that any stream of Jewish thought regarded the general Hellenistic repugnance to circumcision as grounds for dispensing with the rite for proselytes.

1. Izates as a monarch is a very special person and thus his case is a very special case.
2. It is not the personal repugnance of his subjects which as such constitutes the basis for his abstention. The basis is rather the threat of insurrection which is consequently thought to be posed.
3. Even Izates was considered something less than a proselyte (= a Jew) in his uncircumcised but pious state.

The furthest the evidence can possibly take us is to the suggestion that there might have been those prepared to offer dispensation to particular highly placed individuals on the grounds of threat to life and property posed by their receiving circumcision. Indeed even to go this far is conjectural.

We must conclude therefore that none of the texts brought forward stand scrutiny as firm evidence for a first-century Jewish openness to the possibility of accepting as a Jewish brother a convert to Judaism who felt unable to undergo circumcision.

Notice: This material may be protected by the copyright law (Title 17 USC).

e-6620

Journal for the Study of Judaism, Vol. XII, No. 2

REACTIONS TO DESTRUCTIONS OF THE SECOND TEMPLE

Theology, Perception and Conversion

BY

MICHAEL E. STONE

Hebrew University, Jerusalem

The destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem by Titus in the year 70 C.E. was the last of a series of destructions and desecrations: by Nebuchadnezzar in 587-6 B.C.E., by Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 169-8 B.C.E., and by Pompey in 63 B.C.E. [1]). In reaction to these events, Judaism gradually developed the structures and instruments for survival as a religion bereft of its central cult place. Although the destruction by Nebuchadnezzar was followed, in about half a century, by a restoration, a heritage of diaspora remained. Some sacrificial cult was probably maintained in Jerusalem [2]), while some Jews built

[1]) For an overview of Jewish history of this period, see S. SAFRAI and M. STERN (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century* (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 1.1-2; Assen, Van Gorcum, 1974-76); E. SCHÜRER, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, rev. by G. VERMÈS and F. MILLAR (Edinburgh: Clark, 1973-). The present article does not pretend to exhaust the topic. We have deliberately left aside all of the development, change and revolution that took place in the conceptual and *halachic* structures of Judaism, most typically represented, but far from exhausted, by the work of R. Yochanan b. Zakkai. This subject has never been treated exhaustively in all its aspects, but a number of relevant studies may be found in G. ALON, *The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age (70-640 C.E.)*, (Jerusalem, Magnes, 1980). The work of J. NEUSNER, *A Life of Yohanan ben Zakkai* (Studia Post-Biblica 6; Leiden, Brill, 1970) does not set forth these issues systematically; but see his comments on pp. 183-193. See, moreover, his interesting observations in, "Map without Territory: Mishnah's System of Sacrifice and Sanctuary," *History of Religions* 18: 103-127 (1979). See also note 10, below. Attitudes to the destruction of the Temple in the New Testament and early Christian literature are outside the scope of this paper. Some material may be found in B. GERHARDSSON, "Sacrificial Service and Atonement in the Gospel of Matthew", *Reconciliation and Hope: Festschrift L. L. Morris*, ed. R. J. BANKS (Exeter, 1974), particularly pp. 26-29; cf. also L. H. GASTON, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Fall of Jerusalem* (Leiden: Brill, 1970).

[2]) The cult seems to have survived to some extent: see Jer 41:5-6; cf. the discussion by P. R. ACKROYD, *Exile and Restoration* (Old Testament Library; London, SCM, 1968), pp. 25-29. This work touches on many of the issues of biblical thought as they relate to our subject. It is cited extensively below for its interesting ideas as well as for its bibliography. On the survival of the cult, see also J. BRIGHT, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia, Westminster, 1959), p. 325.

temples outside the Land of Israel [3]). Most did not, however, and the Babylonian exile and the developing diaspora prefigured Judaism without a temple. The religious ideas and structures thus initiated were molded and hardened by the tragedies of the following centuries [4]).

