Liv Ingeborg Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in* 2 Baruch (Leiden: Brill, 2008). Pp. xix + 375; $172.00.

SHAYNA SHEINFELD, MCGILL UNIVERSITY

2 Baruch is a Jewish apocalypse written between 70 and 132 C.E. in response to the destruction of the Second Temple. The oldest extant manuscript of the entire apocalypse is contained in a Syriac version, which itself claims to be translated from the Greek. The discussion of original language is still under debate; Lied argues for a Greek original (23). The present volume, based on the author's 2006 doctoral dissertation at the University of Bergen, argues that the Land of Israel is a redemptive category in *2 Baruch,* contrary to the view of the Land in *2 Baruch* in previous scholarship. Lied's argument breaks out of traditional concepts of Land that are based around spatial epistemology and instead approaches Land through a more flexible and mobile praxis epistemology. In the case of *2 Baruch*, this means that the Land does not just equal physical/geographic locations as found around the inscribed Jerusalem/Judah/Palestine, but that Land as a redemptive category is located wherever the remnant community observes the laws, regardless of their physical location.

Lied's book moves in a logical, chronological progression through the temporal categories in *2 Baruch*. Chapter one considers the nature of the question, examining spatial theory and the *status quaestionis* of *2 Baruch.* This research is built upon the work of H. Lefebvre and E. W. Soja, who "propose a change of spatial epistemology" by studying space "as a cultural and social construct" (14). Using spatial epistemology, Lied uses the following chapters to consider space used in *2 Baruch* not in a one-to-one correlation to actual geography in the Land, but to consider how space is imagined through *2 Baruch*'s eschatology.

Chapters two and three focus on the First Temple in *2 Baruch*. Chapter two considers Baruch's concern for the role of the Land with the imminent destruction of the temple and Jerusalem, as well as the results of what will happen to the remnant community upon their relocation outside of Jerusalem. Lied's interpretation is supported by the Syriac: for instance, when the remnant leaves Jerusalem, Jerusalem itself becomes wilderness—this can be seen through, for example, the Aphʿel form of *arpe*, which means "'to leave' in the sense of deserting or renouncing something" (55).

Chapter three explores how *2 Baruch* constructs the Land of the past, specifically through an analysis of the importance of kingships as told in the Apocalypse of the Cloud (*2 Bar* 53–74). In this chapter Lied shows how praxis shapes Israel's Land, that is, Israel's actions must comply with the covenant in order to define Land, and the definition of the Land changes depending on righteous praxis.

Chapters four and five consider spaces of the end-time. Chapter four moves away from the history of the Land to the present narrative time, when the temple has been destroyed, and the righteous remnant, with Baruch at its head, has moved to the Kidron valley. Lied argues that the movement of the remnant, even just to the nearby Kidron valley, places the remnant in a type of exile (115). The movement also supports an eschatological reversal from the holy temple locale—which is no longer holy—to the Kidron valley which is known as a place of punishment and as a graveyard, and ultimately as wilderness (122). Chapter five considers Baruch's move to Hebron, which is, like the Kidron valley, a wilderness location that has numerous biblical references associated with it, especially in relation to Abraham, but also with Moses. The period of time in chapter four and five constitutes the "end time" space, since the time of the Messiah and ultimate redemption do not come immediately (111).

Chapters six and seven move on to the time of the redemption. Chapter six studies the Land in the messianic era. During this time the remnant must survive the end of the corruptible world while preparing for the incorruptible world. The Land during the messianic era is thus a period of transition for Israel and includes both the corruptible and incorruptible world. Chapter seven considers how Israel as well as the temple vessels move from the corruptible, imperfect world into heaven. Lied emphasizes that the two worlds are connected through Israel and the artifacts, and that "as spatial constructions and outcome of Israel's practices, [the two worlds] overlap" (303). Thus, the Land in the incorruptible world is connected to the Land in the corruptible world, and it is in the heavenly Land that the righteous will receive their reward.

Lied's analysis is well written and concise. The exegetical analysis of *2 Baruch* is clear and convincing, and each section builds steadily upon the previous ones, creating by the end of the book a solid argument that gives credence to the idea that redemptive

space in *2 Baruch* is created through praxis. One example of this can be seen in chapter five, where the focus is on *2 Baruch* 77:5-6. Lied argues that the 'here' (Syriac *hārkā*) location in this passage is explicitly tied to the location of Baruch and/or the righteous remnant. Thus future redemptive space is tied to Baruch/the remnant—that is, the *hārkā* is wherever Baruch/the remnant are located, regardless of whether or not it happens to be in the physical Land. Lied proposes that allowing the "territorial aspect to determine our interpretations" is problematic because a specific location of the remnant is never mentioned (176–177). True though this point is, Lied herself points out that the idea of return to the promised Land *as a physical location* is a common trope in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple literature (176, n.113), and thus to dismiss concrete location as part of the interpretation simply because it is not stated outright is problematic. This is not to say that Lied's interpretation is incorrect, only that this interpretation perhaps needs to be expanded to include the possibility that the readership of *2 Baruch* would also have connected the extensive traditions associated with physical Land, as well as the remnant, to redemptive space.

The above example also serves as an illustration for Lied's use of Syriac throughout the book: the arguments found therein do not focus on the language of the extant text except when they hinge on the specific words, such as in *2 Baruch* 77:5-6 (mentioned above) where *hārkā* (here) appears. This word again appears in 80:5, where it refers to "the area [of] 'the inhabitants of Zion"' (175) and supports, according to Lied, the argument that *hārkā* serves as an indication of the presence of the remnant rather than physical location. Lied's use of Syriac examples is thus sparse but placed with skill, making the book accessible to both lay readers and scholars of Syriac alike.

Lied's book is a very strong analysis of *2 Baruch*. Even with the exclusion of the geographic possibilities, to argue that *2 Baruch* transforms the "convenantal space to address the crisis caused by the fall of the Jerusalem temple and the dispossession of Palestine in 70 C.E. and to argue for Israel's survival and ultimate redemption in the other world" (318) via the praxis and location of the remnant is effective and convincing. *The Other Lands of Israel* offers an innovative and convincing analysis of *2 Baruch*.