

Anthropologie und Ethik
im Frühjudentum und im Neuen Testament

Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen

Internationales Symposium in Verbindung mit dem Projekt
Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti (CJHNT)

17.–20. Mai 2012, Heidelberg

Herausgegeben von

MATTHIAS KONRADT und ESTHER SCHLÄPFER

Mohr Siebeck

Inhalt

Übergreifende Beiträge

- JOHN M.G. BARCLAY (Durham)
Constructing a Dialogue.
4 Ezra and Paul on the Mercy of God..... 3
- CHRISTFRIED BÖTTRICH (Greifswald)
Menschenwürde – Menschenpflichten.
Perspektiven universaler Ethik in den Henochschriften
und im lukanischen Doppelwerk 23
- RENÉ BLOCH (Bern)
Take Your Time.
Conversion, Confidence and Tranquility in *Joseph and Aseneth*..... 77

Paarvorträge

Das imago-Dei-Motiv im hellenistischen Judentum und entstehenden Christentum

- GEORGE H. VAN KOOTEN (Groningen)
Man as God's Spiritual or Physical Image?
Theomorphic Ethics versus Numinous Ethics
and Anthropomorphic Aesthetics in Early Judaism,
Ancient Philosophy, and the New Testament 99
- KARL-WILHELM NIEBUHR (Jena)
Menschenbild, Gottesverständnis und Ethik.
Zwei paulinische Argumentationen (Röm 1,18–2,29; 8,1–30)..... 139

Gewalt als anthropologisches und ethisches Problem

LOREN T. STUCKENBRUCK (München)

- The Myth of Rebellious Angels.
Ethics and Theological Anthropology 163

ECKART REINMUTH (Rostock)

- Befreiung und Gewalt.
Perspektiven theologischer Anthropologie im Hebräerbrief 177

Sünde und Tora

HINDY NAJMAN (Yale, USA)

- Sin and Torah in *4 Ezra* 201

JENS HERZER (Leipzig)

- „Worin es schwach war durch das Fleisch“ (Röm 8,3).
Gesetz und Sünde im Römerbrief –
oder: Das Ringen des Paulus um eine neue Identität 219

Der Mensch und seine Sexualität

MATTHIAS KONRADT (Heidelberg)

- „Fliehet die Unzucht!“ (TestRub 5,5).
Sexualethische Perspektiven
in den Testamenten der zwölf Patriarchen 249

FRIEDRICH WILHELM HORN (Mainz)

- Nicht wie die Heiden!
Sexualethische Tabuzonen und ihre Bewertungen durch Paulus 283

Der Mensch und die Gefahren des Reichtums

MICHAEL TILLY (Tübingen)

- Besitzethik und Menschenbild bei Pseudo-Phokylides 309

ROLAND DEINES (Nottingham)

- God or Mammon.
The Danger of Wealth in the Jesus Tradition
and in the Epistle of James 327

Barmherzigkeit mit den Bedürftigen und Notleidenden
und ihre anthropologischen Grundlagen

MARKUS WITTE (Berlin)

Begründungen der Barmherzigkeit gegenüber den Bedürftigen in
jüdischen Weisheitsschriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 387

GERD THEIßEN (Heidelberg)

Gemeindestrukturen und Hilfsmotivation.
Wie haben urchristliche Gemeinden zum Helfen motiviert?..... 413

Das Ende des Menschen: Tod – Auferstehung – Gericht

MATTHIAS HENZE (Houston/Rice University)

“Then the Messiah will begin to be revealed”.
Resurrection and the Apocalyptic Drama in 1 Corinthians 15
and *Second Baruch* 29–30, 49–51 441

SAMUEL VOLLENWEIDER (Zürich)

Auferstehung als Verwandlung.
Die paulinische Eschatologie von 1Kor 15 im Vergleich
mit der syrischen Baruchapokalypse (2Bar) 463

Beiträge aus den Arbeitsgruppen

TODD D. STILL (Waco, TX)

Turning to God from Idols.
Conversion in *Joseph and Aseneth* and 1 Thessalonians..... 493

STEFAN KRAUTER (München)

Der Mensch ist, was er isst.
Ernährung als zentrale Dimension des Menschseins
in den Adamviten 515

Autorinnen- und Autorenverzeichnis 529

Stellenregister 531

Autorinnen- und Autorenregister 566

Sach- und Personenregister 575

Register griechischer Begriffe 595

“Then the Messiah will begin to be revealed”

Resurrection and the Apocalyptic Drama
in 1 Corinthians 15 and *Second Baruch* 29–30, 49–51

MATTHIAS HENZE (Houston/Rice University)

1. Introduction

The aim of this essay is to compare the soteriological role of the Messiah at the end of time as it is described in two texts of the first century C.E. The older of these two works, Paul’s first Epistle to the Corinthians, is a canonical text and well studied, whereas the younger, the *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*, or *2 Baruch* for short, is a little known pseudepigraphic composition. The former is a Christian work with an impressive reception history, the latter a Jewish text that was forgotten soon after it was composed and would have been lost to us altogether, were it not for a single biblical manuscript written in Syriac that was rediscovered in the nineteenth century in the Ambrosian library in Milan.¹

The point of our comparative reading cannot be, it needs to be stressed at the outset, to shed light on the so-called Jewish background of the New Testament, that is, to look for the underlying Jewish influences on early Christian thought and literature. The *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* was written toward the end of the first century, that is, about half a century after Paul wrote to the Corinthians, so that, even though the apocalypse has preserved a wealth of older materials, it could hardly have served as a source for Paul. In line with the subtitle of this volume, the point of our study, instead, is to look for the “reciprocal perceptions” of early Christian and Jewish literature, without privileging one text or the other. This marks an important paradigm shift in our field, to be sure, as the dominant view since the nineteenth century has been to think of the relationship between

¹ P.M. BOGAERT, *L’Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch: Introduction, traduction du syriaque et commentaire* (2 vols.; Paris: Cerf, 1969), 1:33–56.

early Jewish and early Christian literature as a one-way street: Jewish texts from the so-called Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha are worthy of our attention to the extent that they shed light on early Christianity. By contrast, our approach will be to read the texts on their own grounds. Rather than seeing one as the foil to the other, we are mindful of the multiple points of connection between them. Instead of singling out their differences, we find that both texts, disparate as they may seem based on their unequal reception history, are nonetheless linked in thought and language. The agreements run deep and are anchored in the respective worldview of both authors – so deep, in fact, that one wonders whether categories such as “canonical” versus “pseudepigraphic,” “exoteric” versus “esoteric,” and even “Christian” versus “Jewish,” all categories assigned to the texts by their early transmitters, do not unduly prejudice our reading more than they enlighten it.

There are many points of connection between Paul and *2 Baruch* that merit further investigation. Of these we are interested in the advent of the Messiah at the end of time and, specifically, in the resurrection of the dead. For both Paul and the author of *2 Baruch*, the resurrection of the dead is part of the apocalyptic drama as it will unfold in the *eschaton* according to a preordained scheme. For both authors the resurrection is tied specifically to the return of the Messiah. It has long been recognized that Paul’s depiction of the resurrection in 1 Cor 15:20–28, his most explicit treatise on the topic, is firmly anchored in Jewish apocalyptic thought.² Our comparative reading confirms that Paul’s thinking is essentially Jewish, and it will help to bring the nature of the apocalyptic worldview on the resurrection that is shared by Paul and the author of *2 Baruch* further into focus.

Our reading will proceed in chronological order: we begin with Paul, then turn to *2 Baruch*, and draw some conclusions.

