

## The Calendar Implied in 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra: Two Modifications of the One Scheme

### 0. Introduction

Both 2 *Baruch* and 4 *Ezra* provide series of revelations followed by a 40-day period of teaching (2 *Baruch* 76:4) or (re)writing of revealed books (4 *Ezra* 14). The number of days between visions is always explicated, and so, both 2 *Baruch* and 4 *Ezra* are interwoven by numerical sequences which can hardly be random or inessential. Their relation to the calendar is rather obvious given that both books are apocalypses, and that the Jewish apocalypses are saturated with liturgical elements, as it is the case of 2 *Baruch* and 4 *Ezra* as well.

The fact that both 2 *Baruch* and 4 *Ezra* contain some calendrical and liturgical contents was clear even to the early students but the first attempt of systematic recovering of their calendrical structures was undertaken in 1959 by Jan Van Goudoever.<sup>1</sup> Then, in 1969, Pierre Bogaert published another reconstruction of 2 *Baruch*'s calendar as a part of the Introduction to his French translation.<sup>2</sup> Since then, no particular attention to the calendars of both apocalypses was paid. Several important liturgical observations were published, however.

Van Goudoever and even Bogaert proposed their reconstructions when the studies in the Second Temple period Jewish calendars were in their beginning. No wonder that now there is a need to revisit their conclusions.

The detailed reconstruction of the implied calendar(s) is, nevertheless, problematic due to the impossibility of identification of the calendaric data from 2 *Baruch* and 4 *Ezra* with any already known Jewish calendar of the Second Temple period.

### 1. Bogaert's Approach to the Calendar of 2 Baruch

The reliability of any liturgical reconstruction, including the reconstruction of the calendar, depends on the number of detected parallels with other liturgical institutions, already known as having some relation to the same milieu. Bogaert himself mentions this methodological principle when saying that "...la mention des jeûnes de sept jours et la période de quarante jours qui précède l'envoi de la lettre semblent bien recouvrir des données liturgiques connues par ailleurs."<sup>3</sup> The main problem with his reconstruction consists precisely in the fact that it results in a calendar that has very little in common with any other calendar known to us. In the 1960s, it was not as striking as now, when the number of known calendars of the Second Temple period became relatively large.

What is especially important, the cornerstone of Bogaert's reconstruction, the 40-day period between the Yom Kippur and the day 21.VIII mentioned in 2 *Bar* 77:18<sup>4</sup> is absolutely

---

<sup>1</sup> In his thesis first published as a monograph in 1959; s. Van Goudoever 1967: 143-152 (4 *Ezra*) and 153-161 (2 *Baruch*).

<sup>2</sup> Bogaert 1969, I: 163-169. I agree with Bogaert's criticisms against Van Goudoever's reconstruction of the calendar of 2 *Baruch*, and so, I do not see a need to discuss the latter.

<sup>3</sup> Bogaert 1969, I: 163.

<sup>4</sup> Oddly enough, this verse is distorted in A. F. J. Klijn's translation (OTP 1:647) having "the ninth month" instead of "the eighth" (as in Charles' translation); the original has صَاحِبُ دَالْحَصْبِ (Dederling 1973:48). In the Arabic version the verse 77:18 contains the same date, which is, however, mistranslated by the editors: "of the fifth month" instead of "of the eighth month," as it is stated in the text (من الشهر الثامن) (Leemhuis, Klijn, Van Gelder 1986: 114).

unparalleled.<sup>5</sup> On the contrary, a 40-day period after a heavenly revelation resulted in appearance of some text is a well-known pattern of the Pentecost, shared also by *4 Ezra* (will be discussed in the next section). The latter parallel is especially important because of a great similarity of both apocalypses in other respects.

