized that there were other groups besides the Zealots who objected to the Roman presence in Palestine. But, invariably, the other movements which they identified were similarly disposed to violent revolutionary action.⁵² It is true that historians have become more attentive to isolated instances of nonviolent resistance. Nevertheless, nationalistic movements with an inclination to rebellion still continue to hold centre stage in any discussion of Jewish opposition to Roman rule.

The scholarly tendency to overemphasize revolutionary activity may be explained by an untenable assumption about politics which underlies much of the study of Jewish opposition to Roman rule. This underlying assumption was detected by both Cadoux and Borg in their monographs about the historical ministry of Jesus. Cadoux warned that

we must not make the common mistake of treating 'political' and 'military' in this connexion as if they were synonymous... All he (Jesus) repudiated was the use of coercion in acquiring the political sovereignty he desired. That, no doubt, made a vast difference but it did not render his object non-political.⁵³

Borg maintained that

supporting the status quo in a revolutionary situation is not apolitical, but is a political stance. Moreover, there is a range of political stances between violent revolution and unqualified allegiance to the present order.⁵⁴

As these two excerpts reveal, Cadoux and Borg disputed, both in their own way, the view that equates political participation exclusively with revolutionary activity. Cadoux was constrained to argue the obvious point that Jesus' message could be a political program even if he did not advocate the use of violence because many historians of first century Palestine make aggression a criterion by which to

significant repercussions for my contention that apocalyptic communities were passive resistance movements. To substantiate my case about apocalyptic communities, it was first necessary to discredit prevalent views about Jewish opposition to Roman rule which are fraught with inconsistencies. As military opposition was not a telltale sign of a nationalistic movement and was not the only mode of resistance to Roman rule, it can very well be that apocalyptic communities were politically oriented and that the ideology of this movement, apocalyptic eschatology, was a political program. Nor does the fact that apocalyptic eschatology antedated the political career of Judas of Galilee militate against my assertions about apocalyptic communities. Judas neither formulated the first resistance ideology nor were all other resistance ideologies dependent on Judas' "fourth philosophy". There were plenty of resistance ideologies prior to Judas' revolt in 6 C.E. From its inception, the presence of the Roman Empire in Palestine offended the political religious sensitivities of some Jews. It is no wonder, therefore, that a resistance ideology which was first practised during the reign of Antiochus 4th Epiphanes, and then retained against the Hellenistically-styled rule of the Hasmoneans, should continue to hold a great attraction for some Jews who despised the Roman administration of Palestine after the revolt of 66-74 C.E.

They strive to ascertain the literary features of a distinctive type of writing, Jewish apocalypses.⁶

The students of apocalyptic eschatology, on the other hand, concentrate much of their efforts on the ideology of apocalyptic works. They employ the time-honoured techniques and methods of biblical interpretation or exegesis. The traditional and well honed methodology which biblical exegetes have developed over the years has been enlisted for service by students of apocalyptic eschatology. Scholars engaged in this limited area of research direct their attention to the apocalyptic works themselves and their primary goal consists of retrieving the sense or the meaning of the text which lies before them. In addition, the study of apocalyptic eschatology aims at systematizing the thought world contained within this body of literature and at presenting the message in as coherent a fashion as possible. Finally, the study of apocalyptic eschatology involves the determination and the classification of those texts with a similar mental outlook.⁷

Finally, the study of apocalypticism is not concerned so much with the literary form or the thought world of apocalyptic literature — which is the domain of the study of apocalypses and apocalyptic eschatology respectively — as with the people, places, and times which formed the background to this literature and to which this literature was addressed. The students of Jewish apocalypticism are chiefly interested in the communities which embraced apocalyptic eschatology as their view of reality and which expressed this frame of reference in apocalypses. The study of apocalypticism operates on the assumption that the same historical and social forces drove the various communities which stand behind the apocalyptic works to accept the message of apocalyptic eschatology. As specific social and historical conditions may have occasioned the formation of apocalyptic communities, students of apocalypticism attempt to discern what those factors or

Secondly, scholars of Jewish apocalypticism weigh the information which they were able to glean from apocalyptic writings about apocalyptic communities with the sociological and historical information we already possess about the second temple period from other ancient sources. Scholars of Jewish apocalypticism have reasoned that the data about apocalyptic communities and their environment may be further explicated and redefined when it is studied against the backdrop of other, contemporaneous movements or sects, especially those groups which betray some affinities with apocalyptic communities.¹⁶ Again, Nickelsburg's explanation of this point is most apropos: "we attempt to correlate the textual material with a mass — or a miniscule — of extrinsic evidence."¹⁷

The nature of apocalyptic writings, however, pose certain problems for scholars of Jewish apocalypticism. First of all, it cannot be said that the authors of apocalyptic works were interested in preserving sociological and historical data. As the sociological and historical information which may be present in any given apocalyptic work was recorded more or less accidentally or randomly, scholars of Jewish apocalypticism are not always certain about the relative value of any of the data which they have uncovered. It is not always possible to ascertain how much significance to attach to some sociological or historical data as it is conceivable that other, more crucial information about the community may not have found its way into the text. The second problem which students of Jewish apocalypticism face concerns the state of the study of apocalyptic eschatology. Students of Jewish apocalypticism begin their enterprise from where students of apocalyptic eschatology leave off. Only after the meaning of the sense of an apocalyptic writing has been determined can the student of Jewish apocalypticism begin to analyse the sociological and historical factors which occasioned the work. But, the interpretation of most apocalyptic writings is still disputed. Consequently,

literature. In particular, scholars were most concerned with the identity of the Jewish sect or party of the second temple period which was responsible for the production of this literature. Yet this approach to the study of Jewish apocalypticism did not yield any positive results because, as K. Koch has observed,

Every one of the groupings of the late Israelite period for which we have any evidence at all has been suggested as the Sitz im Leben of the apocalyptic writings.¹⁹

Various scholars proposed that the Pharisees were the composers of apocalyptic literature²⁰, while other scholars countered that the Essenes were responsible for this literature²¹, and still other scholars perceived apocalyptic literature to be the work of the Zealots.²² There even have appeared two extensive monographs, one by O. Plöger and the other by M. Hengel, in which the authors argued for the Hasidic authorship of apocalyptic literature.²³ But in the end, this approach of matching apocalyptic literature with one of the known parties was largely abandoned by scholars because it did not seem possible to confine apocalyptic literature to any one party. This observation prompted D.S. Russell to write:

We conclude that the apocalyptic writers were to be found not in any one party within Judaism but throughout many parties, known and unknown, and among men who owed allegiance to no party at all.²⁴

L. Morris also shared the sentiments of Russell:

There is quite a range of apocalyptic opinion, and the men who wrote this kind of literature seem to have come from all parties and from none.²⁵

As both statements would indicate, apocalyptic literature does not seem to conform with party lines, at least not as modern scholars have drawn those lines, and hence another approach for discerning the Sitz im Leben of apocalyptic literature was required.

the perspective of apocalyptic eschatology is drawn back into the society, where it reassumes its position as a potentiality awaiting new crises, new polarizations and new births of apocalyptic subuniverses.⁴⁰

These two theories of Vielhauer and Hanson concerning the Sitz im Leben of apocalyptic communities are, in my estimation, quite insightful and much to be commended. Specifically, their joint proposal that one of the fundamental characteristics of apocalyptic communities was their opposition to those in authority seems to me to be very much to the point. There is, nonetheless, one common omission in the theories of Vielhauer and Hanson. Vielhauer and Hanson should have taken their papers one step further to locate the historical context and the concrete, historical events from which apocalyptic communities emerged.

A treatise which did go this extra step and which thus represents a third line of approach in the study of Jewish apocalypticism was S.R. Isenberg's contribution to the field. In his article entitled "Millenarism in Greco-Roman Palestine"⁴¹ Isenberg derived his portrayal of apocalyptic communities from his definition of religion, particularly of religion in Palestine. For Isenberg, religion consisted of a "central power" whose members could have "access to power" through various institutions and social organizations imposed by the "central power". These institutions and social organizations of any religion, however, carry with them certain obligations which the members of the religion must follow in order to have "access to power". Isenberg referred to these obligations as "redemptive media" because it is through the discharging of these duties that members of a religion are believed to be saved. The final concept with which Isenberg defined religion was "redemption". In any religion, "redemption" is realized when a member of the

religion has fulfilled all the obligations which the institutions command and has drawn near to the "central power".⁴²

From this definition of religion, Isenberg was able to give a portrayal of millenarian movements (i.e. apocalyptic movements⁴³). Isenberg argued that the growth of millenarian movements occur when a segment of the community perceives itself to be hindered from participating in the process of salvation or the "redemptive media". In times of social upheaval, certain groups within the society may become marginalized and may be denied the use of the institutions and structures which lead to the "central power" and "redemption". When a group realizes that it cannot discharge its duties to the central "power", it may decide to separate from the rest of the community to protest its exclusion from the "redemptive media". The birth of a millenarian movement is signaled, therefore, when a group distances itself from the main community because, unable to fulfill its obligations to the central "power", it feels confused and threatened.⁴⁴

To this point, Isenberg's analysis of apocalyptic communities resembled those of Vielhauer and Hanson, in that it consisted of a general, sociological depiction of millenarian movements. But unlike Vielhauer and Hanson, Isenberg did not stop there. He tried to root his general characterization of millenarian movements into the events and circumstances of the second temple period. Modern scholarship has been able to learn a great deal about the religion and history of the second temple period from other sources and Isenberg correlated this religious and historical data with his general, sociological theory of millenarian movements.

In particular, Isenberg dealt with the controversial nature of the Torah among the Jewish parties and sects because he believed that the origins of millenarian movements in Greco-Roman Palestine were located within this historical context. In Jewish thought, access to God and the attainment of salvation were dependent

upon the Torah. Consequently, millenarian movements would arise within Judaism when a group of Jews felt themselves alienated from the Torah. If a number of Jews sensed that they were unable to participate fully in the institutions of the Jewish society, such as the Temple, they might adopt a millenarian stance and segregate themselves from the mainstream of Jewish life. Millenarian movements in Greco-Roman Palestine were characterized by their rejection of traditional Temple and scribal authority. Finally, they would also develop a new understanding of the Torah and they would form new institutions with which to fulfill their obligations to God.⁴⁵

Isenberg concluded his article with a discussion of a sect in Greco-Roman Palestine which fit this description of a millenarian movement, namely, the Qumran community. Isenberg recounted how the Qumran community was founded by a group of disgruntled priests. These priests challenged the legitimacy of the high ranking officials of the Temple to hold office. The members of the Qumran community also questioned the efficacy of the sacrifices which were presided over by these high ranking priests. Under the leadership of the Teacher of Righteousness, these priests separated themselves from the Temple and refused to worship in the Temple any longer. The Teacher of Righteousness, who acted as the prophetic leader of the Qumran community, was believed to be inspired by God and empowered to interpret the Torah, a prerogative which he delegated to the members of the community. With this authority to interpret scripture, the Qumran community was able to construct new "redemptive media" which would draw them to God. The Qumran community formulated a very stringent moral code and created new rituals and practices for its members to follow. The Qumran community also lived in a heightened expectancy of the end. With the arrival of the eschaton, the Qumran community believed the Temple would be purified and

they would be responsible for its administration in the age to come. In other words, the Qumran community betrayed all the characteristics of a millenarian movement which Isenberg listed in the first half of his study.⁴⁶