² R. BULTMANN, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (6th ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1968), 347 writes about Paul that he retained the traditional Jewish understanding of resurrection. “Er hält vielmehr an der traditionellen jüdisch-urchristlichen Lehre von der Auferstehung der Toten fest und damit an der Anschauung der Apokalyptik vom Endgericht und von dem kosmischen Drama, das der alten Welt ein Ende macht.” Also A. SCHWEITZER, *Reich Gottes und Christentum* (München: Beck, 1995), 92. Less specific is G. BORNKAMM, *Paul* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), 198. In general, see J. FREY, “Die Apokalyptik als Herausforderung der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft. Zum Problem: Jesus und die Apokalyptik,” in *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie* (ed. Michael Becker et al.; WUNT 2/214; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 23–94.

2. First Corinthians 15

In chapter 15 of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul provides his readers with his own account of Christ’s resurrection and its implications for a Christian understanding of the resurrection of the dead. This eschatological “self-contained treatise on the resurrection”³ is provoked by what to Paul are certain misunderstandings among the Corinthian Christians regarding the resurrection.⁴ Some deny altogether that there is a resurrection of the dead or any post-mortem existence (15:12); others deny the physical nature of the resurrection and view it as purely spiritual (15:32; cf. Acts 17:32; 23:8); and for yet another group, the advocates of what has been called a “realized eschatology,” the resurrection is already present (15:32; cf. 1 Cor 4:8–11). Paul seeks to refute all of these positions. And he leaves no doubt what is at stake: the resurrection of Christ is the essence of the Christian gospel. Without the belief in the resurrection, the Corinthians are not saved (v. 2), Christ has not been raised (vv. 13, 16), Paul’s proclamation to the Corinthians has been in vain (vv. 14, 15), the Corinthian Christians still live in their sins (vv. 14, 17), and the believers who have already died have perished (vv. 18–19).

That the resurrection is not a minor issue for Paul is furthermore evident from the sheer length of the treatise, its prominent position at the end of the Epistle, and its careful structure. Paul begins in vv. 1–11, part one of his treatise, with his own account of the risen Christ (cf. 1 Cor 2:1–3). He wants to remind the Corinthians, as he writes in verse 1, of the εὐαγγέλιον, the “good news” which he had preached when he was with them and through which the Corinthians are saved. He then provides a brief account of the risen Christ. Far from simply re-telling a familiar story, Paul is clearly intent on solidifying his own authority.⁵ This becomes especially clear at the end of his account where Paul’s self-deprecation (“Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me,” v. 8) is immediately fol-

³ H. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 249.

⁴ J.A. FITZMYER, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 558–561. On the hypothesis that the Corinthians skeptics were gnostics, see G. BARTH, “Erwägungen zu 1. Korinther 15,20–28,” *EvT* 30 (1970): 515–527. Many of the positions Paul finds erroneous have vivid afterlives in the Early Church. See B.E. DALEY, *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003), ad loc.

⁵ CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians* (n. 3), 251–254; D.C. ALLISON, *Resurrecting Jesus: The Earliest Christian Tradition and Its Interpreters* (New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 233–269.

lowed by the remark that he, Paul, worked harder than any of the other apostles.

Now that Paul has reaffirmed the validity of his previous teaching, he is ready to address directly those who deny the resurrection. In part two of his treatise, in vv. 12–19, he establishes a connection between the resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of the dead. Those who deny the resurrection also deny the resurrection of Christ – and if Christ has not been raised, the Christian faith is futile, as Christians will have no hope for the hereafter. And so Paul concludes this second part in v. 19 with the striking statement, “If for this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all people most to be pitied.”

It is the third section in vv. 20–28, however, that is most relevant to us. Here Paul goes on to explicate further the singular importance which Christ’s resurrection has for the Christian faith.

²⁰ But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruit of those who have died.

²¹ For since death came through a human being, the resurrection of the dead has also come through a human being; ²² for as all die in Adam, so all will be made alive in Christ.

²³ But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits, then at his advent those who belong to Christ. ²⁴ Then comes the end, when he hands over the kingdom to God the Father, after he has destroyed every ruler and every authority and power. ²⁵ For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. ²⁶ The last enemy to be destroyed is death. ²⁷ For “God has put all things in subjection,” it is plain that this does not include the one who put all things in subjection under him. ²⁸ When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to the one who put all things in subjection under him, so that God may be all in all. (1 Cor 15:20–28)

This carefully crafted passage is framed by two related statements. It begins in v. 20 with the creedal affirmation that Christ has in fact been raised from the dead (Νυνὶ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν), a statement clearly intended on contradicting directly the doubts of some Corinthians. It also serves as the rhetorical transition to the third part of the treatise (note the repeated ἐγήγερται in vv. 4, 12 and 20). This section culminates in v. 28b in a purpose clause: in the end Christ will defeat the enemy and then submit himself to God, “so that God may be all in all” (ἵνα ἢ ὁ θεὸς [τὰ] πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν).⁶ This evidently is the focal point of Paul’s eschatological outlook, the total sovereignty of God. Anyone who denies the resurrection also denies that God has raised Jesus from the dead and therefore questions that in the end God “will be all in all.”

Within **the envelop??** of vv. 20 and 28, Paul’s argument proceeds in two steps, in vv. 21–22 and vv. 23–28. In the first part Paul contrasts Adam

⁶ FITZMYER, *First Corinthians* (n. 4), 575.

and Christ in an antithetical juxtaposition: just as all humans are condemned to die as a consequence of Adam’s sin, so all human beings will be made alive because of Christ (v. 22). The typology is reinforced rhetorically by Paul’s choice of language. Both Adam and Christ are “human beings” (ἄνθρωποι). Death was introduced by “the first man” (ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος; v. 47) and can only be overcome in the end by “the second man” (ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος; v. 47), that is, Christ. The typology is remarkable, and not simply for what it tells us about the *res humana*. Paul uses it because it allows him to explain the significance of Christ’s resurrection in the larger eschatological scheme of things: the death of all humans – moral death, physical death, and death eternal⁷ – as it was caused by Adam’s transgression and is confirmed by the sins of his descendants, is emblematic of this present age, whereas the resurrection of Christ makes possible the resurrection of all believers and promises life eternal in the age to come.

Paul keeps the Adam/Christ typology rather short here and is content merely to contrast the death that came through Adam and the life that comes through Christ. He will come back to the typology and expand on it later in Romans 5:12–21. There the emphasis is less on life and death but rather on the sinful nature of humanity and the origin of sin. It will suffice for us briefly to refer to the first verse of that pericope only, Rom 5:12: “Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned.” Here Paul walks a fine line. The fate of humanity ultimately rests on what its progenitor, Adam, has done to it. The primary causality for its sinful and mortal condition is ascribed to Adam. But Paul also wants to be careful not to absolve Adam’s offspring of their responsibility so that they can no longer be held accountable for their deeds. And so he ascribes a secondary causality to the sins committed by all human beings, “because all have sinned.” Paul refers here to the personal, actual sins of individual human beings.⁸ His argument is important to us because the author of *2 Baruch* will argue the exact same case, also using Adam’s sin as the primal cause of all sinfulness, and also indicting the individual human being – even

⁷ M.C. DE BOER, *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians and Romans 5* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 93–105; *ibid.*, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn* (ed. Joel Marcus et al.; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 169–190; *ibid.*, “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. John J. Collins; New York/London: Continuum, 2000), 345–383.