Another major problem with Bogaert's reconstruction is its impreciseness with the starting point of the visions. According to Bogaert, it can fall somewhere between 5.VI and 12.VI, more probably 9 or 10.VI. Thus, he failed to identify it with a precise date. As to the liturgical sense of this date, Bogaert proposed several dates of the fall of Jerusalem. The earliest one, 5.VI, is mentioned in Ez 8:1 (MT; LXX has 5.V) as the date of the vision of the glory of God leaving the Temple. The date 8.VI (8 Gorpiaeus) is mentioned as that of the fall of Jerusalem in Josephus, *Wars* 6:435. Finally, the date 10.VI (10 Gorpiaeus) as the date of the Jewish feast of mourning over Jerusalem is mentioned in the Christian text (2<sup>nd</sup> half of the fourth cent.) *Apostolic Constitutions* V, 20. However, the liturgical significance of these dates is unclear. Josephus' date 8.VI seems to have never acquired any liturgical significance. The "Jewish" date of the *Apostolic Constitutions* seems to be erroneous (most probably, a contamination of the feast of *Tisha Be'Av* 9.V with the date of Yom Kippur 10.VII, because the correspondence of Gorpiaeus to Tishri is also possible<sup>6</sup>).

The only important liturgical date beside the Yom Kippur in the whole Bogaert's reconstruction is 3.VII, the fast of Gedaliah according to the rabbinic tradition (7 days before the Yom Kippur). I would add that this date is significant not only in the rabbinic tradition but also in the much earlier calendar implied in *3 Baruch*.<sup>7</sup>

Thus, Bogaert's reconstruction contains two known dates (10.VII and 3.VII) against a rather difficult supposition of a 40-day period after the Yom Kippur and an uncertainty in defining of the starting point of the visions. This is not a good balance. His reconstruction, of course, could be (and will be below) contested and improved in some minor points but, nevertheless, I don't see any way to improve it significantly without dismissing the verse 77:18. In fact, there are purely textological reasons to do so.

## **2. Problem of 2 Baruch 77:18 and Bogaert's Reconstruction of the Calendar**

This verse belongs to the introduction (77:18-26) to the Letter of Baruch which has a textual history of its own. As Bogaert himself stated, "Et si la lettre était vraiment une addition, c'est toute la finale de l'apocalypse depuis le ch. LXXVII qui serait en porte à faux."<sup>8</sup> Despite his own view that the apocalypse has never existed without the Letter, Bogaert acknowledges that ch. 77 is linked more strongly with the Letter than with the remaining part of the text. However, there is no logically binding argument for Bogaert's schemes of the development of the present text of *2 Baruch* (that it was written by either unique author or an author elaborating on the previously existing text of the Letter); the textological arguments contain here no more than a balance of probabilities. There is also a logical possibility that the present recension of *2 Baruch* resulted in an editorial work from the two independent sources corresponding to the Letter and to the first 76 chapters of the apocalypse. In this case, 77:18 would be certainly produced by the editor.

---

<sup>5</sup> To my knowledge, there is only one but very remote parallel, the festival Seged (Sigd) of the Ethiopian Beta Israel (Falasha) on 29.VIII, the 50<sup>th</sup> (not 40<sup>th</sup>!) day after the Yom Kippur. Moreover, Bogaert's ignores the problem of counting the 40 days between this date 21.VIII and the date of the Yom Kippur (10.VII). 21.VIII is not the 40<sup>th</sup> but the 41<sup>st</sup> day after 10.VII (unless we suppose 29 days for Tishri which seems to be also unparalleled). I think that the author of the verse 77:18 had in mind that the preaching on 21.VIII took place just after the 40 days were finished.

<sup>6</sup> Gorpiaeus' counterpart in the Julian calendar was either August or September, whereas that of Tishri either September or October and that of Ab either July or August.

<sup>7</sup> Lourié (forthcoming).

<sup>8</sup> Bogaert 1966, I: 78.

However, the decision to disregard the Letter of Baruch as a later addition which has nothing to do with the original calendar of the apocalypse would be an inadmissible oversimplification. Now the problem of the Letter is readdressed by Lutz Doering, who convincingly argued that the Letter belongs to the original text of *2 Baruch*.<sup>9</sup> Below we can add some liturgical reasons (related to the sense of the Pentecost) supporting this view (s. the next section). Thus, the textological problem of 77:18 must be resolved not on the macro-level of the whole text but on the micro-level of a given verse.