If the documents of the Second Temple age that deal with these destructions and desecrations are examined, it becomes apparent that theodicy became the central issue. Israel's suffering was thought to be the result of sin; a punishment inflicted by God who covenanted with the nation [5]). Israel's fate was seen as bound to Israel's action and God's justice [6]). In the attempt to comprehend the destruction, the idea arose that by recounting, examining and evaluating the events of the past, a basis could be found for understanding the present [7]). It

[3]) A Jewish colony of mercenary soldiers in the Persian army had a temple at Elephantini in Upper Egypt (fifth-century B.C.E.). See B. PORTEN, *Archives from Elephantini* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California, 1968), pp. 109-122. See further, on multiple temples, M. SMITH, *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament* (New York, Columbia, 1971), pp. 90-94; M. E. STONE, *Scriptures, Sects and Visions* (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1980), pp. 77-82; E. F. CAMPBELL, "Jewish Shrines in the Hellenistic and Persian Periods", *Symposia: ASOR 1900-1957*, ed. F. M. CROSS Jr. (Cambridge, Ma. ASOR, 1979), pp. 159-167..

[4]) The situation in the Babylonian exile has been dealt with at length by ACKROYD, *Exile and Restoration*, passim. On the evidence for the development of the synagogue and increased prominence of other religious practices, see *ibid.*, pp. 33-36. On page 44 he analyzes factors leading to the survival of the exiles of 586 in contrast to those of 722 B.C.E. Compare also the comments by M. SMITH, *Palestinian Parties*, p. 102. The centrality of the Temple is witnessed by the fact that the express purpose of the return from the Babylonian exile was to rebuild it. Contrast the aims of the conquest under Joshua. See SAFRAI, *Pilgrimage*, p. 7 (below, n. 14).

[5]) The literature is extensive. See, in short, the article "Covenant", *Interpreters' Dictionary of the Bible* (New York and Nashville, Abingdon, 1962), 1.716-721 and the article "Covenant", *Supplement Volume to IDB* (1976), pp. 188-197. On the literary and conceptual structures, see K. BALTZER, *The Covenant Formulary* (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1971); see also W. EICHRODT, *Theology of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, Westminster, 1961), 1.36-69.

[6]) See Lev 26 and ACKROYD, *Exile and Restoration*, pp. 89-90; Deut 27-28. Y. KAUFMANN, *The Religion of Israel*, tr. M. GREENBERG (Chicago, University of Chicago, 1960), pp. 280-282 sensitively traces the shift from covenant curses to threatening eschatological certainty; see also the *IDB* articles cited in the preceding note and bibliography there. The ideas were developed in connection with the Temple at the time of the return from the Babylonian exile: see ACKROYD, *Exile and Restoration*, pp. 157 f. On the antiquity of these ideas see *ibid.*, pp. 43 f.; see BALTZER, *Covenant Formulary*, pp. 97-175 on their development.

[7]) See also ACKROYD, *Exile and Restoration*, pp. 63-102; on the role of recital in biblical thought see, for example, G. E. WRIGHT, *God Who Acts* (Studies in Biblical Theology; London, SCM, 1952), especially pp. 33-58; but compare now

was possible thus to retell the past, when the events presented were selected, flexibly formulated and understood in perspective.

Such views of the reasons for destruction are clearly reflected in various sources of the age. Achior the Ammonite suggests to Holofernes, the enemy general contemplating an attack on Jerusalem, that he examine the deeds of Israel. Only if they had sinned against God could they be vanquished (Judith 5:17-18) [8]). Second Maccabees states that the Temple was desecrated by Antiochus Epiphanes because of the sins of Israel. Yet, the event was of such proportions in the author's mind that he was forced to say that it implied no weakness or fault in God; Jerusalem's sanctity and its fate derive from those of Israel. Even though it is holy, the Temple is not sacrosanct (5:17-20). So Second Maccabees goes beyond the simple correlation of destruction and Israel's sin and takes up the old problem of the nature of Zion's sanctity [9]). Pompey's desecration of the Temple mount forced the author of the Psalms of Solomon to assert that it was the result of Israel's sin. In this punishment, justly administered by God, he saw a loud proclamation of God's justice (see, e.g., 2:1-3, 16). Such ideas are found throughout the period and continue alive in later Jewish literature [10]).

The flow of discrete and diverse historical events was, for all such views, the arena in which God acted. The events of history were often interpreted by means of "rules of thumb" such as may be discerned in the Deuteronomic History [11]). But another way of approaching

the observations of W.G. DEVER, "Biblical Theology and Biblical Archaeology: An Appreciation of G. Ernest Wright", *HTR* 73: 2-5 (1980) and the literature cited there on p. 6, n. 15.