⁸ J.A. FITZMYER, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 416–417.

though he gives the argument a slightly different twist. When Baruch begins to appreciate in conversation with God the true gravity of Adam's offense, he famously exclaims, "O, what have you done, Adam, to all those who were born of you!" (48:42). But he does not leave it with that. Without exonerating Adam, he makes clear that humans bear their own responsibility. And so he writes in one of the best known passages in the book, "For even though Adam was first to sin and brought death upon all who were not in his time, but rather [of] those who were born of him, each one of them has prepared for himself the torment that is coming . . . Adam is therefore not the cause, except only for himself, but each of us has become our own Adam!" (54:15, 19).⁹

But we need to return to 1 Corinthians 15. Exactly how Christ is going to overcome the death introduced by Adam is the topic of the next section in vv. 23–28 that forms the core of part three of the treatise. Here Paul provides a rather detailed outline of the messianic activities. His use of words with a temporal meaning – "the first fruit" (ἀπαρχή; v. 20); "after that" (ἔπειτα; v. 23); "then" (εἶτα; v. 24); "the end" (τέλος; v. 24); and the future tense in the phrase "they will be made alive" (ζωοποιηθήσονται; v. 22) – makes clear that Paul is concerned with the temporality, and indeed the linearity of the events as they unfold. Things will not happen all at once but, as Paul puts it, "each in his own order" (Ἐκαστος δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι; v. 23). The phrase has multiple connotations. It tells the Corinthians that their time has not yet come, lest they become presumptuous and make false claims that the resurrection has already arrived (4:8–13). It also puts things into their proper eschatological perspective. The events of the end time, including the resurrection of the dead, have their specific, pre-ordained place in the apocalyptic order. Specifically, Paul distinguishes be-

⁹ Both Paul and the author of *2 Baruch* are participants in a much broader discourse toward the end of the Second Temple period on Adam, and the obvious points of connection between them need to be interpreted with this context in mind. The parallels with *4 Ezra* are particularly striking (*4 Ezra* 3:21–22; 7:116–118). On *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, see E. BRANDENBURGER, *Adam und Christus: Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Röm. 5,12–21 (1. Kor. 15)* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), 39–67; M.E. STONE, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990), 63–67, 258–259; M. HENZE, *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading Second Baruch in Context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 165–170. On Adam in Early Judaism, see J.R. LEVISON, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988); R.C.T. HAYWARD, "The Figure of Adam in Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities," *JSJ* 23 (1992): 1–20; G.A. ANDERSON, M.E. STONE, and J. TROMP, eds., *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

tween three consecutive stages, or “orders,” and each is associated with a certain event.

The first order has already occurred and now lies in the past, the resurrection and exaltation of Christ. Paul calls this ἀπαρχή, translated variously as “beginning of a sacrifice,” or “first fruit” (vv. 20, 23). In the Torah, the term carries connotations of harvest and of plenty. God provides for his people and in return receives the first fruits of their harvest.¹⁰ Christ’s rising from the dead marks “the beginning” of resurrection, it anticipates the resurrection of all Christians. The second order is yet to occur in the eschatological future when Christ returns, it will be ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ, or “at his coming” (v. 23). This will be at Christ’s second visitation. Earlier, in the opening thanksgiving section of the Epistle, Paul introduced the eschatological perspective that dominates the Epistle when he used revelatory language to refer to Christ’s return (1:4–9). The Corinthians are waiting for “the revelation (ἀποκάλυψις) of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1:7). Christ will be “revealed” at his *parousia*. The second order, which Paul awaits together with the Corinthians, begins with the apocalypse of Christ. The main event associated with his *parousia*, according to 15:23, is the resurrection of the deceased Christians. The phrase “those who belong to Christ” (v. 23) makes clear that, even though the Adam/Christ typology in the previous verse seemed to suggest that all will be resurrected at Christ’s second visitation, Paul is here in fact concerned only with the resurrection of the deceased Christians, those who died while hoping for Christ.¹¹ The same sentiment is expressed in 1 Thess 4:16, another Pauline description of the apocalypse, which has numerous parallels with our treatise. There Paul writes that “at the sound of God’s trumpet . . . the dead in Christ will rise first” (οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον). Paul is consistent in his belief that it is the deceased Christians who will be first to rise.

The third order, finally, is described in vv. 24–28. Paul simply calls it “the end,” or “the fulfillment” (τὸ τέλος; v. 24), a term he has used already in 1:8. There Paul sought to encourage the Corinthians with the promise that Christ will strengthen them “to the end” (ἕως τέλους), so that they will be found blameless “on the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.” The apocalyptic overtones in 1:7–8 and 15:24–28 are unmistakable. The term τὸ τέλος denotes the final consummation of time, a purposeful ending. Now Christ establishes his own messianic kingdom. Paul stresses that “he must reign”

¹⁰ In the Septuagint, ἀπαρχή translates several Hebrew terms, though mostly תְּרִיבָה, “beginning, first of fruits” (Exod 23:19; Lev 2:12; 23:10; et al.), and מְהִלָּה, “offering, contribution” (Exod 25:2; 35:5; Lev 22:12; et al.).

¹¹ The fate of non-Christians is simply not addressed, nor does Paul make any distinction between the righteous and the wicked.

(note the δεῖ γάρ in v. 25). The apocalyptic necessity nicely captures the inevitability of the events as they have been foreordained long ago. In order to establish his reign, Christ has to destroy “every ruler and every authority and power” (πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν; v. 24) – who these rulers are and how they will be defeated we are not told. The last enemy to be destroyed is death (v. 26).¹² Only then will Christ surrender the kingdom and subject himself to God (v. 28). This means that the messianic kingdom is an interim kingdom. It comes to an end and will be dissolved when death will have been overcome. The focal point of the Pauline *eschaton* is not the reign of Christ or his messianic rule but the rule of God, “that God may be all in all” (v. 28).

To summarize, Paul explains the significance of Christ’s resurrection by arguing that it is part of the preordained, apocalyptic order. It is the first in a sequence of eschatological events, Christ “the first fruit.” That means that Paul, and with him his readers, live in the Mean-Time, the time in between the resurrection of Christ and his return. The second order will be Christ’s return at his *parousia*, when those who belong to him will be raised. Then Christ will establish his interim messianic kingdom and defeat the last mundane enemy. With the third order, finally, comes the end, τὸ τέλος, after the messianic kingdom is dissolved, with the absolute rule of God.

3. Second Baruch

It does take Baruch about twenty chapters into his book to realize that the full restoration of Israel after the defeat of the Jews will not happen in historical time. The sacking of Jerusalem and the sheer size of the devastation force Baruch to come to realize that this was no isolated historical incident but part of a larger divine plan for Israel.¹³ That plan began with Adam’s

¹² Paul is using and adapting a christological reading of Ps 110:1 (“until he has put all his enemies under his feet” in v. 25) and Ps 8:7b (“God has put all things in subjection” in v. 27) that was most likely known to the Corinthians in order to make the point that Christ is able to overcome all enemies because God has put all things under his feet. DE BOER, *Defeat* (n. 7), 114–120; G.W.E. NICKELSBURG, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity* (expanded edition; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 308–309.