To my mind, it is the calendrical (and other mathematically strict) schemes that must have priority in defining whether we are dealing with a genuine recension or not, and this rule is to be considered as relevant to the textology. If the text of *2 Baruch* within the first 76 chapters presents a coherent calendar structure incompatible with the verse 77:18 as we have it in the available recension, we have to admit that this verse contains some later changes or additions. We will return to this verse at the end of our reconstruction (section 10 below).

Running ahead, I have to say that the calendar of *2 Baruch* taken within the seventy-six former chapters is fitting much better than Bogaert's reconstruction with other data of the Second Temple period in general as well as *4 Ezra* in particular. However, this does not mean that Bogaert's reconstruction is wrong. It is basically true but corresponds to the calendrical ideas of the later editor, who was working without understanding the original calendar of his source.

### 3. Pentecost

Starting to read *2 Baruch* in the limits of its 76 former chapters, we see that its basic structure is very similar to that of *4 Ezra*. First of all, the 40-day periods after the last vision (*2 Baruch* 76:4 and *4 Ezra* 14) are obviously referring to the 40-day period of revelation to Moses on Sinai (Ex 24:18; cf. also *3 Baruch* 4:2S mss BT<sup>10</sup>). Thus, in both cases and not only in the case of *4 Ezra*, it is reasonable to accept that the final day of visions is that of the Pentecost.

Both Ezra and Baruch are "second Moseses." This means, among others, that they transmit to the people some written Law. In the case of Ezra, it is stated quite explicitly that he ordered to the scribes to write the revealed books (ch. 14). In the case of Baruch, this written Law is his Letter. The two apocalypses are justifications, through the idea of a New Pentecost, of the authority of some biblical canon (in Ezra's case) or some instructive text (in Baruch's case).

Without the Letter, the purpose of *2 Baruch* would be unclear. I think this is an important, even if not decisive argument in favour of the presence of the Letter in the original recension of *2 Baruch*.

### 4. Apparent Lack of the Passover

One has to expect that, in both books, the series of visions start on the Passover. The Passover in Exile is considered as the feast turned into mourning about Jerusalem. In this respect, *3 Baruch* and *4 Baruch*, indeed, follow a tradition traceable in some biblical books starting their series of revelations on the Passover in Nisan.<sup>11</sup> However, in both *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra*, the chronology of visions is too short to fill the whole period between the Passover and the Pentecost. Both calendars start on some date in between. This date (or these dates, if they are different in *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra*) is the *crux interpretum* of the corresponding calendars.

As it seems, there is no place for the Passover in our calendrical sequences, although the reality can be more complicated.

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. his "The Letter of Baruch and its Role in *2 Baruch*" in the present volume. I am very grateful to Lutz Doering for the valuable discussion that we had in the days of the Sixth Enoch Seminar.

<sup>10</sup> Lourié (forthcoming).

<sup>11</sup> Lourié (forthcoming).

## 5. Calendrical Schemes in Outline

In the Table 1 we provide the calendrical data from *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra*, namely, the intervals between the seven visions described in each of the two books (here I do not discern between the visions *sensu stricto* and the other heavenly revelations, because this difference does not affect the calendrical schemes).

The seven-day intervals are normally explicit in our texts,<sup>12</sup> although the one-day intervals need some discussion (only *4 Ezra* 11:1 is explicit).

**4 Ezra 5:16.** *4 Ezra* opens with a vision at the starting point of its calendar (3:1). However, in 5:16 one day of space between the day of the first vision and the following seven days of fasting is added (Phaltiel came “on the second night” after the first vision).