A final sociological and historical examination of apocalyptic communities which deserves a mention in this study was written by D.W. Suter and has the rather cerebral title of "The Measure of Redemption: The Similitudes of Enoch, Nonviolence, and National Integrity".⁴⁷ In this article, Suter was concerned with locating the Sitz im Leben of the apocalyptic work known as the Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 37-71). Suter's main argument in this work was that "the composition of the Similitudes" should be located "in the resistance to Gaius Caligula's effort to install his statue in the Temple in Jerusalem."⁴⁸ In addition, he contended that those who participated in this resistance to the Roman Emperor and who were responsible for the writing of the Similitudes of Enoch were the lower ranks of the priests and Levites.⁴⁹

The section of Suter's study which is of particular significance for my own study concerns his discussion of the nature of the resistance offered by the lower ranks of the priesthood to the Roman emperor. Suter maintained that the author of the Similitudes did not encourage his audience to take up arms against the Emperor's armies. Instead, the community behind this writing anticipated the imminent arrival of a Messiah figure. This apocalyptic community believed that the military might of the Romans would be of no consequence against the Chosen One and he would defeat the Romans by means of a final judgment. Suter surmised that the Similitudes of Enoch followed in the tradition of passive resistance to Roman rule which, according to the records of Josephus, became very prominent after the death of Herod the Great in 4 B.C.E. Suter depicted the apocalyptic community in which the Similitudes of Enoch originated as a group of priests who,

opposed to the intentions of Gaius Caligula to desecrate the Temple, adopted a stance of nonviolent resistance towards Roman rule.⁵⁰

The article by Suter is of value to my study because, in it, Suter has managed to link an apocalyptic work to the nonviolent resistance which mounted against Rome in the first century C.E.⁵¹ His arguments were very perceptive because of his appreciation of the pervasiveness of passive resistance to Roman rule in first century Palestine. That he would associate the Similitudes of Enoch to this impulse in first century Palestine is even more laudable. I would only correct Suter's impression that passive resistance dominated only in the first half of the first century C.E. but gave way or developed into military resistance further on in the century.⁵² Passive resistance and violent resistance were not mutually exclusive impulses within second temple Judaism. Both could exist concurrently and passive resistance can still be traced in the second half of the first century C.E.

brings against God in the initial complaints of the three dialogues also reveal a great deal about the difficulties which the audience was experiencing after the war of 66-74 C.E.

The second dialogue in 4Ezra, for instance, opens with Ezra bewailing current affairs:

And after seven days the thoughts of my heart were very grievous to me again. Then my soul recovered the spirit of understanding, and I began once more to speak words in the presence of the Most High. And I said, "O sovereign Lord, from every forest of the earth and from all its trees you have chosen one vine, and from all the lands of the world you have chosen for yourself one region, and from all the flowers of the world you have chosen for yourself one lily, and from all the depths of the sea you have filled for yourself one river, and from all the cities that have been built you have consecrated Zion for yourself and from all the birds that have been created you have named for yourself one dove, and from all the flocks that have been fashioned you have provided for yourself one sheep, and from all the multitude of people you have gotten for yourself one people; and to this people, whom you have loved, you have given the Law which is approved by all. And now, O Lord, why have you given over the one to the many, and dishonored the one root beyond others, and scattered your only one among the many? And those who opposed your promises have trodden down on those who believed your covenants. If you really hate your people, they should be punished at your hands. (4Ezra 5:21-30)

The first aspect of the community of 4Ezra which this excerpt betrays involves its collective orientation. Both by way of images and explicit statements, this passage reinforces the observation that the nation of Israel occupied a vital position in the thought world of this community. The community which was responsible for the composition of 4Ezra was characterized by a strong attachment to its country. It identified itself very closely with the nation of Israel. Moreover, the community of 4Ezra perceived itself to be part of a specially chosen nation. They believed that "from all the multitude of people" God had reserved for himself only "one people" (v.27). They saw themselves as belonging to a nation which had a unique relationship with God; no other nation on earth enjoyed the same privilege. One of

insignificant because the fate of Israel was determined in the temporal sphere. As a result of the nationalistic disposition of the community behind 4Ezra, political events featuring the nation of Israel ranked high on their list of priorities.⁶

Another striking complaint which is found on the lips of Ezra comes at the beginning of the third dialogue. This dialogue, like the two previous to it, begins with a description of Ezra's emotional state:

Now after this I wept again and fasted seven days as before, in order to complete the three weeks as I had been told. And on the eighth night my heart was troubled within me again, and I began to speak in the presence of the Most High. For my spirit was greatly aroused, and my soul was in distress. (4Ezra 6:35-37)

The complaint, itself, which is prefaced by a résumé of the creation account in Genesis (4Ezra 6:38-54), follows this depiction of Ezra's condition:

All 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? How long will this be so? (4Ezra 6: 55-59)

From the transitional passage concerning Ezra's mood (4Ezra 6:35-37) and from the tone and nature of Ezra's complaints (4Ezra 6:55-59) — indeed, from the tone of all three dialogues — it would appear that the community behind 4Ezra was in the throes of a great crisis. The indications about Ezra's anxiousness and the bleak nature of the questions which Ezra poses to the angelic intermediary all point to the confusion which had gripped the apocalyptic community of 4Ezra after the revolt of 66-74 C.E. The community seems to have been passing through a period of great turmoil and this tension seems to have been brought on, at least partially,

by dashed hopes. This community was beset by confusion because their dreams had been turned into nightmares by the prevailing historical conditions.⁷

As I pointed out above, the community of 4Ezra believed that Israel had been divinely elected to share a prestigious relationship with God. In the above quote, it is learnt that the status of being God's chosen people, for the community behind 4Ezra, carried with it certain privileges. The above selection brings to light some of the blessings which were to flow upon Israel from the covenantal relationship as envisioned by the community of 4Ezra. This community was of the opinion that being God's chosen people entailed having the world as their inheritance. A blessing which God was to bestow on his only begotten people was no less than the whole of creation. In the belief system of the community of 4Ezra, God had promised Israel "that it was for us (Israel) that you (God) created this world" (v.55). In practical terms, possessing the earth as an inheritance for the community of 4Ezra signified having political control over all the earth. The blessing which the community of 4 Ezra expected was dominion over all the nations of the world. This community fostered the hope that, as God's chosen people, they were to rule over the entire earth and its inhabitants, much in the same fashion as the Roman Empire.

While this community aspired to grandeur, the conditions in which they lived spoke a very different tale. The lofty heights to which the community of 4Ezra had set its sights had already been scaled by the Romans. The problem which caused the community of 4Ezra the lion's share of its Angst was that "if the world has indeed been created for us, why do we not possess our world as an inheritance?" (v.59). In this present order, the gentile nations, whom God considered to be "nothing" and "spittle" (see v.56), appropriated Israel's inheritance, while Israel herself was "domineered over" and "devoured" by these gentile nations. In this age,

gentile nations to be "nothing", "spittle", and "a drop from a bucket" (v.56). It also felt that the gentile nations should have no advantage or superiority over the nation of Israel.⁸

But perhaps the passage which above all others catches the essence of Ezra's complaints throughout the entire book is the very first lament in the first dialogue. The first dialogue is ushered in by another illuminating glimpse into Ezra's emotional state:

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. . . (4Ezra 3:1-3)

The structure of the first dialogue is also similar to the third dialogue in that an outline of biblical history (4Ezra 3:4-27) precedes the initial grievance which runs as follows:

Then I said in my heart, Are the deeds of those who inhabit Babylon any better? Is that why she has gained dominion over Zion? For when I came here I saw ungodly deeds without number, and my soul has seen many sinners during these thirty years. And my heart failed me, for I have seen how you endure those who sin, and have spared those who act wickedly, and destroyed your people, and have preserved your enemies, and have not shown to anyone how your way may be comprehended. Are the deeds of Babylon better than those of Zion? Or has another nation known you besides Israel? Or what tribes have so believed your covenants as these tribes of Jacob? Yet their reward has not appeared and their labor has borne no fruit. For I have traveled widely among the nations and have seen that they abound in wealth, though they are unmindful of your commandments. Now therefore weigh in a balance our iniquities and those of the inhabitants of the world; and so it will be found which way the turn of the scale will incline. When have the inhabitants of the earth not sinned in your sight? Or what nation has kept your comandments so well? You may indeed find individual men who have not kept your commandments, but nations you will not find. (4Ezra 3:28-36)

First of all, the community's attitude to the present order may be deduced from these two selections. In true apocalyptic fashion, the community of 4Ezra depicted

inferior status of the nation of Israel in the international community. The community behind 4Ezra was even infuriated with God for "not having shown anyone how (his) way may be comprehended" (v.31). The community of 4Ezra could conceive of no practical political solutions which would improve Israel's political fortunes in this present age.

Finally, the above passage suggests that at least some in the wider Jewish community may have begun to harbour some doubts about their convictions in the face of the political superiority of the Romans. The comparison which Ezra makes between Israel's righteousness and Babylon's sinfulness in his first lament may reflect an underlying historical reality where some Jews not associated with the community of 4Ezra thought that Rome's political superiority was a result of their moral superiority. After the war of 66-74 C.E., some members of the Jewish community may have had some serious reservations about the traditions of their forefathers and may have questioned whether Israel had any special rapport with God. As the above excerpt attests, however, the community of 4Ezra wanted to ensure that this loss of faith among its countrymen did not affect its own members. The above extract presents the spectacle of a community trying to salvage its belief system when historical realities would ostensibly deny it and others of their own kind were abandoning it. The community of 4Ezra, while not totally understanding why Rome prospered at the expense of Israel, still had no designs of letting go of their ancestral traditions.

The sister apocalypse of 4Ezra, namely 2Baruch, can be employed with equal profit in assessing the configuration of the community for which 2Baruch was composed. Like 4Ezra, the author of 2Baruch incorporated the dialogue format into his work. But unlike 4Ezra, the conversation between Baruch and the divine speaker is not very heated. The discourse between Baruch and the voice from the

heavens lacks the pathos which is characteristic of the debate between Ezra and Uriel. As I mentioned elsewhere, the tension in the dialogues of 2Baruch is not as pronounced as it is in the case of 4Ezra. In fact, Baruch does not genuinely raise complaints so much as he merely poses questions to the heavenly voices. In the apocalypse, Baruch functions as a foil for the divine interlocutor who expounds the views of the author.⁹ Baruch, however, did articulate some authentic laments in the first vision (2Baruch 1:1-12:5) which seem to mirror the concerns of the community of 2Baruch. When Baruch is informed in the first dialogue that God will allow the Temple in Jerusalem to be destroyed by the Babylonians, he becomes quite downcast and he tries to dissuade God from his proposed course of action. Baruch's laments over the destruction of the Temple, which are reminiscent of the laments found in 4Ezra, highlight some of the characteristics of the community of 2Baruch.