¹³ The enemy in *2 Baruch* are the Babylonians, and the book is set in the sixth century B.C.E., even though the actual author wrote in the first century C.E. in the wake of the Roman destruction of Jerusalem. Helpful introductions to *2 Baruch* include R.H. CHARLES, *The Apocalypse of Baruch* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896), vii–lxxxiv; L. GINZBERG, “Apocalypse of Baruch (Syriac),” *JE* 2:551–556; BOGAERT,

transgression, through which “the darkness of Adam” was introduced to all of humanity (2 Bar. 18:1–2), and it will come to its culmination in the end of time. The fall of Jerusalem marks a crucial moment in that plan. As the book unfolds and Baruch increasingly gains a fuller understanding of the divine intention, he directs his hopes toward that time which is promised. When he sits in the Kidron valley in an underground cave and prays, “For if there were this life only, the one here [which is] for everybody, nothing could be more bitter than this” (2 Bar. 21:13), we might think we hear a faint echo of Paul’s strikingly similar exclamation in 1 Cor 15:19 about the futility of hope in this life only.¹⁴

The first passage in 2 Baruch that describes the advent of the Messiah and his activities comes at the end of a long dialogue section between God and Baruch (22:1–30:5).¹⁵ God has spoken at length about the structure of the end time, offering a concise – albeit elusive – plan of how time will be divided into twelve parts (27:1–28:2). Baruch shows himself impressed, though wants to know exactly who will be affected by these events. God

L’Apocalypse (n. 1), 1:57–380; G.W.E. NICKELSBURG, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (2d ed.; Minneapolis 2005), 277–285; HENZE, *Jewish Apocalypticism* (n. 9), 16–70. We know from the superscription in the Ambrosian manuscript that the Syriac version of 2 Baruch is a translation from the Greek, which most likely is a translation of the Hebrew original, which is no longer extant. The Syriac is thus a tertiary translation. Even though, strictly speaking, the scribe responsible for the Syriac text is therefore the translator, not the author of our text, we will refer to him as the author, in full acknowledgement that what we have is the translation of a translation.

¹⁴ R.B. HAYS, *First Corinthians: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997), 261–262 notes that Baruch’s point is different from Paul’s. Whereas Baruch laments over the transience of all human strength and beauty, Paul is here not concerned about human mortality in general but rather argues that Christians “offer the world’s ills a pious lie” (262) if there is no resurrection. Also K.J. MADIGAN and J.D. LEVENSON, *Resurrection: The Power of God for Christians and Jews* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 25–26. The numerous parallels between 2 Baruch and the New Testament were already noticed by CHARLES, *Apocalypse of Baruch* (n. 13), lxxvi–lxxix. That Charles is interested in 2 Baruch primarily for what it tells us about the New Testament is evident already from his opening remarks. “The Apocalypse of Baruch is a composite work written in the latter half of the first century of the Christian era. It is thus contemporaneous with the chief writings of the New Testament. Its authors were orthodox Jews, and it is a good representative of the Judaism against which the Pauline dialectic was directed” (p. vii). On 2 Bar. 21:13 and 1 Cor 15:19, see p. 40. Also B. VIOLET, *Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt* (Leipzig: Hinrich, 1924), 234.

¹⁵ J. KLAUSNER, *The Messianic Idea in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah* (New York: MacMillan, 1955), 330–348; and S. MOWINCKEL, *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1956; repr. 2005), 356–379.

replies that what happens will befall the entire earth (28:3–7). He then adds what is the first extended reference to the Messiah in *2 Baruch*.¹⁶

29:2 For at that time I will protect only those who are found in those days in this land.
³ And after what will happen in those parts is completed, then the Messiah will begin to be revealed (or: will begin to reveal himself). ⁴ Behemoth will be revealed from its place, and Leviathan will ascend from the sea, those two great serpents that I created on the fifth day of creation and have preserved until that day, and then they will be for food for all who are left. ⁵ Also, the earth will yield its fruits ten thousand fold. A single vine will have a thousand branches, and a single branch will produce a thousand bunches of grapes, and a single bunch of grapes will produce a thousand grapes, and a single grape will produce a kor of wine. . . .

30:1 And after these [events], when the time of the Advent of the Messiah will be fulfilled and he will return in glory, then all those who have fallen asleep in hope of him will rise. ² At that time those reservoirs will be opened in which the number of the souls of the righteous have been preserved, and they will go out, and the multitude of the souls will appear together in one gathering, of one mind. The first will rejoice, and the last will not be saddened, ³ for they know that the time has arrived of which it is said that it is the consummation of times. ⁴ But the souls of the wicked, while seeing all of these, will then waste away the more, ⁵ for they know that their torment has arrived and their ruin has come. (*2 Bar.* 29:2–30:5)

The passage is divided into two sections, chapter 29 and chapter 30. Both sections open with an introductory formula, “For at that time,” and “And after these [events].” And, as 30:1 makes clear, some time has elapsed between the events related in the first and in the second section.

Chapter 29 describes a time of messianic plenty, when the Messiah will appear and Israel will enjoy an abundance of food. The beneficiaries will be those who live in “this land” (29:2; cf. 71:1), that is, the land of Israel.¹⁷ There is no indication that the presence of the Messiah will be felt outside of Israel. The messianic fullness manifests itself in form of an unprecedented abundance of food: the sea monsters will provide enormous amounts of meat, those who are wanting will be sated, and there will be streams of wine.¹⁸ It should be noted that the text says surprisingly little

¹⁶ All translations of *2 Baruch* are my own and follow the critical edition by S. DERLING, *Apocalypse of Baruch* (Peshitta Institute; The Old Testament in Syriac IV,3; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 1–50.

¹⁷ On the significance of the land in *2 Baruch*, see L.I. LIED, *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 185–241.

¹⁸ The brief description of the messianic excess in 29:4–8 is a good example of how the author of *2 Baruch* makes sparing use of literary motifs and interpretive vignettes that are known to us from other Second Temple texts, without going into any detail. For example, on the Leviathan-Behemoth myth, see *1 En.* 60:7–11; *4 Ezra* 6:49–52; and *Rev* 13:1–18 (W.K. WHITENY, *Two Strange Beasts: Leviathan and Behemoth in Second Temple and Early Rabbinic Judaism* [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006], 38–44); or on the abundance of wine, see *1 En.* 10:19; *John* 2:1–12; *Sib. Or.* 3.787–795; Irenaeus, *Haer.*

about the Messiah himself. He remains entirely passive, and the focus is squarely on the changes that are the result of his visitation, not of any of his actions.

The events related in chapter 30 are of a different nature altogether. There, at the Advent of the Messiah, the dead will rise. Syriac ܡܠܟܐ, “advent” or “coming,” is the Syriac equivalent to Greek παρουσία (cf. Matt 24:3, 27, 37; 1 Cor 15:23; 16:17; and elsewhere). The text does not speak about a general resurrection; rather, the author is more precise. It is those “who have fallen asleep in hope of him,” that is, those who died trusting in the Messiah, who will rise. While this peculiar statement is without parallel in early Jewish literature, the phrase is reminiscent of Paul’s insistence that the deceased Christians are the first to be resurrected. Thus Paul wrote in 1 Cor 15:23 that “those who belong to Christ” (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) will rise at Christ’s *parousia*.¹⁹

The author of *2 Baruch* is rather deliberate about the timing of the events. The abundance of food will occur, we read in 29:3, when the Messiah “will begin to be revealed” (ܡܠܟܐ ܡܢܗܘܢܐ), a claim that has long puzzled interpreters. The revelatory language to express the visitation of the Messiah is not unusual. It is familiar from Paul (1 Cor 1:7; 15:23): the Messiah will be revealed, meaning that the Messiah is preexistent. But why a beginning of his revelation? Not surprisingly, Robert H. Charles proposed to emend the Syriac text, and Bruno Violet thought of a faulty translation.²⁰ But the text makes good sense as it stands. The phrase “the Messiah will begin to be revealed” simply points out that the feast merely marks the initial stage of the messianic presence. The meal represents the beginning of the messianic revelation, “the first order” in Pauline parlance, with more to come. *2 Bar.* 30:1 then marks the transition from the first to the second order. The appearance of the Messiah will continue “when the time of the Advent of the Messiah will be fulfilled and he will return in

5.33.3 (L. GRY, “Le Papias des belles promesses messianiques,” *Vivre et penser* 3 [1933–34]: 113–124).