**2 Baruch 36:1.** The space between the fourth and the fifth visions is somewhat difficult to define. Bogaert asserts that it is specified in 32:7 where Baruch says to the elders “And now, do not draw near to me for some days” (Bogaert’s tr.: “pendant quelques jours”; Syr.: ܠܦܢ ܠܦܢ ܠܦܢ ; Dederling 1973:17); the verse indicates an imprecise little number of days which Bogaert considers as the interval from 2 to 5. However, it is unlikely that, in a text where each day is to be calculated in the calendrical scheme, one of such important intervals is specified without any precision. On the contrary, it is natural to consider 32:7 as an estimation of the time needed to obtain the further vision; Baruch had to promise to the people some deadline, the near the better, but, nevertheless, with some float. The implied chronology is, however, the following: the rest of the day of the fourth vision was completed with the dialogue with the assembly; then, Baruch “went to the holy place,” Zion (35:1), and the fifth vision took place even later when he “fell asleep” (36:1) after an overcrowded day, thus, in the night. On the following day, Baruch has another dialogue with the people (ch. 44-46).

**2 Baruch 47:1.** After the day of the fifth vision Baruch went to Hebron. At this place, he started to fast seven days (47:2). It is not specified that he went to Hebron in the night; thus, by default, he went in the morning. The distance between Jerusalem (Zion) and Hebron is between 40 and 50 km (depending on the route) that corresponds roughly to one day’s journey.

**2 Baruch 53:1.** Again, a vision when Baruch fell asleep (52:7) with a discussion (with the Mighty One) when he awoke (53:12).

Table 1.

Visions <i>2 Bar/4 Ez</i>	<i>2 Baruch</i>	Intervals (days)	<i>4 Ezra</i>	Intervals (days)
I	1:1	Starting Point	3:1; 4:1	Starting Point
II/ –	9:2; 10:1	7 (vision II)	5:16	1 (no vision)
III/II	12:5	7 (vision III)	5:21	7 (vision II)
IV/III	20:5	7 (vision IV)	6:35	7 (vision III)
V/IV	36:1	1 (vision V)	9:26	7 (vision IV)
– /V	47:1	1 (no vision)	11:1	1 (vision V)
VI	47:2	7	13:1	7
VII	53:1	1	14:1	3
Σ		<b>31</b>		<b>33</b>

These sequences of visions can be also described by the equations below (SP = Starting Point):

<sup>12</sup> The only exception is *4 Ezra* 6 :35 which mentions three weeks of fasting, whereas without stating that they are already finished; this gave a pretext to count three weeks as already passed before the third vision, and so, to postulate one unmentioned week of fasting before 3:1 (Box in Charles 1913, II:578 followed by Van Goudoever 1967:147). I consider this conjecture as superfluous.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
2 \text{ Baruch:} & SP + 7 + 7 + 7 + 1 + 1 + 7 + 1 = \text{Pentecost} \\
4 \text{ Ezra:} & SP + 1 + 7 + 7 + 7 + 1 + 7 + 3 = \text{Pentecost}
\end{array}$$

Given that the latest day of the both sequences is the Pentecost, their Starting Point is to be placed somewhere in the second month.

## 6. Meaning of the Second Month: Two Traditions

Both numbers 31 and 33 are too big to allow to the SP to be fitting with the middle of the Pentecost.

To go further, we have to review the traditions related to the second month and important for the ideas of restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple. There are two such traditions.

### (1) Reconsecration of the Temple on 1.II:

1 Esd 5:55: καὶ ἐθεμελίωσαν τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ νουμηνίᾳ τοῦ δευτέρου μηνός...  
[NRSV: “and they laid the foundation of the temple of God on the new moon of the second month...”] (cf. 2 Esd = Ezr 3:8, but without mention of the new moon).

### (2) Reconsecration of the Temple and the postponed Passover on 14.II:

2 Chr 30:15: וַיִּשְׁחָטוּ הַכֹּהֲנִים בְּאַרְבָּעָה עָשָׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ הַשֵּׁנִי  
καὶ ἔθυσαν τὸ φασεκ τῇ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ δευτέρου...  
[NRSV “They slaughtered the Passover lamb on the fourteenth day of the second month.”] (cf. 2 Chr 30:2, 13).