[8]) On the character of Judith, see E. HAAG, *Studien zum Buch Judith* (Trierer Theologische Studien 16; Trier, Paulinus, 1963), passim.

[9]) See, e.g., the views attacked by the prophet in Jer 7:14, 14:13-19; 26, etc.; perhaps also those attacked by Agrippa in Josephus, *War* 2.397; attitudes of extreme reverence to the Temple are also evinced by Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1.66-78; and he himself went on pilgrimage to the Temple (*de Prov* 64).

[10]) Some discussion of the rabbinic attitudes may be found in E. E. URBACH, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs* (Jerusalem, Magnes, 1975), 1.597-599. Compare the passage from the Additional Service for Festivals: "But on account of our sins we were exiled from our land and removed far from our country, and we are unable to go up on order to appear and prostrate ourselves before thee, and to fulfil our obligations in thy chosen house, that great and holy temple which was called by thy name, because of the hand that hath been stretched out against thy sanctuary." [S. Singer (tr.), *The Authorised Daily Prayer Book* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1962), p. 319].

[11]) See, e.g., VON RAD, *Theology*, 1. 336-340, 348-350, 352 (see n. 12 below). On the impact of such views on the actual presentation of history, see *ibid.*, pp. 343 f., 348.

the problem of theodicy developed through eschatology. There is a general, predetermined pattern to history; wickedness must run its course and in the new age, at the end of history or beyond, God's righteousness will be vindicated. The particular events of the ongoing historical process are no longer the arena in which the struggle for understanding is conducted. Instead, men attempted to discern an overall pattern within history, to encompass all of history from creation to eschaton in a coherent, simple structure [12]). This more inclusive view of the past and the future rendered more traumatic the dilemmas arising from destructions of the Temple [13]).

The profound impact of such destructions is appreciable only in light of the central role of Jerusalem, the Temple and the High Priesthood in the whole of Jewish life in the Second Temple period [14]). This augmented role was also reflected in the growth of speculation about the heavenly Temple and the heavenly Jerusalem at this time.

---

[12]) The Priestly source does have overall chronological structure and division; see ACKROYD, *Exile and Restoration*, pp. 91 f.; on other time divisions, see G. VON RAD, *Old Testament Theology* (New York & Evanston, Harper & Row, 1962) 1.129 f. Of course, the tendentious "theological" rewriting of history perceived coherences and causal relationships, but it did not necessarily produce a "philosophy of history" or other sort of overall view of the historical process. The course of discrete events is given meaning and causality by the conceptual scheme, but it is a course of discrete events for all that.

[13]) Early examples of such an inclusive view are Daniel and Jubilees. See J. LICHT, "The Doctrine of 'Times' according to the Sect of Qumran and other 'Computers of Seasons'", *Eretz Israel* 8: 63-70 (1967).

[14]) So, e.g., the first act of the Hasmoneans in institutionalizing their rule was to proclaim themselves High Priests; see SCHÜRER, *History*, 1.193 f., who adduces all the sources. Again, the issue of the validity of the priesthood and the Temple cult was at the heart of the schism of the Qumran covenanters; see F. M. CROSS, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (2ed.; New York, Doubleday, 1961), pp. 109-160; SCHÜRER, *History*, 2.587. The awe with which, in the early second century, the High Priest was regarded is well illustrated by ben Sira's praise of the High Priest Simon (chap. 49). That description is reminiscent of the hymns in the Jewish liturgy for the Additional Service of the Day of Atonement that describe the appearance of the High Priest. Other indications of the central position of the Temple are the Temple tax, paid by all Jews, and the development of the institution of pilgrimage. See n. 9, above and see SAFRAI and STERN, *Compendia*, 1.1: 191-204; 1.2: 880-881, 891-896; S. SAFRAI, *Pilgrimage at the Time of the Second Temple* (Jerusalem, Am Hasefer, 1965) (in Hebrew). The important role of the Temple in Jewish life and law requires no further documentation here; it was also a central theme of Jewish iconography from the time of the Bar Cochba coins on.