¹⁹ Also 1 Thess 4:16, “the dead in Christ will rise first (καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον).” The close resemblance between Paul and *2 Baruch* regarding the order of resurrection and its connection to the Messiah raises the question whether *2 Bar.* 30:1 contains a Christian gloss. A similar case exists in *4 Ezra* 7:28, “For my Messiah shall be revealed with those who are with him,” where the Latin adds “my son Jesus,” obviously a Christian addition. The idea that we are dealing with a Christian gloss was already entertained by CHARLES, *Apocalypse of Baruch* (n. 13), 56, who merely noted, “The words ‘of him’ cannot be original.”

²⁰ CHARLES, *Apocalypse of Baruch* (n. 13), 52: “The phrase ‘begin to be revealed’ seems corrupt.” VIOLET, *Apokalypsen* (n. 14), 245.

glory.”²¹ Whereas the culinary extravagance in chapter 29 represents only the initial phase of the messianic era, the advent, or *παρουσία*, of the Messiah that is described in chapter 30 now marks its fulfillment. Now the Messiah has “returned in glory.” But why “returned”? It may well be that “return” here means return to heaven, the text is not clear.²² What is clear, however, is that there are two consecutive stages, each associated with a distinct moment during the apocalyptic order: an initial phase, which will be felt in the land of Israel only, during which the people of Israel will live in plenty while feasting on Behemoth, Leviathan and other delicacies; and a second phase that includes the resurrection of the dead.

The hope for the resurrection of the deceased marks a central moment in the unfolding of the *eschaton* and constitutes an indispensable source of hope for both Paul and the author of *2 Baruch*. Paul was educated in Judaism (2 Cor 11:22; Gal 1:14), a Pharisee (Phil 3:5–6).²³ The Jewish historian Josephus tells us that the Pharisees believed in the resurrection of the dead, and he summarizes their position as follows: “Every soul, they [i.e., the Pharisees] maintain, is imperishable, but only the soul of the good alone passes into another body, while the souls of the wicked suffer eternal punishment.”²⁴ It is remarkable how closely Josephus’ description of the Pharisaic position on the resurrection resembles the scene in *2 Bar.* 30:4–5. When the Messiah returns at the consummation of time, the souls of the deceased emerge from their repositories. Only the souls of the righteous will be reunited with their bodies – the reincarnation of the soul constitutes

²¹ Paul, too, uses fulfillment language when describing the moment of the messianic revelation in Gal 4:4: “But when the fullness of time had come (ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου), God sent his Son.” Compare John’s message in Mark 1:15, “The time is fulfilled (πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς), and the kingdom of God has come near.” M. HENGEL, “Das Begräbnis Jesu bei Paulus und die leibliche Auferstehung aus dem Grabe,” in *Auferstehung – Resurrection: The Fourth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium: Resurrection, Transfiguration and Exaltation in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Tübingen, September, 1999) (ed. F. Avemarie et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 119–183 (179) poignantly speaks of the “fulfilled presence” (die “erfüllte Gegenwart”).

²² CHARLES, *Apocalypse of Baruch* (n. 13), 56 suggests that the Messiah returns to heaven. “He returns whither He had come.” So also BOGAERT, *L’Apocalypse* (n. 1), 2:65. K. KOCH, “Messias und Menschensohn: Die zweistufige Messianologie der jüngeren Apokalyptik,” *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 8 (1993): 73–102, by contrast, argues that the Messiah returns to earth and that *2 Baruch* thus assumes two messianic manifestations (“zwei-stufige Messianologie”). But this is far from certain.

²³ On the recent attempt of “re-Judaizing Paul,” see J.G. GAGER, *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 54–75.

²⁴ Josephus, *B.J.* 2.163; see also 3.374, and, to a lesser degree, *C. Ap.* 2.218.

the main act of resurrection²⁵ – while the souls of the wicked never reach that point and, in the words of Josephus, “suffer eternal punishment.”

The resurrection becomes the subject of the dialogue between Baruch and God again later in the book. There Baruch pushes the issue further and inquires about the physical integrity of the resurrected body. Specifically he inquires about the corporeality of the resurrected. His interest in the physicality of the body is noteworthy, since otherwise Baruch has little if any interest in the physical death.

49:2 “Indeed, in what form will those live who live in your day?
Or how will the splendor of those persist who [will be] after then?”

³ Will they indeed then take this form of the present,
and will they put on these members of chains,
those that are now steeped in evils and through which evils are wrought?
Or will you perhaps change these, those that are in the world, as also the world?”

50:1 He answered and said to me: “Hear, Baruch, this word, and write in the memory of your heart everything that you learn. ² For the earth will then surely return the dead, which it now receives to preserve them, while not changing anything in their form. But as it has received them, so it will return them, and as I have handed them over to it, so too it will restore them. ³ Then it will be necessary to show to the living that the dead are living and that those have come [back] who had been gone. ⁴ And when those who now know one another will have recognized each other, then judgment will be strong, and those [things] that were formerly spoken of will come.

51:1 After the day of resurrection has passed, then afterward the form of those who are guilty will be changed and also the glory of those who are righteous. ² For the form of those who now act wickedly will become worse than it is, as they will endure torment. ³ Also, as for the glory of those who are now righteous in my Torah, those who have had understanding in their lives, and those who have planted in their heart the root of wisdom – then their splendor will be glorified through transformations: the form of their faces will be turned into the light of their beauty, that they will be able to acquire and receive the world that does not die, which was then promised to them. (*2 Bar.* 49:2–51:3)

After a brief reflection on the reward that awaits the righteous (48:49–50), Baruch now inquires about the post-resurrection state of the human body. Since with the transition from this world to the next, the corruptible will be replaced with the incorruptible, it is inconceivable to Baruch that the human body will again wear “these members of chains” (49:3). The seer therefore wonders about the form in which the resurrected will live. Again, we are reminded of Paul’s treatise on the resurrection, where the same question comes up. There an imaginary inquirer whom Paul quotes somewhat dismissively in 1 Corinthians 15:35 raises the issue. Much like Baruch, the anonymous, and possibly fictitious, skeptic wants to know, “How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come?” While Paul

²⁵ It will become clear from *2 Bar.* 50:2–4 that the souls of the righteous are reunited with their former bodies, whereas Josephus writes of “another body” (εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα).

shows little sympathy for the question, or for the questioner, for that matter, whom he calls a “Fool!” (ἄφρων; 15:36), the author of *2 Baruch* answers the question in considerable detail.

First, the divine interlocutor explains that the earth will release the bodies of the deceased as it has received them. The resurrected will assume the exact same body they left behind at the moment of death, without any change. This is “necessary” (50:3), we are told, so that those who are left on earth will recognize the resurrected.²⁶ Apparently the resurrection itself is thought to be rather unobtrusive, or at least the author of *2 Baruch* assumes that not everyone alive at the time will necessarily take notice.²⁷ The scene is immediately followed by the judgment, presumably of the living and the newly resurrected (50:4). The judgment scene is most striking for its terseness. All we are told is that “then judgment will be strong” (ܫܦܬܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ; 50:4), a mere three words in the Syriac, with no further indication about the circumstances, the place of judgment, or even the judge. Then, in chapter 51, Baruch’s question about the corporeality of the resurrected is finally addressed. The author distinguishes sharply between the wicked and the righteous. The former “will endure torment” (50:2; as already in 30:4–5), whereas the righteous will be transformed: they will gain entry into the world to come, their physique will become radiant, and their splendor will be like that of the angels.²⁸ In effect, their transformation marks the eschatological undoing of the physical debilitations that were the result of Adam’s initial transgression (56:6).²⁹ There follows one of the most stunning parts in the book, an elaborate portrayal of the rewards that await the righteous in “the expanses of Paradise” (51:11).³⁰ It is from pericopes like this that we learn about the author’s intention.