This tradition is especially interesting because it is compatible with the interpretation of the Passover in some other apocalypses (*3 Baruch*, *4 Baruch*) as *the* day of the mourning of Jerusalem and the Temple.<sup>13</sup>

## 7. Calculation of the Starting Points

It is reasonable to suppose that

$$SP = \begin{cases} 1. II (1 \text{ Esd } 5: 55) \\ \text{or} \\ 14. II (2 \text{ Chr } 30: 15) \end{cases}$$

The two above suppositions are to be verified or falsified when applied to each of the two apocalypses. For this procedure, we have to know the allowable dates of the Pentecost. Let us start from the dates already known from the other Second Temple works. If we find among them the only fitting one, thus, according to the principle of Ockham’s razor, we do not need to hypothesise other, so far unknown dates of the Pentecost.

The known dates of the Pentecost are: 15.III (*Jubilees*, DSS, etc.), 6.III (2 *Enoch*, rabbinic tradition),<sup>14</sup> 4.III (3 *Baruch*).<sup>15</sup>

Thus, the following suppositions are proven in result of our procedure of verification/falsification:

<sup>13</sup> Lourié (forthcoming).

<sup>14</sup> Lourié 2012.

<sup>15</sup> Lourié (forthcoming).

*2 Baruch*: (SP + 31 = Pentecost) – fitting with 14.II + 31 = 15.III (the revelation starts on the postponed Passover according to 2 Chr 30:15).

*4 Ezra*: (SP + 33 = Pentecost) – fitting with 1.II + 33 = 4.III (1 Esd 5:55).

## 8. Types of the Calendars

Both 15.III and 4.III as the dates of the Pentecost are known from 364-day calendars only. It is extremely unlikely that the calendars of *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra* are not following the same 364-day principle.

However, the 364-day calendars are divided in the two basic types depending on the weekday corresponding to the beginning of the year (1.I): either Wednesday or Sunday.<sup>16</sup>

Thus, we have for the two apocalypses, supposing that the Pentecost falls on Sunday (which is the common feature of the 364-day calendars):

*2 Baruch*: Wednesday 364-day year  
(1.I We, 14.I Tu, 14.II Th, 15.III Su), as it is in *Jubilees* etc.

*4 Ezra*: Sunday 364-day year  
(1.I Su, 14.I Sabbath, 1.II Tu, 4.III Su), as it is in *3 Baruch*.

## 9. Weekdays of the Revelations

The weekdays of the important dates of the 364-day calendars should not be without any liturgical meaning, and so, they need to be clarified (s. Tables 2 and 3 below).

Both apocalypses end with the visions on the Pentecost which falls on Sunday.

In *2 Baruch*, the first four visions take place on Thursday, although the fifth one (dedicated to the judgement) on Friday. This is hardly occasional. The sixth vision with a long liturgical performance is quite fitting with Sabbath, although a day-long journey (47:1), also on Sabbath, is difficult to understand.

In *4 Ezra*, everything happens on Thursday or Wednesday, nothing on Sabbath.

### 9.1. 2 Baruch (Wednesday calendar)

Table 2.

Visions (Nr)	<i>2 Baruch</i>	Date	Weekday
I	1:1	14.II Postponed Passover	Thu
II	9:2; 10:1	14.II + 7 = 21.II	Thu
III	12:5	21.II + 7 = 28.II	Thu
IV	20:5	28.II + 7 = 5.III	Thu
V	36:1	5.III + 1 = 6.III	Fri
—	47:1	6.III + 1 = 7.III	Sab
VI	47:2	7.III + 7 = 14.III	Sab
VII	53:1	14.III + 1 = 15.III Pentecost	Sun

<sup>16</sup> S., for the details, Lourié 2012.

## 9.2. 4 *Ezra* (Sunday calendar)

Table 3.