After a voice from the heavens brought word to Baruch that the Temple would be destroyed and the Jewish community would be scattered among the nations (2Baruch 1:1-2:1), he replied with astonishment:

O Lord, my Lord, have I therefore come into the world to see the evil things of my mother? No, my Lord. If I have found grace in your eyes, take away my spirit first that I may go to my fathers and I may not see the destruction of my mother. For from two sides I am pressed: I cannot resist you, but my soul also cannot behold the evil of my mother. But one thing I shall say in your presence, O Lord: Now, what will happen after these things? For if you destroy your city and deliver up your country to those who hate us, how will the name of Israel be remembered again? Or how shall we speak again about your glorious deeds? Or to whom again will that which is in your Law be explained? Or will the universe return to its nature and the world go back to its original silence? And will the multitude of the souls be taken away and will not the nature of man be mentioned again? And where is all that which you said to Moses about us? (2Baruch 3:1-9)

The first part of this excerpt imparts the knowledge of the community's temperament after the revolt of 66-74 C.E. The sight of the destruction of their

unacceptable. This outlook, which is similar to the one espoused by the community of 4Ezra, seems also to have been derived from the community's understanding of the covenant relationship between God and the people of Israel. The community of 2Baruch accepted the viewpoint that part of the privileges of being God's chosen people consisted of towering over the other nations and exercising hegemony over the gentile nations. Under the existing conditions, however, the situation was reversed. The Romans enjoyed the prerogatives which, in the thinking of the community of 2Baruch, rightly belonged to Israel. Historical realities invalidated many of the principal beliefs of the community of 2Baruch and these incongruities were responsible for the despondant temperament of this community and its pessimistic appraisal of this present age.¹¹

The devastating effect which the primacy of Rome over Israel had on the community of 2Baruch is noteworthy for another reason. While the existence of the Roman Empire discredited, at least on the surface, many of this community's beliefs about the covenant, the community of 2Baruch did not abandon its convictions. The community of 2Baruch was aware of the implications which the Roman suzerainty held for its imperialistic expectations and these implications greatly disturbed the community. Yet they did not dishearten the community of 2Baruch to such an extent as to propel it to relinquish its stance on the issue of the covenant. In fact, the historical conditions had the exact opposite effect. The community wanted its beliefs about the covenant vindicated more than ever. The questions which Baruch raises at the end of the above passage discloses that the community still wanted to make sense of their beliefs, especially in the light of recent events. They still sought an arbitrator to remedy the situation and a tribunal to which they could present their complaints. Though the community of 2Baruch wrestled both emotionally and intellectually with Rome's mastery of

Israel, they still remained steadfast to their convictions about the nation of Israel. This passage presents another community which, instead of renouncing its beliefs in the covenant, strove to save its beliefs in its struggle against a superior culture.

The two questions which Baruch poses at the end of the above selection also exhibit the political impotence of this community. Not only did this community not like being subjugated to Rome; it longed for someone to repair this injustice, since it did not know how to accomplish this feat for itself. The community of 2Baruch desired that someone would "judge over these things" and they wished to refer a "complaint" to someone "about that which (had) befallen" (v.3) the nation of Israel because of their own inability to deal with the calamity. Yet the community of 2Baruch did not hold out much hope that either of these requests would be granted. This community did not even feel that there was someone to plead its cause nor was there anyone who would lend a sympathetic ear to its petition. This community would have liked to escape the Roman yoke but it imagined that there were not many options open to it to achieve this goal. The community of 2Baruch was not very certain how to ameliorate its position vis-à-vis the Romans. Consequently, this passage, on the one hand, manifests the political inexperience of the community of 2Baruch and, on the other hand, it shows that its means of resisting the Romans were rather limited.

Finally, this excerpt finds once again the nation of Israel pitted against the gentile nations. As was also witnessed in the previous passage which I discussed from 2Baruch (5:1) where the Babylonians are described as "haters" of God and idol worshippers, the community of 2Baruch took a very dim view of the Romans. If Rome had been equal to Israel, this parity would have been considered a travesty by this community. Given the fact that the Romans enjoyed an edge over the nation of Israel, its hate and jealousy of the Romans knew no bounds. This

grievances. The divine messengers attempt to assuage the anxiety of the human visionaries by explaining the meaning and purpose of present events and by revealing the solace which the nation of Israel would receive at the end of this age. Consequently, the explanations and revelations to Baruch and Ezra unveil the solution which the communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra adopted to the problem of the foreign domination of Israel. The responses which the divine interlocutors give to the plight of the human seers demonstrate how the communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra chose to handle the Roman menace. The laments to Baruch and Ezra divulge that the communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra resented Roman rule. The words of encouragement offered by the divine intermediaries in the dialogue format discloses how they resisted Roman rule.

The divine interlocutors of 2Baruch and 4Ezra strive to console Baruch and Ezra with a particular conception of time and history.¹³ The view of time and history espoused by the divine interlocutors in 2Baruch and 4Ezra is highly eschatological in nature. They suggest that time is linear and is making its way to a final glorious end. The divine messengers in 2Baruch and 4Ezra also maintain that God, who arranged and predetermined history from the beginning of creation¹⁴, divided history into different periods. The basic dichotomy is between the present age and the age which is to come. Uriel, for example, tells Ezra that "the Most High has made not one world but two" (4Ezra 7:50). But even these two ages are further compartmentalized in 2Baruch and 4Ezra. This present age is subdivided in a number of ways. Sometimes it follows the chronology of biblical history; alternatively the duration of the world empires may act as dividing lines. Each period, moreover, has its own distinctive character and is normally depicted as being evil in some way.¹⁵ The age to come in the future is compartmentalized into two segments. According to the heavenly intermediaries in 2Baruch and

communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra followed a longstanding view of history by which four different world empires had ruled over the Near East. In 2Baruch, this understanding of history is described in the following terms:

As you have seen the great forest surrounded by high and rocky mountains, this is the word: Behold, the days will come when this kingdom that destroyed Zion once will be destroyed and that it will be subjected to that which will come after it. This again will also be destroyed after some time. And another, a third, will rise and also that will possess power in its own time and will be destroyed. After that a fourth kingdom arises whose power is harsher and more evil than those which were before it, and it will reign a multitude of times like the trees on the plain, and it will rule the times and exalt itself more than the cedars of Lebanon. (2Baruch 39:1-5)

The apocalypse of Ezra contains two such depictions in the fifth vision (11:1-12:51).

One appears in the vision proper:

Are you not the one that remains of the four beasts which I made to reign in my world, so that the end of my times might come through them? You, the fourth that has come, have conquered all the beasts that have gone before. (4Ezra 11:39-40)

The other portrayal of the four kingdom schema is found in the interpretation:

The eagle which you saw coming up from the sea is the fourth kingdom which appeared in a vision to your brother Daniel. But it was not explained to him as I now explain or have explained it to you. (4Ezra 12:11-12)

The meaning and significance of this four kingdom schema was initially brought to the attention of the scholarly community by J.W. Swain in an article entitled "The Theory of the Four Monarchies: Opposition History under the Roman Empire".¹⁷ Swain introduced his article with the observation that this view of history was expounded in a Latin work which is older than the book of Daniel and that both these works appropriated this theory of history from Persian thought.¹⁸ When Persia held sway over the Near Eastern world, it considered itself to be the third in a line of world empires. When the Macedonian forces conquered Persia,

however, the Persians were anything but delighted by their fall from power and formulated a view of history to oppose the Seleucid Empire. Persian nationalists appended Greece to the list of world empires and predicted that a fifth world power would arise to destroy the power of the Greeks and restore the hegemony back to the east. In any event, Swain speculated that this four kingdom schema plus a fifth glorious kingdom took on a fixed form during the Seleucid Empire and many Near Eastern peoples employed this understanding of history as propaganda against western imperialism.¹⁹ According to Swain, the four kingdom plus one schema also circulated widely after the Seleucid Empire fell to the Romans. During the Roman Empire, many Near Eastern peoples continued to advocate this view of history to manifest their opposition to Roman rule. Swain described this development as follows:

While Pompey destroyed the armed forces of the Orient, he did not win the hearts of the Orientals. As they could no longer fight against Rome with armies, they returned to the old method of propaganda (i.e. the four kingdoms theory) which they used against the Seleucids long before.²⁰

Swain also provided a brief list of the essential characteristics of this theory:

We must bear in mind that the theory of four monarchies and a fifth included three elements: (1) it made each monarchy a world-empire; (2) it minimized everything else (e.g., pre-Alexandrian Greece and ancient Egypt); and (3) it declared that the fifth monarchy — which might or might not have appeared as yet — would be vastly superior to all its predecessors and last forever.

Finally, it would appear that this portrait of history made quite an impact among Orientals and became a thorn in the side of the Romans. The Emperor Augustus , for example, commanded that no fewer than two thousand works containing this prophecy be suppressed.²²

The relevancy of Swain's article for this study is two-fold. The four kingdom schema constituted a form of propaganda against western imperialism in Roman times and hence its acceptance by the communities behind 2Baruch and 4Ezra reinforces many of the remarks I made about these two communities in the last section. The significance of the presence of the four empire schema in 2Baruch and 4Ezra is that it provides one more piece of evidence for my contention that the communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra were opposed to Roman rule. Flusser, who investigated the concept of the four empires in Jewish literature, noted that

the Jews did not abandon the scheme of four empires, having Rome as the fourth and last monarchy; in the Jewish sources this concept was more or less explicitly anti-Roman.²³

This anti-Roman bias is to be detected in the works of 2Baruch and 4Ezra as well.

Secondly, and more importantly, the schema of the four kingdoms was a form of nonviolent resistance to Roman rule. Swain's article is instructive in that it implicitly suggests that Near Eastern peoples devised other means of manifesting their opposition to Roman rule besides warfare. Near Eastern peoples could display their dissatisfaction to Roman imperialism with ideas and propaganda. Consequently, the acceptance of this view of history by the communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra is a preliminary indication that these two communities were interested in opposing Roman rule with nonviolent forms of resistance. The diffusion of the four empire schema in 2Baruch and 4Ezra discloses, not only that the communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra despised Roman rule, but also that at least one of the tactics used to resist Roman rule was nonviolent in nature.

The second premise of the view of history espoused by the heavenly interlocutors which draws attention to the political propensities of the communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra concerns the fifth glorious kingdom. The

heavenly intermediators predict that God's Messiah would establish a fifth and final kingdom on this earth after the demise of the fourth kingdom (i.e. the Roman Empire) for the sake of the nation of Israel (see 2Baruch 39:6-7 and 4Ezra 12:22-32).²⁴ In 4Ezra, the coming of the Messianic kingdom is one of Uriel's stock answers to Ezra's laments in the first three dialogues (see 4Ezra 7:26-29). The more informative and detailed descriptions of the Messianic kingdom, however, are located in the fifth and six visions.²⁵ The Messianic kingdom is discussed on three different occasions in 2Baruch. But the more enlightening references to the Messianic kingdom are the second and third as the first is rather brief (see 2Baruch 29:3).²⁶

The fifth vision in the apocalypse of Ezra is often referred to as the "eagle vision" because Ezra is shown an image of an eagle with a vast number of heads and wings (4Ezra 11:1-12:3). In the interpretation of the vision, Uriel explains to Ezra that the heads and wings represent a succession of kingdoms and monarchs who had ruled over the earth (4Ezra 12:10-30). The vision also includes a symbolic portrayal of the Messiah and his kingdom which Uriel decodes as follows:

This is the Messiah whom the Most High has kept until the end of days, who will arise from the posterity of David, and will come and speak to them (the kings who ruled before the Messiah); he will denounce them for their ungodliness and for their wickedness, and will cast up before them their contemptuous dealings. For first he will set them living before his judgment seat, and when he has reproved them, then he will destroy them. But 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. (4Ezra 12:32-35)

This interpretation of the Messianic kingdom bears witness to the twofold task which the Messiah was to perform. The conclusion of the interpretation suggests that the Messiah would save a "remnant" of God's chosen people and he would turn their suffering into "joy". The Messiah was to correct the grievances expressed by

vague terms by the community of 4Ezra as if it was not preoccupied with particulars. This haziness probably stems from their lack of interest in the exact manner the Messiah would elevate the nation of Israel to international prominence. They were more preoccupied with the end results than with the means to achieve these results.

