

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



## **Diversity in Christian Attitudes to the Destruction of the Temple The Case of Luke-Acts**

Monier, Mina

*Awarding institution:*  
King's College London

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

### **END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT**



**Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page** this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# Diversity in Christian Attitudes to the Destruction of the Temple: The Case of Luke-Acts

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree  
of Doctor of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies,

King's College London

Mina Monier

April 2018

## **ABSTRACT**

This study explores Christian responses to the destruction of the Second Temple of Jerusalem, with a particular focus on examining the ambiguities of the attitude to the Temple found in Luke-Acts. It is argued that a unified Christian attitude should be questioned from a historical perspective. After diagnosing the methodological problems in scholarly discussions, a new approach is proposed: one in which the study of Luke-Acts takes place in relation to the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, using the conceptual framework of Tertullian for this categorisation. This is supported by modern scholarship on the dating of Luke-Acts. The study takes place by situating Luke-Acts within the context of the work of the Apostolic Fathers. Of these, the key texts chosen are 1 Clement and the Epistle of Barnabas. The examination follows after a review of Jewish attitudes to the Temple and its destruction, with an acknowledgement that the boundaries between 'Judaism' and 'Christianity' are not fixed in the period through to the Bar Kokhba revolt. The study shows that both Jews and Christians developed various attitudes towards the destruction of the Temple at the same time, under the same political circumstances and in different regions. While the Epistle of Barnabas categorically rejected the idea of Temple worship, questioning the legitimacy of any Christian compromise towards the Temple authorities of Jerusalem and their claim to represent the true heritage of Israel, 1 Clement offered a completely opposing view. Through a comparative analysis of Luke-Acts and the other two 'apostolic' texts, the study finds that Luke-Acts's main narrative voice shows a close affinity to 1 Clement and that both reflect the concepts used by contemporaneous Trajanic biographers to assert legitimacy through fulfilling the values of Roman imperial ideology. At the same time, there is a distinctive alternative voice that lies behind Stephen's speech (Acts 7), which has a strong similarity to the views of the Epistle of Barnabas. This study concludes that the challenge presented to scholars by the Temple attitude found in Luke-Acts' is due to the existence of diverse responses within the work, evidenced also in other Jewish and Christian texts.

# ***Contents***

|                                                  |    |
|--------------------------------------------------|----|
| Contents.....                                    | 3  |
| Introduction .....                               | 8  |
| 1.1 The Temple in Scholarship .....              | 8  |
| 1.2 The Status Quaestionis.....                  | 27 |
| 1.3 Method.....                                  | 28 |
| 1.4 An Apostolic Approach .....                  | 31 |
| Jewish Attitudes to the Temple.....              | 34 |
| 2.1 Philo.....                                   | 38 |
| 2.1.3 The Therapeutae .....                      | 42 |
| 2.2 Josephus .....                               | 46 |
| 2.3 Sibylline Oracles 5 .....                    | 54 |
| 2.4 Sibylline Oracles 4 .....                    | 57 |
| 2.5 Fourth Ezra.....                             | 61 |
| 2.6 2 Baruch.....                                | 65 |
| 2.7 4 Baruch and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah..... | 72 |
| 2.8 The Apocalypse of Abraham.....               | 75 |
| 2.9 Conclusion .....                             | 77 |
| The Epistle of Barnabas .....                    | 78 |
| 3.1 Provenance.....                              | 78 |
| 3.2 Date.....                                    | 80 |

|                                                                              |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 3.3 The Structure of the First Part (1–16).....                              | 85  |
| 3.4 Deconstructing the Jewish Temple.....                                    | 87  |
| 3.4.1 Barnabas 5–15 .....                                                    | 87  |
| 3.4.2 Barnabas 16.....                                                       | 93  |
| 3.5 Constructing the Christian temple .....                                  | 94  |
| 3.5.1 Barnabas 4.10-11 .....                                                 | 94  |
| 3.5.2 The Son and Creation: Barnabas 5–6 / Genesis 1:26-28.....              | 95  |
| 3.5.3 The Vessel of the Spirit: Barnabas 11.1-11 / Ezekiel 47:1-12.....      | 98  |
| 3.5.4 Sabbath and Continuous Creation: Barnabas 15.4-6 / Genesis 2:2-3 ..... | 101 |
| 3.5.5 Barnabas 16.....                                                       | 102 |
| 3.6 Conclusion .....                                                         | 103 |
| 1 Clement .....                                                              | 105 |
| 4.1 Introduction.....                                                        | 105 |
| 4.1.1 Date.....                                                              | 105 |
| 4.1.2 Background .....                                                       | 111 |
| 4.2 The Temple in Clement’s Rhetoric .....                                   | 118 |
| 4.3.1 1 Clement 23.5.....                                                    | 120 |
| 4.3.2 1 Clement 29.1–30.1.....                                               | 124 |
| 4.3.3 1 Clement 40–41.....                                                   | 127 |
| 4.3 Temple language in 1 Clement.....                                        | 133 |
| 4.3.1 Martyrdom as access to the Holy Place .....                            | 133 |
| 4.3.2 The Blood of Christ (1 Clement 7.4) .....                              | 134 |