Visions (Nr)	4 <i>Ezra</i>	Date	Weekday
I	3:1; 4:1	1.II	Tue
—	5:16	1.II + 1 = 2.II	Wed
II	5:21	2.II + 7 = 9.II	Wed
III	6:35	9.II + 7 = 16.II	Wed
IV	9:26	16.II + 7 = 23.II	Wed
V	11:1	23.II + 1 = 24.II	Thu
VI	13:1	24.II + 7 = 1.III	Thu
VII	14:1	1.III + 3 = 4.III Pentecost	Sun

## 10. Problem of 2 *Baruch* 77:18

The problematic verse 77:18 states that Baruch started to write his two epistles “on the one and twentieth day in the eighth month,” after the 40-day period (76:4) when Baruch instructed the people after his visions. No date of the Pentecost plus 40 days could result in 21.VIII. Indeed, as Bogaert rightly stated, this date seems to be harmonized with that of the Day of Atonement (10.VII). However, there is no specific indication of the Day of Atonement as the day of the final revelation within the text, and the cumulative evidence of other data forces us to acknowledge that the revelation to Baruch finished at the Pentecost. So, the link between 21.VIII and the Day of Atonement must be considered as an idea of a later editor.

In the frame of our reconstruction of the 2 *Baruch* calendar, the right date meant in 77:18 must be calculated as 15.III + 40 days = 24.IV (providing that the third month contains 31 days). This date might be adjusted to 23.IV or 25.IV (depending on the exclusive or inclusive method of counting) but certainly neither to 21 or VIII.

Lutz Doering drew my attention on the fact that, in the Greek Oxyrhynchus fragments *P. Oxyr.* 403, the only preserved Greek text of 2 *Baruch*, there is one instance of use of numerals (2 *Bar* 12:5), and here the numeral “seven,” which is always written down in the Syriac manuscripts,<sup>17</sup> is rendered with the number ζ.<sup>18</sup> In the Greek uncial script, confusion between Α and Δ is not infrequent, which, in numerals, corresponds to confusion between 1 and 4. Thus, the appearance of 21 instead of 24 can be explained with a misspelling in the manuscript of the Greek uncial protograph of the Syriac version, where numerals were written with numbers. The following distortion of the number of month (“fourth” to “eighth”) is to be explained as a deliberated editorial change based on a different understanding of the implied calendar of 2 *Baruch*, that is, with an insertion of the calendrical ideas related to the Day of Atonement (as it was observed by Bogaert). Probably, this hypercorrection was provoked by the erroneous reading “21” instead of “24.” This change must be, too, going back to an early epoch and could take place already in the Greek text.

## 11. Toward Understanding of the Liturgical Setting

It would be untimely, in the current state of research, to define the exact liturgical setting of 2 *Baruch* and 4 *Ezra*. Both apocalypses are elaborating on the extremely important, for some milieux, topics of expiatory value of wine rituals interwoven into the fabrics of penitential rites.

<sup>17</sup> ܫܒܥܬܐ (Dedering 1973:6).

<sup>18</sup> [ημε]ρας ζ (Bogaert 1969, I: 41).

For *4 Ezra*, the wine is mentioned in the prophecy quoted in 5:5,<sup>19</sup> although the chalice in ch. 14 belongs to the same chalice/wine imagery; the presence of atonement rites in *4 Ezra* has been pointed out by Daniel Boyarin.<sup>20</sup> In *2 Baruch*, the fifth vision dedicated to the judgement is focused on the tree of vine; Lorenzo DiTommaso demonstrated parallelism between the penitential prayers in *4 Ezra* and the prayers in *2 Bar* 48 and 54, whereas without speculating on their possible liturgical setting.<sup>21</sup>

A “collapse” of the period from the Passover to the Yom Kippur in both apocalypses is to be compared with the trend of unification between the four feasts: Passover, Pentecost, New Wine, and Yom Kippur. This trend reached its culmination in Christianity (the sacrifice of Christ belongs to the feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Yom Kippur, and its main rite is a rite of wine/chalice).<sup>22</sup> Other stages of this process can be seen in *3 Baruch* (where the New Wine feast is already connected with the judgment) and the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (where a Yom Kippur rite is performed on the day of the New Wine feast).<sup>23</sup>

## 12. Sevenfold Literary Structure of Apocalypses

A sevenfold structure of the liturgical space of both heavenly and earthly temples is a phenomenon, which is attested quite well in a number of texts of Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity, not only in the Qumranic *Songs of the Sacrifice of Sabbath*.<sup>24</sup> No wonder that there existed a sevenfold literary structure of apocalypses, whereas there is no witness of this structure in Jewish apocalyptic literature apart from *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. There are, however, two early Christian witnesses.