The nonviolent nature of the opposition which the community of 4Ezra offered to the Roman Empire is perhaps best exemplified in the "Man from the Sea" vision:

As for your seeing a man come up from the heart of the sea, this is whom the Most High has been keeping for many ages, who will himself deliver his creation; and he will direct those who are left. And as for your seeing wind and fire and a storm coming out of his mouth, and as for his not holding a spear or weapon of war, yet destroying the onrushing multitude which came to conquer him, this is the interpretation: . . . my son will be revealed, whom you saw as a man coming up from the sea. And when all the nations hear his voice, every man shall leave his own land and the warfare that they have against one another; and an innumerable multitude shall be gathered together, as you saw, desiring to come and conquer him. But he will stand on the top of Mount Zion. And Zion will come and be made manifest to all people, . . . And he, my Son, will reprove the assembled nations for their ungodliness (this was symbolized by the storm), and will reproach them to their faces with their evil thoughts and with the torments with which they are to be tortured (which were symbolized by the flame); and he will destroy them without effort by the law (which was symbolized by the fire) . . . But those who are left of your people, who are found within my holy borders, shall be saved. Therefore when he destroys the multitude of the nations that are gathered together, he will defend the people who remain. And then he will show them very many wonders. (4Ezra 13:25-28, 32-38, 48-50)

According to this vision, the time just before the arrival of the Messiah would find the gentile nations making war against each other. When the Messiah appears, however, the gentile nations will stop fighting amongst themselves to present a united front against the Messiah. The gentile nations would come to Mount Zion, where the Messiah would be standing, to defeat him. But the Messiah, "not holding spear or weapon of war" (4Ezra 13:28), would triumph over the gentile nations

"without effort by the law" (4Ezra 13:38). After he had overwhelmed the gentile nations, the Messiah would "defend" and "save" God's chosen people.

The significance of this excerpt for the purposes of this study is that there is an explicit rejection of military force. The gentile nations who would come against the Messiah would be armed and ready for battle. The Messiah, however, would be unarmed and he would "neither lift his hand nor hold a spear or any weapon of war" (4Ezra 13:9). The community of 4Ezra did not envisage that the Messiah would employ weapons to subjugate the gentile nations. In fact, there appears to be a certain disdain for this sort of activity on the part of this community. As in the fifth vision, the strategy which the Messiah would use to bring to completion his assigned tasks of destroying the gentile nations and exalting the nation of Israel is judgment. The Messiah would "reprove the assembled nations for their ungodliness" and "reproach them to their faces" (4Ezra 13:37-38). Again, divine reproachment and judgment were the only means which, in the opinion of the community of 4Ezra, were required to correct the imbalance between the nation of Israel and the other gentile nations. Military force was of no account in the expectations of the community of 4Ezra. The community of 4Ezra awaited the arrival of a Messianic figure who would save God's chosen people from the clutches of the Romans with divine power, not military force.

Many of the same features which are found in 4Ezra about the Messiah and his kingdom are also present in 2Baruch. The two major discussions of the Messiah in 2Baruch are set in a visionary context. The first vision in 2Baruch consists of a forest in which a fountain and a vine spring up (2Baruch 36:1-11). The Lord to whom Baruch prays for enlightenment (2Baruch 38:1-4) clarifies the meaning of the fountain and vine as follows:

willing to endure whatever came their way in this age because they knew that this present period of human history would soon come to an end. These two communities did not take matters into their own hands but awaited the miraculous intervention of God into human history. The Messiah and God's judgment would rectify what was wrong in this present age. The eschatological beliefs of these two communities were directed against the Romans and the problems the Romans presented to them. Consequently, this eschatological ideology which characterized the communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra qualifies these two communities as passive resistance movements.

My analysis of 2Baruch and 4Ezra can at best demonstrate that, at the time of composition, the communities which stood behind these two writings had adopted a nonviolent solution to the Roman menace. This analysis of 2Baruch and 4Ezra, however, was intended to perform another function. I have intended this analysis as an initial or tentative look into the social setting of Jewish apocalyptic literature. If the rest of the Jewish apocalyptic corpus were examined along the lines I have set forth in this study, I am confident that these other texts will demonstrate many of the same features about the communities which stood behind them as 2Baruch and 4Ezra did. I am of the opinion that the other apocalyptic writings will also highlight that other communities employed eschatology for political ends. Eschatology became a pervasive factor in the second temple period and it was used many times as a nonviolent, political tool directed against foreign overlords.

The frequency with which eschatology was enlisted for the service of politics will also have many repercussions for the study of Jewish nationalism in the second temple period. Nationalistic feelings ran quite high in the period bounded by the Maccabean revolt on one side and the Bar Kochba rebellion on the other.

ENDNOTES

INTRODUCTION

Passive Resistance and Jewish Apocalypticism

¹ For a discussion of the evidence for the continuous Jewish opposition to Roman rule, see M.J. Borg, Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teaching of Jesus, (New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1984), pp. 27-49 and M. Stern, "Sicarii and Zealots", Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period, Vol. 8 of The World History of the Jewish People, ed. M. Avi-Yonah and Z. Baras, (Jerusalem: Masada Publishing Ltd., 1977), pp. 263-264. See further the statement Josephus placed in a speech made by Titus during the siege of Jerusalem:

You have been the men that have never left off rebelling since Pompey first conquered you; and have since that time, made open war with the Romans. [J.W. 6:328-329 and quoted in J. Spenser Kennard, "Judas of Galilee and His Clan", Jewish Quarterly Review, 36 (1946), p. 268.]

² For a discussion of the political intrigues between the Hasmonean house and the Romans, see G.W.E. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), pp. 195-198 and E. Mary Smallwood, The Jews Under Roman Rule, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976), pp. 16-43.

³ Following this introductory chapter, I will devote a section of my thesis to defining terms which I used in the introductory chapter and which I shall continue to use throughout this study, but whose meaning, for whatever reason, needs clarification. One term which will be discussed in that section will be 'revolutionary movements' and I shall contrast this term with its counterpart 'resistance movement'. For the moment let D.M. Rhoads' definitions of the two terms suffice:

... the term 'resistance' encompasses many forms of anti-Roman activity including nonviolent as well as violent actions, official as well as popular protests. The term 'revolutionaries' refers to those who engage in armed resistance and were committed to war against the Romans. [Israel in Revolution: 6-74 C.E., (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), p. 2].

⁴ Borg, Conflict, Holiness, p. 5. Borg, who also treated the question of politics and religion in first century Palestine, confirms my representation of the view of Jewish historians concerning Jewish attitudes toward Roman rule. From scholarly works which dealt with the Jewish revolts, Borg also gained the impression that scholars have tended to advocate that Jews, in first century Palestine, were either violent revolutionaries or apolitical pacifists. Borg characterized the opinion of Jewish historians as follows:

it suggests that resistance was confined to one group and thus not a vital issue for most people; those who advocated it joined the Zealots,

those who did not remained aloof and fundamentally accepted Roman imperial order (pp. 34-35).

⁵ 'Nonviolent' or 'passive' resistance will be another term which I shall discuss in greater detail in the next section (see endnote 3).

⁶ Again, Borg in his book on the historical Jesus corroborated my suspicions about the numerous forms which opposition to Rome could take when he pointed out that,

not surprisingly, Jewish conflict with the colonial power was widespread and utilized a variety of means, ranging from the dispatch of official delegations, to non-violent protests, to guerilla warfare, culminating in the tragic war of liberation of 66-70 C.E. (Conflict, Holiness, pp. 2-3).

For a discussion of the nonviolent resistance movements mentioned by Josephus, see Rhoads, Israel in Revolution, pp. 61-68, and D.W. Suter, "The Measure of Redemption: The Similitudes of Enoch, Nonviolence, and National Integrity", The Society of Biblical Literature 1983 Seminar Papers, ed. K.H. Richards, (Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1983), p. 171.

⁷ The terms 'apocalyptic eschatology' and 'apocalypticism', along with the cognate term 'apocalypse', will be the subject matter of a fairly lengthy discussion in the forthcoming sections on terms. But J.J. Collins has provided a rather succinct definition of all three terms which will suffice for the present:

Subsequent English-language discussion has favored abandonment of "apocalyptic" as a noun and has distinguished between "apocalypse" as a literary genre, "apocalypticism" as a social ideology, and "apocalyptic eschatology" as a set of ideas and motifs that may be found also in other genres and social settings. ["Apocalyptic Literature", Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters, ed. R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), p. 345.]

⁸ Other scholars who have pointed to a connection between apocalyptic ideas and politics include, Stern, "Sicarii and Zealots", p. 256; Rhoads, Israel, pp. 170-173; D.N. Freedman, "Flowering and Apocalyptic", Journal for Theology and the Church, 6 (1969), pp. 171-173; W.R. Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956), pp. 193-194; S. Zeitlin, The Rise and Fall of the Judean State, vol. 3, (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1970), pp. 131-135; M. Black, "Judas of Galilee and Josephus's 'Fourth Philosophy'", Josephus-Studien, ed. O. Betz, K. Haacker, and M. Hengel, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1974), pp. 53-54; N. Cohn, The Pursuit of the Millennium, (London: Temple Smith, revised 1970), pp. 21-22; J.G. Gager, Kingdom and Community, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p.23; M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, vol. 1, trans. J. Bowden, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), p. 188; S. Hoenig, "Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus, Second Commonwealth Parallelisms", Jewish Quarterly Review, 59 (1958), p. 77; and P.D. Hanson, "Prolegomenon to the Study of Jewish Apocalyptic", Magnalia Dei: The

Mighty Acts of God, ed. F.M. Cross, W.E. Lenke, and P.D. Miller, (New York: Doubleday and Company Inc., 1976), p. 392.

⁹ Richard A. Horsley, "Ancient Jewish Banditry and the Revolt against Rome, A.D. 66-70", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 43 (1981), p. 426.

¹⁰ D.S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1964), p.17.

¹¹ On the relationship between apocalyptic literature and this period of nationalistic fervour, see the following by D.S. Russell:

The rise and growth of the apocalyptic literature in Judaism is to be seen against the background of one of the most heroic and at the same time one of the most tragic, periods of Israel's history. The years 200 B.C.-A.D. 100, within which the bulk of this literature was written, witness a revival of Jewish nationalism which was to have repercussions for centuries to come . . . (Method and Message, p.15).

¹² For reasons which I shall discuss later, this paper will examine Jewish apocalypticism only in the Roman period, even though it flourished earlier in the Seleucid period and in the period of Jewish independence under the Hasmoneans.

¹³ For those scholars who have complained that the sociological and historical analysis of New Testament texts has been ignored, see J.G. Gager, Kingdom and Community, p.3; H.C. Kee, Miracle in the Early Christian World. A Study in Socio-Historical Method, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), p.43; and J.Z. Smith, "The Social Description of Early Christianity", Religious Studies Review, 1 (1975), p.19.

¹⁴ G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "Social Aspects of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypticism", Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East, ed. D. Hellholm, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983), p. 641.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 646.

¹⁶ James Barr, "Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study", Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester, 58 (1975), p.22. For similar comments to those of Barr, see P. Vielhauer, "Apocalypses and Related Subjects", New Testament Apochrypha, vol. 2, ed. W. Schneemelcher and E. Hennecke, trans. R. Wilson, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), p. 594.

¹⁷ Klaus Koch, The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic, trans. M. Kohl, (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1972), p. 22. See also the statement of M.E. Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature", Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period, vol. 2, ed. M.E. Stone, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), p. 433.

¹⁸ Among the scholars who have maintained that a sociological and historical analysis of apocalyptic literature is required, there is Nickelsburg, "Social Aspects", p. 646; H.C.Kee, Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel,

(London: SCM Press Ltd., 1977), p. 77; and S.R. Isenberg, "Millenarism in Greco-Roman Palestine", Religion, 4 (1974), p. 35.

19 By a survey study, I intend a monograph which tries to give a comprehensive analysis of the whole of the apocalyptic phenomenon and which does so by listing the characteristics of the apocalyptic phenomenon. Examples of this type of study include, D.S. Russell, Method and Message, (cited in note 10); K. Koch, Rediscovery, (cited in note 17); C. Rowland, The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity, (London: SPCK, 1982); H.H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, (New York: Association Press, 1963); and M. Rist, "Apocalypticism", Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. 1, ed. G.A. Buttrick, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), pp. 157-161.