On the reinforcement of attitudes of love and reverence for the Temple at the time of the Babylonian exile and the return, see ACKROYD, *Exile and Restoration*, pp. 248-251.

The idea was much older, of course [15]), but it received special emphasis at that period (Exod 25:8-9, 1 Chron 28:18; and later Ezekiel 40-48, Zech 2:5-9, *Description of the New Jerusalem* from Qumran [16]), and 2 Apoc. Bar. 59) [17]). Quite ancient too is the view that the heavenly Temple and heavenly Jerusalem would replace the earthly ones at the end of days, at the time of the full revelation of God's glory. So, by way of example, it is found in 1 Enoch 90:28-9, which was composed in the Maccabean age. There it does not solve any particular problem arising from destruction or desecration; it is simply part of the coming, ideal, eschatological state (cf. 4 Ezra 7:26, 2 Apoc. Bar. 32:2-4, etc.) [18]).

The development of meta-historical eschatology and the heightened cosmic role of the Temple combined to produce such passages as 2 Apoc. Bar. 4:2-6. In the preceding text God has announced that he will destroy the Temple because of the evil deeds of Judah and Benjamin. Baruch remonstrates with him: the world was created for Israel; the observance of the Torah is Israel's task; the destruction of Jerusalem will abnegate Israel's role and the Torah's function, and so the very purpose of creation. God assures him that the decree is only temporary and that the time of the dissolution of the world is not yet at hand. Then comes 4:2-6 which is, in effect, "The History of Heavenly Jerusalem". Jerusalem was created before the creation of the world, it was revealed to Adam before he sinned, to Abraham in the covenant vision (Gen 15), to Moses on Sinai. For all its glory, the earthly Temple, like the earthly Jerusalem, does not bear the full weight of a cosmic role. This is reserved for the heavenly Temple [19]).

---

[15]) On the heavenly *tavnit*, see also ACKROYD, *Exile and Restoration*, p. 100 and the extensive discussion in M. E. STONE, "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature", *Magnalia Dei*, eds. F. M. CROSS, W. LEMKE, and P. D. MILLER (New York, Doubleday, 1976), pp. 445-446.

[16]) *DJD* 1.134 (1Q 32), *DJD* 3.84 (2Q 24), 184 (5Q 15). See also the comments by J. MAIER, *Von Kultus zur Gnosis* (Kairos 1; Salzburg, Müller, 1964).

[17]) The broad pseudepigraphical literature of Baruch is all set in the context of the exile: for a survey of the books, see A.-M. DENIS, *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 1; Leiden, Brill, 1970), pp. 79-84, 182-186; J. H. CHARLESWORTH, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research* (SCS 7; Missoula, Scholars Press, 1976), pp. 83-91. Much information may be found in the introduction in Vol. 1 of P. BOGAERT, *Apocalypse de Baruch* (Sources chrétiennes 144-145; Paris, Cerf, 1969).

[18]) See also Jub 1:17, 29; 25:21; cf. Wisd Sol 3:14, and the comment of D. WINSTON, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (Anchor Bible; New York, Doubleday, 1979), p. 132.

[19]) On the heavenly Temple in rabbinic thought, see V. APTOWITZER, "The Heavenly Temple in the Aggada", *Tarbiz* 2: 137-153, 257-287 (1932) (in Hebrew).

So Baruch uses the idea of the heavenly Jerusalem here to handle the problem of the destruction. The proportions the problem had assumed are indicated by the type of solution he sought.

All the formulations of the problem arising from the destruction mentioned so far imply an acceptance of God's justice in allowing it to happen. The terrible fate of the city and its holy place cause anguish and distress. Writers lament, weep, cry out their pain over this terrible calamity. Yet, the righteousness of God's action is not questioned. It may require explanation, and various explanations were attempted: Israel's wickedness had brought about a just punishment; or, when the evil of the oppressors was unbearable, the exhibition of God's righteousness itself is the reason; or, the future restoration in glory will justify God's action by exhibiting his faithfulness [20]).