First of all, it is the *Revelation of John*, whose closeness to *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* in other respects is a well-known fact. Unlike its Jewish counterparts, this apocalypse does not provide exact calendrical information concerning the chronology of visions. Nevertheless, in one place, the calendrical background is outcropping in the mention of the “Lord’s Day” (1:10) as the starting point of the visions. Supposing that the visions outside the four major sevenfold cycles (seven letters, seven seals, seven trumpets, and seven plagues) correspond each to one unit,<sup>25</sup> we can put these seven-unit and one-unit cycles in correspondence with the number of days between the revelations in *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra*. The results are presented in the Table 4.

Table 4.

<i>Rev</i>	Visions	<i>Rev</i>	<i>2 Baruch</i>	<i>4 Ezra</i>
1:10	Starting Point	Sun	Thu	Tue

<sup>19</sup> For the full dossier of this prophecy about “the blood from wood,” including, beside such widely known texts as the *Epistle of Barnabas* and 4QDeutero-Ezekiel (4Q385), a still unpublished in original Coptic letter of Horsiesius (late 4<sup>th</sup> cent.), the Slavonic apocrypha *The Ladder of James* and the *Inscription on the Chalice of Solomon*, and others, s. Lourié 2005: 14-19; the parallels show that the “wood” in this prophecy which was originally meant is the tree of vine.

<sup>20</sup> Boyarin 1972.

<sup>21</sup> DiTommaso 2012: 123-126.

<sup>22</sup> Lourié 2008.

<sup>23</sup> Lourié, forthcoming

<sup>24</sup> I was trying to provide the full dossier in Lourié 2008, but forgot to mention the temple of the *makarinoi*, or the Blessed Ones, that has seven altars (mentioned in the short Byzantine notice Ἐκθεσις λόγων περὶ Μακαρινῶν [An Epitome of the Treatises about the Makarinoi], which absorbs some Jewish-Christian traditions; ed. Rougé 1966: 350).

<sup>25</sup> An alternative approach would consist in dividing these singular visions into threefold cycles, according to their contents (because all of them are composed from three major parts), and so, to three units, which would make the parallelism between these unit-structures and *2 Baruch*’s day-structures less striking but still apparent. Nevertheless, even in this case, the sevenfold apocalyptic structure of the whole work would be preserved. Among many scholars who proposed, without taking into account calendrical considerations, a sevenfold literary structure for the Book of Revelation, it is Hans Bietenhard (1955: 11; first published in 1945), whose subdivision of the book is fitting perfectly with ours. Other sevenfold plans for *Rev* are compared, e.g., in (Humphrey 1995: 82-83 and 87-90).



1:9—3:22	7 letters	7	7	1
4:1—8:1	7 seals	7	7	7
8:2—11:19	7 trumpets	7	7	7
12:1—14:20	Vision of Woman-Sion, Beast, Lamb	1	1	7
15:1—16:21	7 plagues	7	1	1
17:1—19:10	Vision of Woman-Babylon, throne of God, bride of the Lamb	1	7	7
19:11—22:5	Vision of Angel, Resurrection, New Jerusalem	1	1	3
<b>Σ</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>33</b>

One can see, from the Table 4 that the similarity with 2 *Baruch*'s structure is clear.

Another important but very little known early Christian text is the epistle of some Barsabas of Jerusalem *On Christ and the Churches* (2<sup>nd</sup> or early 3<sup>rd</sup> cent., preserved in Georgian version only).<sup>26</sup> This is not an apocalyptic text but a composition enumerating different biblical prophecies, which are fulfilled in Christ. Unlike other texts of anti-Jewish polemics, Barsabas' work has a sevenfold composition: its seven great sections are dedicated each to one of seven "prophets" (Adam, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob, Moses). Moreover, the work as a whole is subdivided into 28 short subsections, each for one "mystery" (that is, a prophecy or an episode prefiguring Christ). The first of these "mysteries" is dedicated to Christ as Sunday. The 28 "mysteries" are distributed among the seven "prophets" in an apparently irregular manner, but, nevertheless, a liturgical background of an apocalyptic literary structure is still perceptible.<sup>27</sup> I called the unique genre of this work "realised apocalypse," that is, an apocalyptic structure turned inside out, where the apocalyptic prophecies about the Messiah are analysed and considered as fulfilled.