20 For those who have rejected this list approach, see H.D. Betz, "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism", Journal for Theology and Church, 6 (1969), p. 136; P.D. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, revised 1979), pp. 6-7; M. Knibb, "Apocalyptic and Wisdom in 4Ezra", Journal for the Study of Judaism, 13 (1983), p.61; G. MacRae, "Apocalyptic Eschatology in Gnosticism", Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East, ed. D. Hellholm, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983), p. 317; M.E. Stone, "List of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature", Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God, ed. F.M. Cross, W.E. Lemke, P.D. Miller, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1976), p. 440; and A.N. Wilder, "The Rhetoric of Ancient and Modern Apocalyptic", Interpretation, 25 (1971), p. 438.

21 J.Z. Smith, "Wisdom and Apocalyptic", Religious Syncretism in Antiquity, ed. B.A. Pearson, (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975), p. 132.

22 Hanson, Dawn, p. 429.

23 S.B. Frost, "Apocalyptic and History", The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J.P. Hyatt, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 99. Compare also this statement by L. Hartman:

(Koch) works on form-critical and text-linguistic lines and arrives at results in these areas that seem convincing, based as they are on a thorough analysis of the text as it stands. Taking a firm hold of the text as text he puts himself into a certain opposition to traditional approaches according to which the text becomes something like a box containing specimens of apocalyptic ideas, of apocalyptic phenomenology. ["Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre", Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East, ed. D. Hellholm, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983), p. 339.]

24 For some examples of works that use this approach, see J.J. Collins, "The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 44 (1982), pp. 91-111; J.J. Collins, "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll", Vetus Testamentum, 25 (1975), pp. 596-612; J.J. Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism", Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East, ed. D. Hellholm, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr

(Paul Siebeck), 1983), pp. 531-548; Tord Olsson, "The Apocalyptic Activity. The Case of Jamasp Namag", Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East, ed. D. Hellholm, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983), pp. 21-49; M.E. Stone, "Coherence and Inconsistency in the Apocalypses: The Case of 'The End' in 4 Ezra", Journal of Biblical Literature, 102 (1983), pp. 229-243; and A Yarbrow Collins, "The History-of-Religions Approach to Apocalypticism and the 'Angel of Waters' (Rev. 16:4-7)", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 39 (1977), pp. 367-381.

25 M.A. Knibb, "Apocalyptic and Wisdom in 4 Ezra", Journal for the Study of Judaism, 13 (1983), pp. 56-74.

26 Ibid., pp. 56-62.

27 Ibid., pp. 62-72.

28 Ibid., p. 62.

29 G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11", Journal of Biblical Literature, 96 (1977), pp. 383-405.

30 Ibid., p. 383.

31 Nickelsburg, "Social Aspects", p. 650.

32 For examples of sociological analyses which employed this method, see Suter, "Measure of Redemption", pp. 167-176; S.B. Reid, "1 Enoch: The Rising Elite of the Apocalyptic Movement", The Society of Biblical Literature 1983 Seminar Papers, ed. K.H. Richards, (Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1983), pp. 147-156; and J.R. Mueller, "A Prolegomenon to the Study of the Social Function of 4 Ezra", The Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers, ed. K.H. Richards, (Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1981), pp. 259-268.

33 A. Yarbrow Collins, "Persecution and Vengeance in the Book of Revelation", Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and Near East, ed. D. Hellholm, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983), p. 729.

34 Besides 2(Second) Baruch, this work is sometimes also called the "Apocalypse of Baruch" or the "Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch". For discussions about the name of this work, see M. Rist, "Baruch, Apocalypse of", Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. 1, ed. G.A. Buttrick, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 361 and A.F.J. Klijn, "The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch", Outside the Old Testament, ed. M. De Jonge, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 193.

The nomenclature associated with 4 Ezra, on the other hand, is much more complex. 4 Ezra is part of a composite work known as 1 Esdras and there are many other works attributed to Ezra. For a discussion of the literature associated with the name of Ezra the Scribe, see N. Turner, "Esdras, Books of", Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. 2, ed. G.A. Buttrick, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), pp. 140-141 and J.M. Myers, 1 and 2 Esdras: The Anchor Bible, vol. 42, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1974), pp. 107-108.

³⁵ J. Hadot in a recent article ["La Datation de l'Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch", *Semitica*, 15 (1965), pp. 79-95] has argued that 2Baruch was composed by an Essene immediately after Pompey's takeover of Palestine in 63 B.C.E. and his subsequent desecration of the Temple. Needless to say, this early dating of the work has not met with much support. Most scholars still concur in dating 2Baruch, as well as 4Ezra, after 70 C.E. but before 132 C.E. (see, for example, Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, pp. 281-287).

The evidence for dating 2Baruch and 4Ezra between 70 C.E. and 132 C.E. is the following. The authors of 2Baruch and 4Ezra both know of the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. and both works seem to be reactions to this event. These observations would set the lower limit of these two works to 70 C.E. [see P. Bogaert, *Apocalypse De Baruch: Introduction, Traduction du Syriaque et Commentaire*, (Paris: Cerf, 1969), pp. 270-271 and L.L. Grabbe, "Chronography in 4Ezra and 2Baruch", *Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers* (20), ed. K.H. Richards, (Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1981), p. 61-63]. There is no indication, however, that either of the authors of 2Baruch or 4Ezra knew of the Bar Kochba rebellion. It would appear very unlikely that an author would compose a work responding to the events of 70 C.E. after the Bar Kochba rebellion and then fail to mention the Bar Kochba rebellion. The upper limit for these two works would, therefore, appear to be 132 C.E.

Other indications for the date of composition of these two works may be the opening verse of both 2Baruch and 4Ezra. 2Baruch and 4Ezra begin with chronological references. The apocalypse of Baruch is introduced with the ensuing remark: "in the twenty-fifth year of Jeconiah, the King of Judea" (1:1). Some scholars have argued that Jeconiah was made King of Judea just three months before the sack of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.E. and then spent the next twenty-five years in exile. Consequently, Baruch is purported to have had these visions twenty-five years after the sack of Jerusalem. But if the date 586 B.C.E. represents the year 70 C.E., then the reference to twenty-five years may mean that 2Baruch was written sometime around 95 C.E. (see Bogaert, *Apocalypse de Baruch*, pp. 281-288). Similarly, in 4Ezra, the phrase "in the thirtieth year after the destruction of our city" (3:1) may indicate that the work was written sometime in the vicinity of 100 C.E. (see B.M. Metzger, "The Fourth Book of Ezra", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1983) p. 520).

Other evidence for the date of composition of 2Baruch concerns the Letter of Barnabas. This letter may contain a quotation from 2Baruch. As the Letter to Barnabas is generally conceded to have been written between 117 C.E. to 120 C.E., this information would establish that 2Baruch was written at least before 115 B.C. (see Bogaert, *Apocalypse de Baruch*, pp. 272-278).

A final scrap of evidence for the date of composition of 4Ezra may be found in the "eagle vision" (4Ezra 11:1-12:51). Some interpreters of this work have argued that the final three emperors who were to rule before the arrival of the Messiah represent the three Flavian emperors. Since Domitian was to be the last emperor before the advent of the Messiah according to the author of 4Ezra, 4Ezra must have been written sometime during his reign between 81 C.E. and 96 C.E. (see Grabbe, "Chronography", pp. 51-52 and Lacocque, "Vision of the Eagle", pp. 239-240).

³⁶ For a discussion on the relationship between 2Baruch and 4Ezra with the revolt of 66-74 B.E., see Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, p. 277-294 and Mueller,

"Prolegomenon to 4Ezra", p. 259. See also the following statement by A.L. Thompson:

Both books (2Baruch and 4Ezra) are apocalyptic laments motivated by the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and deal with essentially the same problem, i.e. the demise of Israel and the resultant questioning of God's effective rule in the world. [Responsibility for Evil in the Theodicy of 4Ezra, (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), p. 121.]

37 For the importance of the dialogue format in 2Baruch and 4Ezra, see Thompson, *ibid.*, p. 124-148.

38 At this point, I would like just to say a word about the relationship of pre-70 C.E. apocalyptic communities and post-70 C.E. apocalyptic communities. Some might feel that the choice of 2Baruch and 4Ezra as typical apocalyptic works might not be very suitable because they were written after 70 C.E. As Judaism was radically transformed after 70 C.E., there might not be much continuity between apocalyptic communities before 70 C.E. with those which emerged after 70 C.E. I, however, would dissent from the view of Jewish history assumed in the above argument and I do not consider 70 C.E. to be any great watershed mark. Certainly new forces were introduced into Jewish society after 70 C.E. But I do not think that these forces came to dominate Jewish society until after the period of the Bar Kochba rebellion. Conversely, many forces which were prevalent in pre-70 C.E., such as Jewish apocalypticism, did not immediately die out as a result of the war but continued into post-70 C.E. Judaism, though they were on their last legs. Many pre-70 C.E. forces did not die out completely until the period after the Bar Kochba rebellion. I would see the Bar Kochba rebellion, therefore, as the great dividing line, not 70 C.E., while the years between the two rebellions were a transitional period. Consequently, I do not feel that there needs to be any concern over the fact that 2Baruch and 4Ezra were written after 70 C.E. 2Baruch and 4Ezra were not new variants on an old theme. Rather, they represented the last gasps of Jewish apocalypticism before they were eclipsed. For a scholar who basically agreed with this reconstruction of Jewish history and who also challenged the significance of 70 C.E., see M. Simon, Verus Israel, (Paris: Editions E. De Boccard, 1964), pp. 9-13. For example, Simon suggested:

Elles ont montré, en particulier, que le judaïsme talmudique, lui-même plus souple à certain égard et plus complexe qu'on ne l'avait cru, ne s'était pas imposé d'un seul coup en Israël comme le type désormais unique de pensée et de vie religieuses. Elles ont établi, ou tout moins suggéré, que les conséquences de la destruction de Jérusalem sur l'évolution de judaïsme n'avaient été ni immédiates, ni brutales, et qu'en particulier la rupture avec la culture gréco-latine s'était opérée progressivement et plus tard qu'on ne l'avait d'abord admis. (p. 9)

to Roman rule with Judas of Galilee, see Rhoads, Israel, pp. 47-60 and Stern, "Sicarii", pp. 266-270.

35 For examples of studies which confine pre-6 C.E. revolutionary activity to their introductory remarks, see Rhoads, Israel, pp. 20-27 and Stern, "Sicarii", pp. 263-266.

36 The inability of most scholars to recognize the significance of pre-6 C.E. revolutionary activity to the history of Jewish opposition to Roman rule is illustrated in the work of E.M. Smallwood. Smallwood, in her discussion of Ezeckias who was one of the first revolutionary figures to be active before Herod's ascension to power, could write:

These brigands, like those who were to infest the country in the decade immediately before the revolt of A.D. 66-70, were no mere highwaymen but terrorists conducting guerilla warfare against the established pro-Roman government. (Roman Rule, p. 44)

Or again, when Smallwood chronicled the war of Varus, she wrote down that

another dispatch had come from Varus, reporting the serious deterioration of the situation in Palestine since Archelaus' departure, where an eruption of violence in Jerusalem at Pentecost had developed into a revolt of virtually the whole country against Rome and the Herods (p. 108).