In contrast with previous writers, however, the author of 4 Ezra did question the very axiom of God's justice in permitting the Romans to wreak their will on Mount Zion. The shock of this event made him re-examine some of the basic concepts of the world-view of Judaism. Supposedly writing in Babylon thirty years after the destruction of the Temple, he challenges the view that the destruction of Jerusalem was justified because of the sins of Israel (3:28-30). Israel's wickedness is not remotely proportionate to that of the Romans (3:31, 34-36). So, the author protests against the destruction of Judea and Jerusalem, not because of Israel's innocence but because Israel's sin is far less than that of the nations into whose hands the city is delivered (cf. also 5:29-30 for another aspect of this). Moreover, he observes, it cannot be maintained that although Israel's sin is less than that of Rome, nonetheless Israel has sinned while some other nation has not. Indeed, no nation has been without sin [21]).

The author then proceeds to challenge the very justice and morality of God and to evaluate His responsibility for the parlous state of the world. He has gone beyond the particular event of the destruction of Jerusalem to the general question of the conduct of history as a whole. He commences with Adam, whom God himself created with his own right hand; He put him in paradise, He gave him one commandment and man transgressed it. The author does not quite attribute to God the human ability to sin, but almost does so. This ability he calls "evil heart", "evil seed", or "infirmity". God decreed death upon man, yet he increased. His offspring sinned and, the author reproaches, "you did not hinder them". So God brought the flood, but saved Noah. Noah's children sinned; but God chose Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. He brought Israel to Sinai, descended, and gave them the Torah:

> And yet you did not take away from them the evil heart, that your Torah might bring forth fruit in them. For the first Adam, clothing himself with the evil heart, transgressed and was overcome, and likewise all who were born of him. Thus the infirmity became inveterate; the Torah was indeed in the heart of the people, but in conjunction with the evil seed; so what was good departed and what was evil remained (3:20-22).

Thus the generations sinned until the time of the monarchy, when God eventually brought destruction and exile upon the whole nation.

The question is not just of the relationship between Israel's sins and those of the nations. Instead, the author formulates a profounder basis for reproach, indeed indictment, of God. God has determined the very course of history which has brought about the sin of the people of Israel. He created, he was prepared to punish and indeed did so. He gave the Torah, it is true, but he did not provide man with the ability to keep the Torah, and it was this inability that led, by a clear and direct path, to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple.

This document questions the meaning of God's creative activity, the justice and morality of his conduct of the world. The answers offered in the ensuing dialogue are almost trite. Ezra's angelic interlocutor makes two chief points: first, that the ways of providence are mysterious; and, second, that evil must reach its peak before good appears. In the second vision he moves from the problem of Israel, and of man as a basis for the problem of Israel, to the election and punishment of Israel. In the third vision he agonizes how the existence of men can be understood. God, who is merciful and loving, created so many men and now he says that they are all destined for

[20]) There were various attitudes to the expected doom at the time of the Babylonian exile (Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration*, pp. 43-48, 78-83, 126 f.); but its justice was not doubted (*ibid.*, pp. 100-105, 233 f.).

[21]) On Jeremiah's anguish over an analogous tension in his time, see Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration*, p. 72; destruction of the Temple was central to the expectations of doom close to the Babylonian exile (*ibid.*, p. 54) as in the thinking of the time of the restoration (*ibid.*, pp. 153-162, 172-175). As to attitudes to Babylon at the time of the Babylonian exile, see *ibid.*, pp. 219-221. A similar dynamic can be observed in the dictum of R. Yohanan b. Torta in j. Yoma 1:1 (38c), who also struggles to find which of Israel's sins can be regarded as bringing about the destruction of the Second Temple. (I am indebted to S. Safrai for this observation.)

damnation. How is this possible and why should he create thus? It is clearly beyond our proper scope here to examine all the arguments employed by the author and the solutions he essays in the tribulation of his soul. They form the heart of the first three visions of the book [22]).

These first three visions are in the form of dialogues. This is unusual, for in apocalypses the extended dialogue is a rare form of revelation. Before each dialogic vision the seer offers a prayer in which the central issues of the book, described in the preceding paragraphs, are formulated. The dialogues come in response to these prayers. Each of them concludes with a short vision foretelling the imminent end. These three dialogic visions are followed by three revelations in the form of symbolic visions. There is, thus, a double tripartite structure, what has been recently called a triptych [23]).