The sevenfold literary structure of apocalypses is a phenomenon especially important for understanding the Jewish matrix of Christianity. Its studies must be continued in connexion with the studies of the sevenfold structures of the liturgical space in Jewish and Christian traditions.

## Bibliography

I hope the references to Dederling 1973, Bogaert 1969, OTP of Charlesworth, and Charles 1913 will be unified for the whole volume.

Bietenhard 1955 — H. Bietenhard, *Das tausendjährige Reich. Eine biblisch-theologische Studie*. Zürich: Zwingli-Verl., 1955.

Boyarín 1972 — D. Boyarín, "Penitential Liturgy in 4 Ezra," *JSJ* 3 (1972): 30-34.

DiTommaso 2012 — L. DiTommaso, "Penitential Prayer and Apocalyptic Eschatology in Second Temple Judaism," in: J. Penner, K.M. Penner, C. Wassen (eds.) *Prayer and the Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*. STDJ, 98; Leiden—Boston: Brill, 2012, pp. 115-133.

Humphrey 1995 — E. McEwan Humphrey, *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse, and the Shepherd of Hermas*. JSP SS, 17; Sheffield, 1995.

Leemhuis, Klijn, Van Gelder 1986 — F. Leemhuis, A. F. J. Klijn, G. J. H. Van Gelder, *The Arabic Text of the Apocalypse of Baruch*. Leiden: Brill, 1986.

Lourié (forthcoming) — B. Lourié, "Cosmology and Liturgical Calendar in 3 Baruch and Their Mesopotamian Background," in: A. Kulik, A. Orlov (eds.), *Harry E. Gaylord Memorial Volume*; SJS; Leiden—Boston: Brill (forthcoming).

Lourié 2005 — B. M. Лурье, "Чаша Соломона и скиния на Сионе. Часть 1. Надпись на Чаше Соломона: текст и контекст [The Chalice of Solomon and the Tabernacle in Sion. Part 1: Inscription on the Chalice of Solomon: Text and Context]," *Byzantinorossica* 3 (2005): 8-74.

Lourié 2008 — B. Lourié, "Calendrical Implications in the 'Epistle to the Hebrews.'" *Revue biblique* 115 (2008): 245-265.

Lourié 2012 — B. Lourié, "Calendrical Elements in 2 Enoch," in: G. Boccaccini, A. Orlov, J. M. Zurawski (eds.), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch. No Longer Slavonic Only*. SJS, 4; Leiden—Boston.: Brill, 2012, pp. 191-219.

<sup>26</sup> van Esbroeck 1982. For the full bibliography s. Lourié 2013.

<sup>27</sup> Lourié 2013.

Lourié 2013 — B. Lourié, “Barsabas of Jerusalem, *On Christ and the Churches*: Its Genre and Liturgical Contents,” in: B. Kudava (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Conference “Georgian Heritage Abroad.” Tbilisi, 2011*. Tbilisi, 2013 (forthcoming).

Rougé 1966 — J. Rougé, *Expositio totius mundi et gentium*. SC 124; Paris: Cerf, 1966.

van Esbroeck 1982 — M. van Esbroeck, *Barsabée de Jérusalem*, Sur le Christ et les églises. *Introduction, édition du texte géorgien inédit et traduction française*. *Patrologia orientalis*, 41,2, N° 187; Turnhout: Brepols, 1982.

Van Goudoever 1967 — J. Van Goudoever, *Fêtes et calendriers bibliques*. Tr. M.-L. Kerremans. *Théologie historique*, 7; Paris: Beauchesne, 1967.