²⁶ On the recognition motif, see G. STEMBERGER, *Der Leib der Auferstehung: Studien zur Anthropologie und Eschatologie des palästinischen Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (ca. 170 v. Chr. – 100 n. Chr.)* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1972), 88; L.I. LIED, “Recognizing the Righteous Remnant? Resurrection and Eschatological Reversals in *2 Baruch* 47–52,” in *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity* (ed. Turid Karlsen Seim et al.; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009), 311–336. HENGEL, “Begräbnis” (n. 21), 119–183 emphasizes the importance of the recognition motif in the resurrection accounts of the Gospels (Mark 16:8; Luke 24:36–49; and John 20:19–29).

²⁷ This poignant moment of recognition may be compared with *2 Bar.* 30:1–5, where the recognition is not between the living and the resurrected, but it is the unfortunate who recognize that their end has come at last.

²⁸ For a similar comparison of the state of the resurrected with the angels, see Dan 12:3; *1 En.* 62:13; 104:2–4; 106:10; Luke 20:36; *4 Ezra* 7:97, 125.

²⁹ HENZE, *Jewish Apocalypticism* (n. 9), 312–317.

³⁰ F.J. MURPHY, *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 60–63.

2 *Baruch* does not advocate an exclusive apocalyptic program for the elect few written by a dissident figure, nor does it condemn “the other,” imagined or real. Rather, its purpose is hortative, to entice and to win over, so that the believer makes the right decisions *now* to be counted among the righteous *then* and gain life immortal.

The two resurrection accounts in 2 *Baruch* in 29–30 and 49–51 nicely complement one another. But there are also significant differences between them. The most important of them is that whereas in the first account, the apocalyptic drama is set into motion at the arrival of the Messiah, the Messiah is conspicuous by his absence from the latter scene. There, the resurrection happens without any redeemer figure present. However, the Messiah does play a central role in an earlier scene, the second messianic passage in 2 *Baruch*. That scene comes at the end of Baruch’s first vision (36:1–43:3), the Vision of the Forest, in which Baruch sees a vine overcoming a cedar and condemning it to be destroyed by fire. God explains that the vision is about the last installment of history. Four successive kingdoms will arise, each one more cruel than the previous – a motif borrowed from Daniel 2 and 7. God explains how the Messiah, represented by the vine, will defeat the ruler of the fourth and final kingdom.

39:7 And when the time of its consummation has drawn near, when it will fall, then the beginning of my Messiah will be revealed, which is like the fountain and the vine. When it is revealed, it will uproot the multitude of its host.⁸ And with regard to the tall cedar that you saw that was left of that forest, and about this that the vine spoke these words to it which you heard – this is the word:

40:1 The last ruler, who will then be left alive when the multitude of his host will be killed, will be bound, and they will take him up to Mount Zion. And my Messiah will admonish him on account of all his evil deeds, and he will gather and set before him all the deeds of his hosts.² And after this he will kill him. And he will protect the rest of my people, those found in the place that I have chosen.³ His rule³¹ will stand forever, until the world of corruption is completed and until the aforementioned times will be fulfilled.

⁴ This is your vision and this is its interpretation. (2 *Bar.* 39:7–40:4)

The focus of the Vision of the Forest is on the end of history. It begins with the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and ends with the scene that is here described. We read in 39:7 that when the fourth kingdom draws to an end, “then the beginning of my Messiah will be revealed.” As in 29:3, the appearance of the Messiah again takes the form of a revelation (cf. 1 Cor 1:7; 15:23). Moreover, the end of the last mundane kingdom marks the “beginning” (39:7) of the messianic rule. Modern interpreters have suggested numerous emendations, pointing to 40:3, where the same word

³¹ The Syriac has ܐܘܪܘܚܐ; “beginning,” which in the context makes little sense. VIOLET, *Apokalypsen* (n. 14), 257 follows Ceriani in assuming that this is a mistranslation of Greek ἀρχή.

for “beginning” (Syr. ܐܘܪܝܢܐ) is the result of a faulty translation from the Greek, from which they gather that 39:7 must therefore be a mistake, too.³² But the text makes very good sense. As we saw in chs. 29–30, the idea is that the messianic revelation follows a set time table and unfolds in stages. The visitation of the Messiah has a definite beginning and a definite end. It begins when the Messiah overthrows the last evil regime and establishes a messianic kingdom, and it ends, according to 40:3, when “the world of corruption is completed.” In other words, the messianic kingdom is an interim kingdom, the last order of this world, that paves the way for the world to come.³³

The final episode in history is set into motion when the Messiah will defeat the last wicked ruler – that is, the Roman emperor.³⁴ This will happen on Mount Zion (40:1). In ch. 29 the Messiah also first appears in the land of Israel, though there he remains passive, at least initially. In both cases, the restoration of the land provides the backdrop for the apocalyptic drama.³⁵ In our text, the activities of the Messiah are cast in forensic terms: he summons the emperor to Jerusalem, indicts him of his wicked deeds, and puts him to death. The Messiah acts as a judge, not as a cosmic judge yet but as the divine agent who frees Judea from its Roman occupation while protecting the remnant community in Jerusalem. The scene is audacious, to be sure, if only because the reader knows all too well that in reality the opposite happened: the Romans humiliated the Jews. The scene “plainly constitutes a parody of the Roman triumph” by “predicting” the humiliation and public execution of the last Roman emperor.³⁶

³² See the previous note. CHARLES, *Apocalypse of Baruch* (n. 13), 65; VIOLET, *Apokalypsen* (n. 14), 256; and BOGAERT, *L'Apocalypse* (n. 1), 2:74: “il n'est pas question du début du Messie mais de son empire.”

³³ The notion that the messianic reign is extended but not everlasting is even more explicit in *4 Ezra* 7:28–29, where it is said to last 400 years, and it ends with the death of the Messiah. STONE, *Fourth Ezra* (n. 9), 215–216; J.J. COLLINS, “A Shoot from the Stump of Jesse,” in *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 52–78 (78).

³⁴ L.T. STUCKENBRUCK, “Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature of Early Judaism,” in *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 90–113 (110–111).

³⁵ D.E. AUNE, with E. STEWART, “From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future: Eschatological Restoration in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. James M. Scott; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 147–77 (153).

³⁶ P.F. ESLER, “God’s Honour and Rome’s Triumph: Responses to the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE in Three Jewish Apocalypses,” in *Modeling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context* (ed. Ph.F. Esler; London: Routledge, 1995), 139–158, see 157. To appreciate the audacity of the scene one only

This moment of reversal of the power structure is of particular interest to us, not for its revisionist character but because of its similarity to 1 Corinthians 15. As noted, the defeat of the last enemy marks a distinct episode in Paul’s apocalyptic outlook, too. In 1 Cor 15:24 Paul writes that Christ does not hand over the kingdom to God until “he has destroyed every ruler and every authority and power” (πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν). The statement seems unprovoked, and the identity of the rulers and powers is never disclosed.³⁷ The statement also seems transitional, in the sense that the enemies are the last obstacle the Son has to overcome on the way to God’s supreme rule. The scene in *2 Baruch* is a narrative expansion of the same motif, the messianic defeat of the last mundane ruler. Here the enemy has a clear identity – it is the Roman empire – and the desire for its defeat is anything but abstract.

The Messiah also acts as a judge in *2 Baruch*’s third and final messianic pericope. The scene is part of the interpretation of Baruch’s second vision, the Vision of the Cloud that rains in turn black and bright waters. Like Baruch’s previous vision, this vision is about the periodization of history, leading up to the messianic age. Remiel, the revealing angel, appears and explains the significance of the bright waters that represent the Messiah.