When Smallwood, however, began her account of the Bar Kochba rebellion, she expressed the prevalent opinion that

towards the end of Hadrian's reign the Jews of Palestine made their second and final attempt to establish an autonomous Jewish state, in a revolt led by a man usually known as Bar Cochba. . . (p. 428)

As the first two passages exhibit, Smallwood was quite cognizant that revolts against Roman rule took place before 6 C.E. But notwithstanding this exhaustive knowledge of events prior to 6 C.E., Smallwood was still of the mind that the Bar Kochba rebellion constituted just the second attempt which the Jews made to throw off the Roman yoke. Scholars, moreover, rarely take the trouble to explain why they refuse to classify the war of Varus and the other repeated efforts of the Jews to be free of Roman rule in the first century B.C.E. with the revolt of 66-74 C.E. and the Bar Kochba rebellion.

37 In Smith's article about the Zealots and the Sicarii ("Zealots", pp. 1-19), he characterized Hengel's view about the differences between pre-6 C.E. and post-6 C.E. revolutionary activity as follows:

He (Hengel) recognizes that the many messianic and pietistic revolts of Herodian times were spontaneous and unconnected outbreaks, diverse in origin and nature, and showing no sign of long preparation or unified leadership, but he attributes to Judas of Galilee the introduction of the

demonstrated (see "The Sicarii: Ancient Jewish Terrorists"), however, the Sicarii were a terrorist movement. They adopted terrorist techniques, like killing their enemies stealthily in crowds (see J.W. 2:254ff), in their vendetta with the Romans. Moreover, the Sicarii did not participate actively in the war of 66-74 C.E., preferring to remain in seclusion at Masada (for a discussion of the history of the Sicarii during the revolt, which notes the differences between the Sicarii and the other revolutionary movements, see Zeitlin, "Zealots", pp. 395-396). These differences in approach add to the overall sense that the Sicarii did not trace their roots back to Judas' "fourth philosophy".

Finally, this view about the Sicarii exhibits a rather elementary grasp of political realities. Any argument which posits that a revolutionary movement could prance about Palestine for over sixty years without being detected or effectively dealt with by an empire as powerful as Rome's defies political common sense. The Roman authorities most certainly would have taken decisive actions to eliminate any seditious element as soon as possible. Scholars who accepted the identification between the Sicarii and Judas' "fourth philosophy" were unaware of the political axiom that it is difficult for a revolutionary movement to exist in a well-organized state (see note 38), which Palestine seems to have been, at least from 6 to 44 C.E.

⁴² See Rhoads, Israel, pp. 52-60 and Smith, "Zealots", pp. 5-6. See further Smallwood, Roman Rule, pp. 153-155 and Stern, "Sicarii", pp. 270-271.

⁴³ Smith, "Zealots", p.6.

⁴⁴ The fallacy in the argument that the Jews who rebelled in the first century B.C.E. were not guided by a revolutionary ideology is perhaps best illustrated in the article by M. Stern about the Sicarii and Zealots. At one point in this article, Stern maintained that Judas, the son of Ezeckias, who rebelled during the war of Varus in 4 B.C.E. was the same revolutionary figure as Judas of Galilee ("Sicarii", p. 269). Stern also supposed that "during the years that elapsed between the insurrection and the census, this Judas formulated the principles of his world outlook. . . ." (p. 269). Stern, in other words, would have his readers believe that Judas had no reason or understanding of why he rebelled in 4 B.C.E. According to Stern, Judas only developed his rationale for rebelling against Rome after he had already rebelled. If it is correct that Judas, son of Ezeckias, can be identified with Judas of Galilee, is it not more logical, given the fact that most people do not act blindly or without reason, that the world outlook which compelled Judas to rebel in 6 C.E. was the same revolutionary ideology which incited him to rebel in 4 B.C.E.? Extending the same logic, would not a more plausible argument be that the Jews who rebelled in the first century B.C.E. likewise had their own motives for rebelling and thus that Judas of Galilee was not the first Jew to devise a revolutionary ideology?

⁴⁵ Rhoads also noted the vast differences between the account of Judas in the Jewish War with that of the Jewish Antiquities in, "The Assumption of Moses and Jewish History: 4 B.C.- A.D. 48", Studies on the Testament of Moses, ed G.W.E. Nickelsburg, (Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), p. 57, ftn 13. In fact Rhoads made many excellent observations about Josephus' apologetical use of Judas in this article which he, unfortunately, did not carry over into his full-length study of Jewish political history, Israel in Revolution. For

Chapter II

The Present State of the Study of the Apocalyptic Phenomenon

¹ For a discussion of the etymology of the word "apocalyptic" and its derivatives, which came from the Greek word meaning "revelation", see Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 428; Koch, Rediscovery, p. 18; Russell, Method and Message, p. 36; W. Schmithals, The Apocalyptic Movement, trans. J.E. Steely, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975), p. 13.

² For scholars who have commented on their amorphous state of affairs, see Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 428; J. Carmignac, "Description du phénomène de l'Apocalyptique dans l'Ancien Testament", Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East, ed. D. Hellholm, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983), p. 164 (From here on in D. Hellholm's anthology will be simply referred to as Apocalypticism); T. Olsson, "The Apocalyptic Activity. The Case of Jamasp Namag", Apocalypticism, pp. 21-22; E.P. Sanders, "The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses", Apocalypticism, p. 447; H. Anderson, "A Future for Apocalyptic?", Biblical Studies: Essays in Honour of William Barclay, ed. J.R. McKay and J.F. Miller, (London: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., 1976), p. 56; M. Barker, "Slippery Words III. Apocalyptic", Expository Times, 89 (1977-78), p. 324; and M.E. Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature", Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God, ed. F.M. Cross, W.E. Lemke, P.D. Miller, Jr., (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1976), p. 439.

³ The definitions of all three terms are discussed in Hanson, Dawn of Apocalyptic, pp. 428-434; Hanson, "Apocalypticism", Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, supp. vol., ed. K. Crim, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976), pp. 29-31; and J.J. Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1984), pp. 2-11.

⁴ Collins, Imagination, p. 2.

⁵ J.J. Collins, "Towards the Morphology of a Genre", Semeia, 14 (1979), p.1.

⁶ This commonly accepted description of the study of apocalypses has recently been challenged by J.J. Collins. Collins has produced one of the more thorough analyses of the genre apocalypse, with his most memorable contribution to the topic coming in the periodical Semeia [see "Towards the Morphology of a Genre", Semeia, 14 (1979), p. 1-20 and J.J. Collins, "The Jewish Apocalypses", Semeia, 14 (1979), pp. 21-49. For Collins' other works in this area, see J.J. Collins, Daniel, First Maccabees, Second Maccabees: Old Testament Message, vol. 16, ed. C. Stuhlmueller and M. McNamara, (Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1981), pp. 130-145 and J.J. Collins, Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature, vol. 20, The Forms of the Old Testament Literature, ed. R. Knierim and G.M. Tucker, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1984).] Collins edited an issue of Semeia which was entirely dedicated to the genre apocalypse. In this enterprise, however, Collins and his collaborators departed from previous scholarship on two essential points. First, they were of the opinion that the genre apocalypse was not peculiar to Palestine but flourished throughout the ancient Mediterranean world. Secondly, Collins' team proposed that apocalypses were not characterized by any common Sitz im Leben or social setting

¹⁴ For a discussion of this two-step procedure see, Kee, Community of the New Age, pp. 10-13; Smith, "Social Description", pp. 19-21; and Theissen, Followers of Jesus, pp. 2-3.

¹⁵ Nickelsburg, "Social Aspects", p. 641.

¹⁶ This second step has already been covered in this study in the last chapter on revolutionary movements.

¹⁷ Nickelsburg, "Social Aspects", p. 641.

¹⁸ For a discussion of these two problems see, Isenberg, "Millenarism", p. 30 and Theissen, Followers of Jesus, p. 21.

¹⁹ Koch, Rediscovery, p. 21.

²⁰ See, for example, W.D. Davies, "Apocalyptic and Pharisaism", Christian Origins and Judaism, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), p. 22; P.M. Bogaert, "La Ruine de Jérusalem et les Apocalypses Juives après 70", Lectio Divina, 95 (1977), p. 126; A.J. Ferch, "The Two Aeons and the Messiah in Pseudo-Philo, 4Ezra, and 2Baruch", Andrews University Seminary Studies, 15 (1977), p. 135; and A. Lacocque, "The Vision of the Eagle in 4Esdras: A Rereading of Daniel 7 in the First Century C.E.", Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers, ed. K.H. Richards, (Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1981), p. 237.

²¹ See, for example, D.N. Freedman, "The Flowering of Apocalyptic", Journal for Theology and Church, 6 (1969), pp. 166-174 and see Russell, Method and Message, pp. 24-25 for a list of scholars who have argued for a connection between the Essenes and apocalyptic literature.

²² For those who claimed that the Zealots were the authors of apocalyptic literature, see *ibid.*, p. 25.

²³ See O. Plöger, Theocracy and Eschatology, trans. S. Rudman, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968), pp. 7-24 and M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, vol. 1, trans. J. Bowden, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), pp. 174-254.

The arguments of Plöger and Hengel, however, are not very convincing and are highly speculative. There are a total of three explicit references to the Hasidim in the primary sources. Consequently, there is not enough evidence to ascertain who the Hasidim were, much less to build another hypothesis about the relationship between the Hasidim and apocalyptic literature. For a critique of Plöger's and Hengel's arguments see Nickelsburg, "Social Aspects", pp. 647-648 and Collins, "Apocalyptic Literature", p. 356.

²⁴ Russell, Method and Message, p. 27.

²⁵ L. Morris, Apocalyptic, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972), p. 20.

²⁶ P. Vielhauer, "Apocalypses and Related Subjects", New Testament

CHAPTER III

The Laments of Ezra and Baruch

¹ The translations of 2Baruch and 4Ezra which were used for the preparation of this section were respectively, A.F.J. Klijn, "2(Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch", and B.M. Metzger, "The Fourth Book of Ezra", both in The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol.1, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, (Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1983), pp. 615-652 and pp. 517-559. All quotations from 2Baruch and 4Ezra are taken from these two translations and all references are to this edition.

² One of the critical problems associated with 4Ezra in particular and, to a much lesser extent, with 2Baruch concerns the dialogue format. In 4Ezra, the seer and angel engage in some rather heated discussions. Their exchanges do not follow the expected pattern of the heavenly messenger answering the queries of the mortal seer. Instead, the two parties espouse competing ideologies and the human visionary defends his position against the beliefs held by the angelic mediator. For as long as the dialogues continue in 4Ezra, there is a stalemate between the seer and the angel so that neither the complaints of the seer nor the pronouncements of the angel are immediately recognizable as the dominant view of the book. In the dialogues located in 4Ezra, it is not clear which stance the author professes and desires to communicate to his audience. The question arises, therefore, as to what the author is trying to accomplish with the dialogue format (for a discussion of this problem, see Thompson, Responsibility, pp. 124-128 and A.P. Hyman, "The Problem of Pseudonymity", Journal for the Study of Judaism, 6 (1975), pp. 47-56).

The function of the dialogue format in 4Ezra, however, is a highly disputed point and two solutions to this problem have dominated the discussion. Gunkel contended that the dialogue structure in 4Ezra reflects the inner turmoil of the author. According to this view, the author's faith was profoundly shaken by recent events and he began to entertain doubts about many of the major tenets of the Jewish tradition. Yet at the same time, the author had deep attachments to the traditions of his people and he reproached himself for having these misgivings. The author represented this conflict which raged within himself literarily by means of the dialogue format. He placed the orthodox position on the lips of the angel and made Ezra the spokesman for the doubts he harboured about the Jewish traditions. In the work, therefore, the author tried to arrive at a resolution of his personal trauma (for a discussion of Gunkel's position, see Thompson, Responsibility, pp. 89-90 and Hayman, "Pseudonymity", pp. 48-49).