The role of the dialogues is ambiguous. Questions are raised on a seemingly logical level of discussion. Answers are proffered which frequently do not respond to the questions [24]). More than resolving tensions, the dialogues serve to heighten them. Dialogue did not resolve the distress, argument and reasoning did not answer the questions; only the eschatological promise could do that. But the resolution and the answer did not come simply through "intellectual" knowledge of coming reward. The angel had assured the seer of it repeatedly during the three dialogues. It was even the subject of the short revelations with which each of the dialogues concludes. Yet the seer returns, dissatisfied, to his questions and his agony. These are, apparently, only assuaged by the three symbolic visions, yet *their* message had already been given repeatedly by the angel in the dialogues. So the question remains: what was it that made the three symbolic visions a satisfactory response to the questions of the dialogues.

In this context it is worth reconsidering the role played in the book by the fourth vision—the first of the three symbolic visions. This

[22]) These issues and the detailed analysis of the text will be presented fully in the author's commentary on 4 Ezra to be published in the *Hermeneia* series.

[23]) It is not our intention to discuss here the various critical problems surrounding 4 Ezra, or the solutions that can be offered for them. This task will be undertaken elsewhere. The term "triptych" was applied to 4 Ezra by E. Breech in his important article, "These Fragments I have shored against my Ruins: The Form and Function of 4 Ezra", *JBL* 92: 267-274 (1973).

[24]) An attempt to define the problem of coherence had already been made in the writer's doctoral thesis, *Some Aspects of the Eschatology of 4 Ezra* (Harvard, 1965), pp. 11-29. Further reflections on the subject will soon be published.

vision, in perhaps the most lyrical lament preserved in the apocryphal literature, expressed the writer's distress over the destruction of Jerusalem and his immovable faith in its future restoration. Ezra, in a field, meets a mourning woman whose only son, borne after years of barrenness, died at the very moment he entered beneath the wedding canopy. Ezra consoles her, comparing her maternal suffering with that of Zion, bereft of all her children by the Romans (10:7-8, 20-22). Thereupon, the mourning woman underwent a wondrous transformation into a glorious builded city, the heavenly Jerusalem to be revealed at the imminent end. This sight comforts the seer in his grief over the destruction of the city in his own time. The longing for a new Jerusalem and a new Temple became particularly poignant after the destruction of the old, and the hope of them the more comforting.

This vision of Jerusalem restored is the pivot on which the whole book turns. Ezra fasts between each of the first three visions and lies on his bed. Before this fourth one, however, he goes out into the field and eats grass and herbs. This shift in framework hints at the shift in mind that takes place. Ezra's questioning and prayer, his pleading, reasoning and intercessions have had not result. In this distressed state of mind, he experiences the sight of the woman; and his physical response is fear, confusion and fainting. The angel then appears, strengthens him, and explains the vision—it is the city of the Most High. Ezra is to enter, see its splendor: "as far as your eye can see it, and afterwards you will hear as much as your ear can hear" (10:55-56).

The experience described here is analogous to a religious conversion. Suddenly the problems and concerns that have beset Ezra and the questions that he has asked, are resolved. They are not solved merely by the knowledge of eschatological reward of which he has been repeatedly assured during the first three dialogues. They are resolved by an experience of overpowering strength. This changes Ezra's view of the world, his perceptions, his feelings and his hopes. No longer does he ask questions or agonize; his questions were not answered. He stops worrying about them; he perceives things anew, and with this new perception he dreams the two dream visions that follow [25]).

[25]) The thesis that is being proposed here will be set forth in detail in a paper to be published shortly. On conversion experiences in late antiquity, see A. D. Nock, *Conversion* (Oxford, Oxford University, 1933), esp. pp. 1-16, 164-186, 254-271. On

This striking change of religious consciousness forms, we submit, the true dynamic of the book. The experience of the heavenly Jerusalem gives him the new perception that relieves his agonizing. The motive, that which forced him to penetrate beyond accepted answers, is his attempt to understand the destruction of Jerusalem. The profundity to which he penetrates in his quest shows the sensitivity of his perception. The unsatisfactory nature of the answers proffered in the dialogues is predictable. The resolution is, for him, eschatological. And for such answers to seem adequate for the problems with which he wrestles, we must recognize the experience of *conversio*, of turning and changing, that the author underwent[26]).