72:2 And after the signs come of which you were told before, when the nations will be confused, and the time of my Messiah will come, he will summon all nations, some of whom he will spare, and some he will kill. ³Therefore, these things are coming upon the nations, those who are about to be spared by him. ⁴Every people that has not known Israel and that has not trodden down the seed of Jacob will live. ⁵This is because some [people] of every nation will be subjected to your people. ⁶But all those who have ruled over you, or have known you, all of them will be delivered up to the sword.

73:1 And it will be after [the Messiah] will have cast down everything that is in the world, and will have taken his seat in peace forever on the throne of his kingship, that then he will be revealed in gladness. Rest shall appear. ²Then health will be descending in dew, and illness will withdraw. Anxiety, distress, and groaning will pass away from humans, and joy will stroll about throughout the entire earth. ³No one will die untimely any more. (*2 Bar.* 72:2–73:3)

With this text we have reached the messianic age, which the angel Remiel calls “the time of my Messiah” (مَهِيسَة, 72:2). The three messianic

needs to think of the portrayal of Rome in a contemporary apocalypse, the book of Revelation, where Rome becomes “Babylon the great, mother of whores and of earth’s abominations” (Rev 17:5).

³⁷ Some interpreters have suggested that the three enemies are, in fact, not human. FITZMYER, *First Corinthians* (n. 4), 572 argued that the three “are abstract terms for some sort of governing entities, probably supraterrrestrial or even mythological, two of which are mentioned in Rom 8:38 along with the *angeloi*, ‘angels’.” Also HAYS, *First Corinthians* (n. 14), 265.

accounts in *2 Baruch* speak to different aspects of the messianic visitations. During his first advent (*2 Bar.* 29–31), the Messiah remains passive. It is only at his return that the dead will rise, those who have fallen asleep in hope of him. The second account (*2 Bar.* 39–40) relates how the Messiah defeats the last emperor and establishes his own reign. The messianic kingdom is an interim kingdom that marks the final installment of history until this world will come to an end. The third text (*2 Bar.* 70–73), finally, depicts the Messiah as *pantocrator*. He summons *all* the nations to him and judges them based on how they have treated Israel in the past (cf. *Pss. Sol.* 17). Some will live and others “will be delivered up to the sword” (72:6). Who will kill them we are not told.³⁸ This is the eschatological turning of the tables, as it were, in that the enemies of God’s people will finally be vanquished once and for all, not by means of a last war, as one might expect from an apocalypse like *2 Baruch*, but by means of a judgment scene in which the Messiah acts as the just judge of all.

4. Conclusion

For Paul and the author of *2 Baruch* the hope for the bodily resurrection was an integral part of their eschatological expectations. Both simply took for granted that the end was imminent and that, when it comes, it will unfold in an orderly fashion, following a preordained plan. Resurrection is part of the apocalyptic order, even though it needs to be emphasized that the belief in the resurrection never gained the centrality in Judaism that it was accorded in the teachings of the Church since Paul.³⁹ Neither Paul or the author of *2 Baruch* go to any length to explain the end time scheme as such, it is simply assumed, and both make ample modifications according to the needs of their respective arguments.

It surely would be wrong to claim that the beliefs of our authors are identical – they are not, and there are many notable and important differences between their eschatological outlooks.⁴⁰ But both do agree on the general outline of the apocalyptic drama, and, as we saw, their language, too, is remarkably similar. Indeed, there is no other Jewish text that resembles Paul’s account of the resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15 as closely as

³⁸ STUCKENBRUCK, “Messianic Ideas” (n. 34), 111.

³⁹ The point is made by G. VERMES, *The Resurrection* (New York: Doubleday, 2008), xv–xix, who refers back to 1 Corinthians 15.

⁴⁰ See the contribution by SAMUEL VOLLENWEIDER in this volume: “Auferstehung als Verwandlung: Die paulinische Eschatologie von 1Kor 15 im Vergleich mit der syrischen Baruchapokalypse (2Bar),” pp. 17–17.

does *2 Baruch*. The first stage in the final drama is tied to the Messiah. For Paul, this event already lies in the past, as the end has begun with the resurrection of Christ, "Christ the first fruits" (1 Cor 15:23). In *2 Baruch*, too, the initial visitation of the Messiah will happen in Israel. The inhabitants of the land will be protected and enjoy an abundance of food, but the Messiah remains passive. With the second stage Paul moves to the future, Christ's return, which Paul describes explicitly in apocalyptic terms (1 Cor 1:7; 15:23). The main event associated with the *parousia* is the resurrection of the dead – or, to be specific, the waking of the deceased Christians. The author of *2 Baruch* also speaks of the "return" of the Messiah that will immediately lead to the resurrection of those who have fallen asleep "in hope of him" (2 Bar. 30:1). At this point *2 Baruch* is more explicit about the sorting of the righteous and the wicked, an element Paul omits in 1 Cor 15:23–28. After the Messiah has established his reign he defeats his enemies. Again, Paul, who is rather terse, is content merely to use the christological interpretation of Psalms 8 and 110 to make the point that this is happening at the will of God. The author of *2 Baruch*, on the other hand, provides a more elaborate account of the Messiah who is acting as a judge – in chs. 49–51 as a judge who is the defender of Israel who summons, convicts, and executes the last mundane ruler, and in chs. 72–73 as the *pantocrator* who judges the people of the earth based on how they have treated Israel in the past. Paul is explicit that the messianic kingdom is transitional only, and that the focal point of his apocalyptic scheme is the absolute reign of God, to which the Messiah, too, ultimately will subject himself. The situation is similar in *2 Baruch*, where the Messiah rules "until the world of corruption is completed" (2 Bar. 40:3). This is followed by a seamless transition from the messianic reign to the eternal bliss in the age to come.

That Paul has made use of traditional materials in construing his argument about Christ's resurrection, the resurrection of the first Christians, and the Adam/Christ typology is evident from his own words in 1 Corinthians 15:3: "For I handed on to you as of first importance what I in turn had received" (ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον). But exactly how extensive his borrowing is and what kind of materials he inherited he does not say. It is generally recognized that Paul's understanding of Christ's soteriological role as he articulates it in 1 Corinthians 15 and elsewhere is indebted to early Jewish apocalyptic thought, with which Paul, a Pharisee well educated in the tradition of his fathers (Gal 1:14), would have been familiar. Not only did Paul consider the Jewish apocalyptic order to be fully compatible with his own notion of Christ's resurrection and the *parousia*. He uses it in 1 Corinthians 15 to refute his skeptics and to explain what to him constitutes the very basis for the Christian faith.

In his commentary on 1 Corinthians, Hans Conzelmann writes the following about 15:23–28: “This section shows us Paul in the tradition of apocalyptic. The latter’s fundamental notion that the course of the world follows a predetermined plan, along with a concrete conception of this plan, of the stages of its development is here taken for granted. ‘Christ’ . . . has been subsequently introduced into the schema, thereby modifying it.”⁴¹ There is little doubt that Paul is thinking in apocalyptic terms here. But has he really introduced Christ into the schema, as Conzelmann would have it? Would it not be more accurate to say that the Messiah has always been part of the schema and that Paul has given him a name? The principal difference between the Christian and the Jewish notion of the soteriological role of the Messiah is that for Paul the Messiah is none other than Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Mary and Joseph, and that therefore “act one” of the apocalyptic drama has already occurred.

There is also light to be shed on *2 Baruch* based on our reading of Paul. Paul is more explicit about the linear sequence of the apocalyptic events than is the author of *2 Baruch*, who divides his material up into two pericopes about the resurrection and three about the Messiah.⁴² Modern interpreters of early Jewish apocalypses have largely been content to discuss each messianic episode in the text separately, without paying much attention to the present narrative context or the order in which they appear in the book. While not all elements in each pericope may be compatible with one another, our comparative reading challenges us to read the individual texts in *2 Baruch* with the larger divine master plan in mind and to investigate whether they are not all part of a single apocalyptic order.