|                                                                             |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 4.3.3 The Patron of our Offerings (1 Clement 36.1) .....                    | 135 |
| 4.4 Conclusion .....                                                        | 138 |
| Luke-Acts .....                                                             | 141 |
| 5.1 Introduction .....                                                      | 141 |
| 5.1.1 Date and Provenance.....                                              | 141 |
| 5.1.2 Sources .....                                                         | 149 |
| 5.1.3 Scholarship on Luke and the Temple.....                               | 151 |
| 5.2 The Infancy Narratives (Luke 1–2) .....                                 | 153 |
| 5.2.1 The Announcement to Zecharias (Luke 1:5-25).....                      | 153 |
| 5.2.2 The Presentation in the Temple (Luke 2:21-38).....                    | 158 |
| 5.2.3 The Boy Jesus in the Temple (Luke 2:41-52) .....                      | 159 |
| 5.3 Preparation for Public Ministry (Luke 3:1–4:13) .....                   | 161 |
| 5.4 The Temptations (Luke 4:1-12) .....                                     | 162 |
| 5.5 From Galilee to Jerusalem (Luke 4:14–19:27).....                        | 163 |
| 5.5.1 The Blood of Zechariah (Luke 11:49-51) .....                          | 165 |
| 5.5.2 The First Lamentation (Luke 13:34-35).....                            | 167 |
| 5.5.3 The Parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (Luke 18:9-14)..... | 174 |
| 5.5.4 The Second Lamentation (Luke 19:41-44).....                           | 176 |
| 5.6 The Temple Ministry (Luke 19:45–21:38) .....                            | 179 |
| 5.6.1 Cleansing the Temple (Luke 19:45-46) .....                            | 181 |
| 5.6.2 The Parable of the Vineyard (Luke 20:9-19).....                       | 183 |
| 5.6.3 The Eschatological Discourse (Luke 21:5-36) .....                     | 186 |

|                                                                                   |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 5.7 The Passion and Resurrection (Luke 22:1–24:53).....                           | 192 |
| 5.7.1 The Death of Jesus (Luke 23:44-49).....                                     | 194 |
| 5.7.2 The Resurrection and Ascension (Luke 24:1-53) .....                         | 196 |
| 5.8 The First Community in Jerusalem and the First Council (Acts 1:12–15:30)..... | 197 |
| 5.9 Stephen (Acts 6:5 – 8:1) .....                                                | 200 |
| 5.9.1 The Speech .....                                                            | 202 |
| 5.9.2 Stephen and the Epistle of Barnabas .....                                   | 210 |
| 5.10 The Pauline Ministry (Acts 15:31–28:31).....                                 | 212 |
| 5.10.1 Paul in Athens (Acts 17:16-32) .....                                       | 212 |
| 5.10.2 Paul from Jerusalem to Rome (Acts 21:17–28:31).....                        | 213 |
| Excursus: Luke-Acts and the Jews .....                                            | 216 |
| 5.11 Conclusion .....                                                             | 220 |
| Luke-Acts and 1 Clement: The Temple Attitude in the Context of Rome .....         | 226 |
| 6.1 Temple Piety .....                                                            | 226 |
| 6.2 Ancestral Customs τὰ ἔθνη τοῖς πατέροις.....                                  | 229 |
| 6.3 Peace and concord: Εἰρήνη καὶ ὁμονοία.....                                    | 233 |
| 6.4 Historical Relevance .....                                                    | 237 |
| 6.4.1 Suetonius .....                                                             | 237 |
| 6.4.2 Tacitus.....                                                                | 238 |
| 6.4.3 Pliny the Younger .....                                                     | 239 |
| 6.5 Conclusion .....                                                              | 243 |
| Conclusion.....                                                                   | 245 |

|                    |     |
|--------------------|-----|
| Summary.....       | 245 |
| Conclusion.....    | 246 |
| Bibliography ..... | 250 |