The solution to the dialogue problem which underlies my analysis of 2Baruch and 4Ezra is very similar to that of Gunkel's. Only, I am of the opinion that the laments expressed by Baruch and Ezra represent the confusion and uncertainty of the communities to which 2Baruch and 4Ezra were addressed. The replies of the divine interlocutors, on the other hand, reflect the faith of the communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra which had been shaken and challenged by recent events. The authors of 2Baruch and 4Ezra were trying to convince the communities for which they wrote that their beliefs were still relevant. The authors of these two works try to console the communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra by demonstrating how the beliefs of the two communities were not proven wrong by recent events but were able to make some sense of and rectify the problems which they faced.

³ At this point, I would like to remind the reader that the purpose of this study is not to understand the works of 2Baruch and 4Ezra per se. What follows in this section is not a typical exegesis of the works of 2Baruch and 4Ezra. This study, as S.B. Reid has phrased it, "is an example of sociological exegesis" ("1Enoch: The Rising Elite", p. 147). I shall employ the works of 2Baruch and 4Ezra as a looking glass into the world of the community which composed the two books. This study represents an attempt at a sociological and historical analysis of the two communities which stood behind the works of 2Baruch and 4Ezra.

Moreover, the primary focus of this study is to determine the political orientation of the communities responsible for 2Baruch and 4Ezra. I shall attempt to discern how the communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra related to the political events of their day. Consequently, I shall treat in this section only those passages in 2Baruch and 4Ezra which, in my opinion, highlight aspects of the political orientation of the communities of 2Baruch and 4Ezra. In this study, I shall not be concerned with the ascertainment of every feature of the community of 2Baruch and 4Ezra nor with every question which might come under the purview of the study of Jewish apocalypticism. In this study, there will also be the conspicuous absence of many interpretive issues which have dominated the scholarly discussion of 2Baruch and 4Ezra. For example, the debate which Ezra and Uriel have about the law and the few who will be saved has captured the imagination of most interpreters of 4Ezra. But this debate does not supply much information about the community of 4Ezra, especially not about the political orientation of this community. Ezra's lament over the few who will be saved, therefore, will be passed over, for the most part, in this study.

⁴ The issue of nationalism versus individualism has traditionally caused quite a stir in the study of 4Ezra. (For an in-depth analysis of this problem, and for a bibliography, see Thompson, Responsibility, pp. 157-256.) One of the major problems of interpretation associated with the apocalypse of Ezra concerns the third vision (4Ezra 6:35-9:25). Most scholars agree that the book of 4Ezra is dominated by nationalistic concerns. In the third vision, however, some scholars feel that there is a curious shift away from the nationalistic proclivities of the work to individualism and universalism. Some scholars argue that the nation of Israel is no longer the centre of attention in the third vision. Rather, the author of 4Ezra seems to be interested in individualistic concerns and in universal salvation. This abrupt change in subject matter, needless to say, has posed many problems for interpreters of 4Ezra who hold this view.

As I explained in the previous note, the issues surrounding the third dialogue generally lie outside the bounds of this study. Nevertheless, the interpretation of the third vision which suggests that 4Ezra is expounding the philosophical positions of individualism and universalism obviously does have certain implications for my contention that the community of 4Ezra stressed nationalistic concerns. Consequently, I should like to discuss briefly this particular interpretation of the third vision.

I am of the opinion that scholars who maintain that Ezra espouses individualism and universalism in the third vision have simply misinterpreted Ezra's complaints to Uriel. Not only does nationalism constitute the object of discussion in visions one and two and in visions four through seven, but nationalism continues to shape the thoughts of Ezra and Uriel in the third dialogue. While a point by point refutation of this interpretation would take this study too far afield, I would like to make just two observations about the third vision.

In the third vision, it is obvious that Ezra is pleading for the salvation of a whole group of people and that Uriel is not moved by these pleas, rigidly maintaining that only a small number of people will be redeemed at the end of time. What has not been obvious, at least to many scholars who have examined the book so far, has been the identity of those people for whom Ezra is seeking clemency. Most scholars have until now suggested that Ezra wants God to be merciful to all humankind, including gentiles. The words of Ezra himself near the close of the third dialogue indicates that he had a very different group of people in mind:

And now I will speak out: About mankind you know best; but I will speak about your people, for whom I am grieved, and about your inheritance for whom I lament, and about Israel, for whom I am sad, and about the seed of Jacob, for whom I am troubled. Therefore I will pray before you for myself and for them, for I see the failings of us who dwell in the land, and I have heard of the swiftness of the judgment that is to come. (4Ezra 8:15-18)

This passage amply demonstrates whom Ezra had in mind when he complained to the angel in the third vision, namely "the seed of Jacob" (v.16). Ezra "laments" for "God's inheritance" (see v.16), not for the whole human population whom he dismisses in the first line (see v.15). Ezra was advocating the salvation of the whole nation of Israel while Uriel responded that only a small remnant of the nation would be found worthy to enter God's kingdom at the end of time. The nationalistic disposition of Ezra the seer inspires him to take up the cause for the salvation of the entire nation of Israel.

The second comment I would like to make with respect to the third vision involves certain ambiguous phrases which are common in this section of 4Ezra. Many scholars have reached the conclusion that Ezra adopted a universalistic stance in the third dialogue because a number of phrases which on first reading, especially by a twentieth century audience, seem to imply that Ezra and Uriel are speaking about all human beings. But when the immediate context is analysed for indications of the identity of the parties involved in the discourse between Ezra and Uriel, invariable the focus of Uriel and Ezra is the Jewish people, not the entire earthly population. Uriel says, for example, "Let many perish who are now living . . ." (4Ezra 7:20). Out of context, this phrase might signify that Uriel wished that all human beings who are now living were dead. But the rest of the sentence continues: ". . . rather than that the law of God which is set before them be disregarded" (4Ezra 7:20). According to the second half of the phrase, the "living" whom Uriel wishes would "perish" are those who have had "the law of God . . . set before them." In the Jewish world view, however, only the Jews have had "the law set before them." Consequently, Uriel by the term "living" does not intend the whole human race but has the Jewish people at the forefront of his thoughts.

Another such example follows on the heels of the above sentence. Uriel continues his diatribe against Ezra's views with the comment:

For God strictly commanded those who came into the world, when they came, what they should do to live, and what they should observe to avoid punishment. Nevertheless they were not obedient, and spoke

against him; . . . they scorned his law, and denied his covenants . . ." (4Ezra 7:22, 24).

In the first half of this selection, the phrase, "those who came into this world", on its own, might conceivably refer to the whole world. Yet in the second half of the above quote, "those who came into the world" are said to have "denied (God's) covenants." Again, in Jewish thought, God only made a covenant with the Jewish people and so only Jews can "deny God's covenants". It would follow, as in the previous example, that the Jewish people are the focus of Ezra's and Uriel's discussion, and not all of creation. (For another example, compare 4Ezra 8:15-18 with 8:45.)

In other words, the situation in 4Ezra is analogous to the situation in the American Constitution. The framers of the constitution filled this document with phrases like, "all men are created equal", which sound highly universalistic. But, as is common knowledge, such phrases did not take into consideration black men or any women. "All men" applied to only a limited group of white, propertied males in the newly formed republic. Similarly, the author of 4Ezra placed phrases in the mouth of Ezra and Uriel which might sound universalistic, at least in the English translations. Nevertheless, the referent is still the Jewish people.

The discussion in the third dialogue, therefore, does not concentrate on universalism or individualism. Nationalism, or concerns about the nation of Israel, still hold center stage in the third dialogue. These comments are not intended to suggest, however, that there is no shift in subject matter in the third dialogue. Throughout most of the book, the attention is on the dichotomy between the nation of Israel and the gentile nations. In the third dialogue, Ezra raises a complaint (see 4Ezra 7:17-18) which steers the dialogue to a consideration of the dichotomy between the virtuous and the evildoers within the nation of Israel. While this turn in the third dialogue constitutes a significant contrast to the rest of the book, it still does not leave the framework of nationalism for individualism and universalism. There is a shift in the subject matter in the third dialogue but the new topic of conversation neither contradicts nor is inconsistent with what appears in the rest of the book. On the contrary, the fresh topic of interest, namely remnant theology, is quite germane to the overall argument of the book. The appropriateness of remnant theology is being discussed in the third dialogue and Koch made the astute observation that

on the other hand, within Israel itself a distinction is made; it is no longer the people as a whole who are the heirs of eschatological salvation. Rather, the righteous in Israel are divided from the ungodly. The idea of the remnant of the chosen people which alone will be saved (a notion in evidence from Isaiah onwards) plays a great part. This differentiation has led to the apocalypticists being today occasionally reproached with individualism. (*Rediscovery*, pp. 30-31)

5 For the communal nature of the concerns of the community of 4Ezra see also Ezra's rebuke to the woman in the fourth vision (4Ezra 10:5-24). The woman was deeply disconsolate over the loss of her only son. But Ezra was angry with her (see v.5) because Ezra felt it was inappropriate for the woman to grieve over personal matters when the nation of Israel was in such dire straits. According to Ezra, the woman should be downcast over Israel's predicament, not her own personal tragedy.

"Apocalyptic and Historiography", Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 5 (1978), pp. 15-28; J. Licht, "Time and Eschatology in Apocalyptic Literature and in Qumran", Journal of Jewish Studies, 16 (1965), pp. 177-182; and H.H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, (London: Lutterworth Press, 1944), pp. 39-40.

¹⁴ See 2Baruch 1:1-15, 5:3-7:1 and 4Ezra 7:74.

¹⁵ For examples of periodization in 2Baruch, see 27:1-15 and chapters 53-76. In 4Ezra, see 6:7-10.

¹⁷ J.W. Swain, "The Theory of the Four Monarchies: Opposition History under the Roman Empire", Classical Philology, 35 (1940), pp. 1-21. For a discussion of the four kingdom theory in Jewish literature, see D. Flusser, "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel", Israel Oriental Studies, 2 (1972), pp. 148-175. For other mentions of this theory in the scholarly literature, see Hengal, Judaism and Hellenism, p.182; von Rad, Old Testament Theology, p. 311; J.J. Collins, "Jewish Apocalyptic against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 220 (1975), p. 29; W.G. Lambert, The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic, (London: The Athlone Press, 1978), pp. 7-13; and M. Stone, "The Concept of the Messiah in 4Ezra", Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough, ed. J. Neusner, (Leiden: Brill, 1968), pp. 301-302. See further Ant. 10:209-210.

¹⁸ Swain, pp. 2-5.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 7-15. In Swain's article, his discussion that the theory of the four kingdoms originated in Persia is highly speculative because Swain did not have command of the Persian sources. But later scholarship has corroborated his suspicions about the Persian derivation of this theory: see, for example, Flusser, "Four Empires", p. 163.

²⁰ Swain, "Four Monarchies", pp. 14-15.

²¹ Ibid., p. 13.

²² Ibid., p. 16.

²³ Flusser, "Four Empires", pp. 157-158.

²⁴ For one of the better discussions concerning the Messiah and the Messianic Kingdom, see Russell, Method and Message, pp. 304-352.

²⁵ For a discussion of the Messiah in 4Ezra, see M.E. Stone, "The Concept of the Messiah in 4Ezra", pp. 295-312 and A. Lacocque, "The Vision of the Eagle", pp. 237-257.

²⁶ For a discussion of the Messiah in 2Baruch, see P. Bogaert, Apocalypse De Baruch: Introduction, Traduction du Syriaque et Commentaire, (Paris: Cerf, 1969), pp. 413-419.

²⁷ For scholars who have noticed that the Messiah in 4Ezra would perform these same two tasks (as well as the Messiah in 2Baruch: see below) see, Ferch, "The Two Aeons", p. 150; Grabbe, "Chronography", p. 62; M. Desjardins, "Law in 2Baruch and 4Ezra", p. 27.