---

p. 7 he offers the following definition: "By conversion we mean the reorientation of the soul of an individual, his deliberate turning from indifference or from an earlier form of piety to another, a turning which implies a consciousness that a great change is involved, that the old was wrong and the new right."

NOCK distinguished conversion strictly defined from revivalism (pp. 9-10). Yet from the viewpoint we are urging, the significant factor is the radical, sudden experience of change that causes the shift of perception. This is as true of conversion as it is of revivalism in NOCK's sense. Much has been written on the sudden shifts of perception, usually preceded by a cumulative stress and distress, by W. SARGANT, *Battle for the Mind* (New York, Doubleday, 1957), pp. 91-122, 149-152. A great deal of interesting information is to be found in W. JAMES, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (London, Longmans Green, 1903), pp. 189-258. Clearly, from our standpoint, many analogies can be found in Christian sectarianism and revivalism.

[26]) The experiential dimension of apocalyptic was explored in M. E. STONE, "Apocalyptic—Vision or Hallucination?" *Milla wa-Milla* 14: 47-56 (1974) and will be discussed in his article, "Apocalyptic Literature", *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 2.2 (forthcoming).

This paper was completed and put in final form during 1980-81, while the writer was a Fellow-in-Residence of the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in Wassenaar. He is indebted to NIAS for providing the opportunity for this.

REVIEW OF BOOKS

Books and articles sent to the secretary of this Journal will be reviewed as soon as possible. Authors who want to make sure that their work on Judaism in Antiquity will be currently mentioned in these reviews are kindly requested to send an off-print (or a photo copy) of their papers to the secretary of the editorial board.

Miguel PÉREZ FERNÁNDEZ, *Tradiciones mesiánicas en el Targum Palestinense. Estudios exegéticos* (Institución San Jerónimo 12), Valencia-Jerusalén 1981, 359 pp. (This book is a doctoral dissertation defended at Madrid's Universidad Complutense in 1975, revised and prepared for publication in Jerusalem during the summer of 1980. A. DÍEZ MACHO, the director of the work, added a preface in which he traces the panorama of targumic studies in Spain and lists the publications of the last ten years. The work of P. F. about the messianic traditions in the Palestinian Targums follows closely the method of thematic analysis started by R. BLOCH and developed by G. VERMES, R. LE DÉAUT, MCNAMARA, MUÑOZ LEÓN and DÍEZ MACHO himself. After a short introduction about the targumic method (pp. 25-30), P. F. offers four very detailed and extremely well documented studies of the targumic texts of Gn 3,14-15 (pp. 33-94); Gn 49,1. 8-12, 16-18 (pp. 99-169); Ex 12,42 (pp. 173-209), and Num 22-24 (pp. 213-286). A synopsis of the Aramaic texts of Onq, PsJ, N, and Ms. Ebr. Vaticanus 440 of all the passages discussed next to Spanish translations plus the Hebrew text (pp. 331-359) make this book even easier to use. It provides good indexes and a comprehensive bibliography. The work is based upon the text of Neofiti I, but the other Palestinian targums are taken into account as well in order to compare them with the Masoretic text and with the Targum Onqelos. P. F. provides detailed philological analysis, but only as a starting-point to uncover the origin of the traditions and their meanings, as well as to trace their repercussions in later writings.

It is impossible to do justice to the riches of the volume without going into a detailed discussion, which is out of place in a short review. I will only single out his negative conclusion about the "healing" character of the targumic Messiah, and his detailed proof of the transformation and revision of the image of the Messiah from the Royal Messiah to a Messiah Teacher of the Law under political, psychological and theological circumstances historically connected with the Maccabean and the Bar Kokhba revolts, as examples of the concrete results of P. F.'s exegesis. On the thorny question of the relationship between Onq. and Neofiti P. F. avoids generalizations drawn from the evidence he brings forward, but nonetheless presents several cases in which Onq. clearly revises and modifies a basic text akin to the Palestinian targum. In some cases P. F. seems to overstretch the evidence of a text and does not avoid a vicious circle, cfr. his treatment of the messianic character of *geber* in the Qumran scrolls, or *anthropos* in LXX Num 24,7. In some other places it remains unclear whether P. F. is