5. Works Cited

- ALLISON, DALE C. *Resurrecting Jesus: The Earliest Christian Tradition and Its Interpreters*. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
- ANDERSON, GARY A., MICHAEL E. STONE, and JOHANNES TROMP, eds. *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- AUNE, D.E., with ERIC STEWART. “From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future: Eschatological Restoration in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature.” Pages 147–177 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- BARTH, GERHARD. “Erwägungen zu 1. Korinther 15,20–28.” *EvT* 30 (1970): 515–527.
- BOER, MARTINUS C. DE. *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians and Romans 5*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.

⁴¹ CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians* (n. 3), 269.

⁴² HENZE, *Jewish Apocalypticism* (n. 9), 293–317.

- . “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology.” Pages 169–190 in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by Joel Marcus and Mation L. Soards. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- . “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology.” Pages 345–383 in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by John J. Collins. New York/London: Continuum, 2000.
- BOGAERT, PIERRE MAURICE. *L’Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch: Introduction, traduction du syriaque et commentaire*. 2 vols. Paris: Cerf, 1969.
- BORNKAMM, GÜNTHER. *Paul*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- BRANDENBURGER, EGON. *Adam und Christus: Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Röm. 5,12–21 (1. Kor. 15)*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.
- BULTMANN, RUDOLF. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. 6th ed. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1968.
- CHARLES, ROBERT H. *The Apocalypse of Baruch*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896.
- COLLINS, JOHN J. “A Shoot from the Stump of Jesse.” Pages 52–78 in *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- CONZELMANN, HANS. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- DALEY, BRIAN E. *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003.
- DEDERING, SVEN. *Apocalypse of Baruch*. Peshitta Institute. The Old Testament in Syriac IV,3. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- ESLER, PHILIP F. “God’s Honour and Rome’s Triumph: Responses to the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE in Three Jewish Apocalypses.” Pages 139–158 in *Modeling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context*. Edited by Philip F. Esler. London: Routledge, 1995.
- FITZMYER, JOSEPH A., S.J. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- . *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- FREY, JÖRG. “Die Apokalyptik als Herausforderung der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft. Zum Problem: Jesus und die Apokalyptik.” Pages 23–94 in *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie*. Edited by Michael Becker and Markus Öhler. WUNT 2/214. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- GAGER, JOHN G. *Reinventing Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- GINZBERG, LOUIS. “Apocalypse of Baruch (Syriac).” Pages 551–556 in vol. 2 of *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. New York: Ktav, 1902.
- GRY, LÉON. “Le Papias des belles promesses messianiques.” *Vivre et penser* 3 (1933–34): 113–124.
- HAYS, RICHARD B. *First Corinthians: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997.
- HAYWARD, ROBERT C.T. “The Figure of Adam in Pseudo-Philo’s Biblical Antiquities.” *JSJ* 23 (1992): 1–20.
- HENGEL, MARTIN. “Das Begräbnis Jesu bei Paulus und die leibliche Auferstehung aus dem Grabe.” Pages 119–183 in *Auferstehung – Resurrection: The Fourth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium: Resurrection, Transfiguration and Exaltation in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Tübingen, September, 1999)*. Edited by F. Avemarie and H. Lichtenberger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

- HENZE, MATTHIAS. *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading Second Baruch in Context*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- KLAUSNER, JOSEPH. *The Messianic Idea in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah*. New York: MacMillan, 1955.
- KOCH, KLAUS. "Messias und Menschensohn: Die zweistufige Messianologie der jüngeren Apokalyptik." *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 8 (1993): 73–102.
- LEVISON, JOHN R. *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
- LIED, LIV INGEBORG. *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . "Recognizing the Righteous Remnant? Resurrection and Eschatological Reversals in 2 Baruch 47–52." Pages 311–336 in *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity*. Edited by Turid Karlsen Seim and Jorunn Økland. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009.
- MADIGAN, KEVIN J., and JON D. LEVENSON. *Resurrection: The Power of God for Christians and Jews*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- MOWINCKEL, SIGMUND. *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1956. Repr. 2005.
- MURPHY, FREDERICK J. *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- NICKELSBURG, GEORGE W.E. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. 2d ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- . *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*. Expanded edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- SCHWEITZER, ALBERT. *Reich Gottes und Christentum*. München: Beck, 1995.
- STEMBERGER, GÜNTER. *Der Leib der Auferstehung: Studien zur Anthropologie und Eschatologie des palästinischen Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (ca. 170 v. Chr. – 100 n. Chr.)*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1972.
- STONE, MICHAEL E. *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990.
- STUCKENBRUCK, LOREN T. "Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature of Early Judaism." Pages 90–113 in *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- VERMES, GEZA. *The Resurrection*. New York: Doubleday, 2008.
- VIOLET, BRUNO. *Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt*. Leipzig: Hinrich, 1924.
- VOLLENWEIDER, SAMUEL. "Auferstehung als Verwandlung: Die paulinische Eschatologie von 1Kor 15 im Vergleich mit der syrischen Baruchapokalypse (2Bar)." Pages 463–490 in *Anthropologie und Ethik im Frühjudentum und im Neuen Testament. Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen*. Edited by M. Konrad et al. **WUNT XXX**. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- WHITENY, WILLIAM K. *Two Strange Beasts: Leviathan and Behemoth in Second Temple and Early Rabbinic Judaism*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Autorinnen- und Autorenverzeichnis

JOHN M.G. BARCLAY, Professor in New Testament Studies, Department of Theology and Religion, University of Durham

RENÉ BLOCH, Professor für Judaistik am Institut für Judaistik der Universität Bern

CHRISTFRIED BÖTTRICH, Professor für Neues Testament an der Theologischen Fakultät der Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität Greifswald

ROLAND DEINES, Professor in New Testament Studies at the Department of Theology and Religious Studies, University of Nottingham

MATTHIAS HENZE, Professor of Biblical Studies at the Department of Religious Studies, Houston/Rice University

JENS HERZER, Professor für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Theologie des Neuen Testaments an der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Leipzig

FRIEDRICH WILHELM HORN, Professor für Neues Testament an der Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität Mainz

MATTHIAS KONRADT, Professor für Neues Testament an der Theologischen Fakultät der Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg

GEURT HENK VAN KOOTEN, Professor of New Testament and Early Christianity at the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, University of Groningen

STEFAN KRAUTER, Privatdozent für Neues Testament an der Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

HINDY NAJMAN, Professor of Religious Studies at the Department of Religion Studies, Yale University (USA)

KARL-WILHELM NIEBUHR, Professor für Neues Testament an der Theologischen Fakultät der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena

ECKART REINMUTH, Professor für Neues Testament an der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Rostock

TODD D. STILL, Professor of Christian Scriptures at George W. Truett Theological Seminary, Baylor University, Waco, TX

LOREN T. STUCKENBRUCK, Professor für Neues Testament mit Schwerpunkt antikes Judentum an der Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

GERD THEIBEN, em. Professor für neutestamentliche Theologie an der Theologischen Fakultät der Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg

MICHAEL TILLY, Professor für Neues Testament und Antikes Judentum und Leiter des Instituts für antikes Judentum und hellenistische Religionsgeschichte der Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen

SAMUEL VOLLENWEIDER, Professor für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft an der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Zürich

MARKUS WITTE, Professor für Exegese und Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments an der Theologischen Fakultät der Humboldt-Universität Berlin