²⁸ For the importance of the concept of "zeal" for the Maccabees and the revolutionary movements of the first century C.E., as well as the origin and history of this idea, see Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus, p. 175-180, and idem. "Zealot", Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, vol.4, ed. G.A. Buttrick, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), pp. 936-939.

²⁹ Many commentators have taken Daniel 11:34 to be a cryptic condemnation of the Maccabean revolt. For discussions of this passage in relationship to the Maccabean revolt, see Nickelsburg, "Social Aspect", p. 648; Kee, Community of the New Age, p. 71; J.J. Collins, "The Mythology of the Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll", Vetus Testamentum, 25 (1975), p. 603; and J.C.H. Lebram, "The Piety of the Jewish Apocalyptists", Apocalypticism, p. 182.

³⁰ For a discussion of the proper sequence of events in the eschatological schema of 2Baruch, see Bogaert, Apocalypse de Baruch, pp. 413-425. For 4Ezra, see M.E. Stone, "Coherence and Inconsistency in the Apocalypses: The Case of 'The End' in 4Ezra", Journal of Biblical Literature, 102 (1983), pp. 229-243. This schema of a temporary Messianic kingdom followed by the creation of a new heaven and earth appears to have been quite popular after the revolt of 66-74 C.E. as it is the sequence that even the Rabbis finally accepted; see Bogaert, p. 414, fn. 1.

³¹ Collins, Daniel, p. 13.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Translations of Primary Sources

- Thackeray, H.S.T., Marcus, R., Wikgren, A., and Feldman, L.H., eds. and trans. Josephus. 10 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926-1965.
- Klijn, A.F.J. "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch", The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Vol. 1. Ed. James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1983, pp. 615-652.
- Metzger, B.M. "The Fourth Book of Ezra". The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Vol. 1. Ed. James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1983, pp. 517-559.

Josephus and Jewish History

- Allon, Gedalyah. "The Attitude of the Pharisees to the Roman Government and the House of Herod", Scripta Hierosolymitana, 7 (1961), pp. 53-78.
- Applebaum, S. "The Zealots: The Case for Revaluation", Journal of Roman Studies, 61 (1971), pp. 156-170.
- Bilde, P. "The Causes of the Jewish War According to Josephus", Journal for the Study of Judaism, 10 (1979), pp. 179-202.
- Black, Matthew. "Judas of Galilee and Josephus's 'Fourth Philosophy' ". Josephus-Studien. Ed. Otto Betz, Klaus Haacker and Martin Hengel. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1974, pp. 45-54.
- Borg, Marc. "The Currency of the Term Zealot", Journal of Theological Studies, 22 (1971), pp. 504-512.
- . Conflict and Social Change. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House, 1971.
- . Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teaching of Jesus. New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1984.
- Cadoux, Cecil John. The Historic Mission of Jesus. London: Lutterworth Press, 1941.
- Farmer, William Reuben. Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.
- . "Zealot." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Ed. G.A. Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, pp. 936-939.

- Hengel, Martin. Judaism and Hellenism. Vol. 1. Trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Hoenig, Sydney. "Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus, Second Commonwealth Parallelisms," Jewish Quarterly Review, 59 (1958), pp. 75-80.
- Horsley, Richard A. "Josephus and the Bandits", Journal for the Study of Judaism, 10 (1979), pp. 37-63.
- . "The Sicarii: Ancient Jewish Terrorists", The Journal of Religion, 59 (1979), pp. 435-458.
- . "Ancient Jewish Banditry and the Revolt against Rome, A.D. 66-70", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 43 (1981), pp. 409-432.
- . "Popular Messianic Movements around the Time of Jesus", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 46 (1984), pp. 471-495.
- , and Hanson, John S. Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs. Minneapolis, Minn.: Winston Press, 1985.
- Kennard, Spenser, J. "Judas of Galilee and His Clan", Jewish Quarterly Review, 36 (1946), pp. 281-286.
- Loftus, F. "The Anti-Roman Revolts of the Jews and the Galileans", Jewish Quarterly Review, 68 (1977), pp. 78-98.
- Neusner, Jacob. From Politics to Piety. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Rajak, Tessa. Josephus: The Man and His Society. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Rhoads, David M. "The Assumption of Moses and Jewish History: 4 B.C.-A.D. 48." Studies on the Testament of Moses. Ed. G.W.E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973, pp. 53-58.
- . Israel in Revolution: 6-74 C.E. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Roth, Cecil. "The Pharisees in the War of 63-73", Journal of Semitic Studies, 7 (1962), pp. 66-67.
- . "The Zealots in the War of 66-73", Journal of Semitic Studies, 4 (1959), pp. 332-355.
- . "The Zealots - A Jewish Religious Sect," Judaism, 8 (1959), pp. 33-40.
- Smallwood, E. Mary. The Jews under Roman Rule. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.
- Smith, Morton. "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century." Israel: Its Role in

- . "Description du phenomene de l'Apocalyptique dans l'Ancien Testament". Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East. Ed. David Hellholm. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983, pp. 163-170.
- Cohn, Norman. The Pursuit of the Millennium. Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages. Revised and expanded edition. London: Temple Smith, 1970.
- Collins, John J. "Jewish Apocalyptic against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 220 (1975), pp. 27-36.
- . "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll", Vetus Testamentum, 25 (1975), pp. 596-612.
- . "Towards the Morphology of a Genre", Semeia, 14 (1979), pp. 1-20.
- . "The Jewish Apocalypses", Semeia, 14 (1979), pp. 21-49.
- . Daniel, First Maccabees, Second Maccabees: Old Testament Message. Vol 16. Ed. C. Stuhlmueller, C.P., and M. McNamara, M.S.C. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1981.
- . "The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 44 (1982), pp. 91-111.
- . "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism", Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East. Ed. David Hellholm. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983, pp. 531-548.
- . Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature. Vol. 20 of The Forms of the O.T. Literature. Ed. R. Knierim and G.M. Tucker. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1984.
- . The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity. New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1984.
- . "Apocalyptic Literature". Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters. Eds. R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986, pp. 354-370.
- Cross, Frank M. "New Directions in the Study of Apocalyptic", Journal for Theology and Church, 6 (1969), pp. 157-165.
- Davies, G.I. "Apocalyptic and Historiography", Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 5 (1978), pp. 15-28.
- Davies, Philip R. "Eschatology at Qumran", Journal of Biblical Literature, 104 (1985), pp. 39-55.

- Davies, W.D. "Apocalyptic and Pharisaism." Christian Origins and Judaism. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962, pp. 19-30.
- Desjardins, Michel. "Law in 2Baruch and 4Ezra", Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses, 14 (1985), pp. 25-37.
- Ferch, Arthur J. "The Two Aeons and the Messiah in Pseudo-Philo, 4Ezra, and 2Baruch", Andrews University Seminary Studies, 15 (1977), pp. 135-151.
- Flusser, David. "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel", Israel Oriental Studies, 2 (1972), pp. 148-175.
- Freedman, David Noel. "The Flowering of Apocalyptic", Journal for Theology and Church, 6 (1969), pp. 166-174.
- Frost, Stanley Brice. "Apocalyptic and History". The Bible in Modern Scholarship. Ed. J.P. Hyatt. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965, pp. 98-113.
- Gager, John G. Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- Grabbe, Lester L. "Chronography in 4Ezra and 2Baruch". Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers. Ed. Kent Harold Richards. Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1981, pp. 49-63.
- Hadot, Jean. "La datation de l'Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch", Semitica, 15 (1965), pp. 79-95.
- Hamerton-Kelly, R.G. "The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic", Vetus Testamentum, 20 (1970), pp. 1-15.
- Hanson, Paul D. "Jewish Apocalyptic against its Near Eastern Environment", Revue Biblique, 78 (1971), pp. 31-58.
- . "Apocalypse, Genre." The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Supplementary Vol. Gen. Ed. Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976, pp. 27-28.
- . "Apocalypticism." The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Supplementary Volume. Gen. Ed. Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976, pp. 28-34.
- . "Prolegomenon to the Study of Jewish Apocalyptic." Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God. Ed. F.M. Cross, W.E. Lenke, and P.D. Miller. New York: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1976, pp. 389-413.
- . The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology. Revised. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

- Nielsburg, G.W.E. "Narrative Traditions in the Paraleipomena of Jeremiah and 2Baruch", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 35 (1973), pp. 60-68.
- . "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11", Journal of Biblical Literature, 96 (1977), pp. 383-405.
- . Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- . "Social Aspects of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypticism." Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East. Ed. David Hellholm. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983, pp. 641-654.
- Olsson, Tord. "The Apocalyptic Activity. The Case of Jamasp Namag." Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East. Ed. David Hellholm. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983, pp. 21-49.
- Philonenko, Marc. "L'apocalyptique qoumrânienne." Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East. Ed. David Hellholm. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983, pp. 211-218.
- Plöger, Otto. Theocracy and Eschatology. Trans. S. Rudman. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.
- Prigent, Pierre. "Apocalypse et Apocalyptique." Exégèse biblique et Judaïsme. Ed. J.E. Ménard. Strasbourg: Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg, 1973, pp. 126-145.
- von Rad, Gerhard. Old Testament Theology. Vol. 2. Trans. D.M.G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.
- Reicke, Bo. "Official and Pietistic Elements of Jewish Apocalypticism", Journal of Biblical Literature, 79 (1968), pp. 137-150.
- Reid, Stephen Breck. "1 Enoch: The Rising Elite of the Apocalyptic Movement." The Society of Biblical Literature 1983 Seminar Papers. Ed. K.H. Richards. Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1983, pp. 147-156.
- Rist, M. "Apocalypticism." The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. 1. Ed. George Arthur Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, pp. 157-161.
- . "Baruch, Apocalypse of." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. 1. Ed. B.A. Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, pp. 361-362.
- Rowland, Christopher. The Open Heaven. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Rowley, H.H. The Relevance of Apocalyptic. London: Lutterworth Press, 1944.
- Russell, D.S. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

- Swain, J.W. "The Theory of the Four Monarchies: Opposition History under the Roman Empire", Classical Philology, 35 (1940), pp. 1-21.
- Talmon, Yonina. "Pursuit of the Millennium: The Relation between Religions and Social Change." Reader in Comparative Religion: An Anthropological Approach. 2nd ed. Ed. W. Lesson and E. Vogt. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1965, pp. 522-537.
- Theissen, Gerd. The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christianity. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1978.
- Thompson, Alden Lloyd. Responsibility For Evil in the Theodicy of 4Ezra. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Turner, N. "Esdras, Books of". Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. 2. Ed. G.A. Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, pp. 140-142.
- Vielhauer, P. "Apocalypses and Related Subjects," New Testament Apochrypha. Ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher and Edgar Hennecke. Trans. R. Wilson. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963, pp. 581-607.
- de Villiers, Peter G.R. "Understanding the Way of God: Form, Function and Message of the Historical Review in 4Ezra 3:4-27." Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers (20). Ed. Kent Harold Richards. Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1981, pp. 357-377.
- Wilder, A.N. "The Rhetoric of Ancient and Modern Apocalyptic", Interpretation, 25 (1971), pp. 436-453.
- Yarbro Collins, Adela. "The Political Perspective of the Revelation to John", Journal of Biblical Literature, 96 (1977), pp. 241-256.
- . "The History - of - Religions Approach to Apocalypticism and the 'Angel of the Water' (Rev. 16:4-7)", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 39 (1977), pp. 367-381.
- . "Persecution and Vengeance in the Book of Revelation." Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East. Ed. David Hellholm. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983, pp. 729-749.
- Zimmerman, Frank. "Underlying Documents of 4Ezra", Jewish Quarterly Review, 51 (1960-61), pp. 107-134.