## Introduction

It is well known that the Second Temple, built in Jerusalem in the sixth century BCE, was destroyed by the Romans in 70 CE (Josephus, *B.J.* 6-7; Suetonius, *Vesp.* 8.1). Despite this, the Temple and its destruction did not cease to be a source of debates and enquires amongst Christian writers for centuries. Hugh Nibley shows examples of the church's concern for the restoration of the Temple,<sup>1</sup> and this prompted a variety of responses. It has long been assumed that Christians considered the destruction an appropriate fulfilment of the prophecies of Christ, and that they had no particular problem with this event. Major patristic voices considered it as a proof that the church had replaced the Temple (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.9; Jerome, *Comm. Isa.* 13; *Haer.* 6.2; Tertullian, *Iud.* 13.26, 14.9), and that they neatly proclaimed that the operations of the Temple were redundant (Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.24-25). The origins of this "ecclesiastical" view are found early in Christian literature and were most clearly stated by Eusebius who attempted to give a homogeneous Christian supersessionist view of the Temple and Judaism (*Hist. eccl.* 2.8, 3.5.3), but if we look carefully at the evidence, we find a more complex range of ideas than has hitherto been supposed. In this study, I will take this question back to the period of late first and early second century literature, with a particular focus on the case of Luke-Acts in its context, in order to see how the problem was handled.

### ***1.1 The Temple in Scholarship***

In the mid-nineteenth century, the question of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity began to be treated systematically through critical constructions of the history of early Christianity. The most significant presentation was by Ferdinand Christian Baur, whose work dominated the Tübingen School. Baur's understanding of Christianity hinges on two principles: Christianity's core is a new ethical demand, and Christianity is a universal religion that transcends all boundaries made by historical religions. Baur's model starts in Jesus' life but continues within two distinctive parts of

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. H. Nibley, "Christian Envy of the Temple," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 2 (1959): 98.

Christianity: Jewish Petrine Christianity of Jerusalem and the Antiochian Christianity. The first, represented by the Jerusalem church, preserved some sort of Jewish particularism<sup>2</sup> that was challenged by Hellenistic Antioch. Baur gives Stephen's speech significant weight in reflecting an emerging gentile Christianity against the Jewish one. Therefore, Baur considers Stephen as "the forerunner" of Paul who is its "true herald and logical founder."<sup>3</sup> The split was thus within Christianity rather than within Judaism as such, which was already superseded by the universal religion, between Petrine Christianity and Pauline Christianity.<sup>4</sup> The former produced the Gospel of Matthew, which did not oppose Jewish particularism, while the latter expanded that Gospel and universalised its teachings in Luke-Acts.<sup>5</sup> For Baur, Stephen's speech reflects a message calling for the abandonment of the Temple by Christians. The speech forms a decisive moment which paved the way for what would later be Pauline Christianity, especially after the destruction of the Temple.<sup>6</sup> Baur saw in this speech the heart of the message of Christianity, boosted by the progress of Hellenization in Diaspora Judaism. One would expect, then, that in Luke-Acts as a whole there would be a systematic endorsement of this view: the Temple, along with the Mosaic law, was utterly redundant.

Hans Lietzmann's studies developed on the basis of Baur's work, notably with his *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*.<sup>7</sup> However, Lietzmann's research incorporated a dramatic shift in the language that dominated the literature of his predecessor. We do not see in Lietzmann the doctrinal antonym of particular versus universal. In Lietzmann's view, the separation between the Jesus movement in Jerusalem and Judaism emerged after Jesus' life due to specific problems of praxis. Using Luke-Acts, Lietzmann pointed out that those belonging to the church of Jerusalem were faithful to the Temple,

---

<sup>2</sup> Baur, *Church History*, 41–43.

<sup>3</sup> Baur, *Church History*, 46. On Stephen see Baur, *Paul: The Apostle of Jesus Christ*, 43 f.

<sup>4</sup> Baur, *Paul: The Apostle of Jesus Christ*, 109f.

<sup>5</sup> Baur, *Paul: The Apostle of Jesus Christ*, 78–79. We can see that Baur did not approve the Two Source Hypothesis, which was too young in his time, and instead maintained the priority of Matthew.

<sup>6</sup> Baur, *Church History*, 19–20, 44–45.

<sup>7</sup> Hans Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, vol.1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1932), ET from Bertram L. Woolf, trans., *The Beginnings of the Christian Church* (London: Lutterworth, 1937).

like other Jews, and its portico was their favourite place to meet.<sup>8</sup> The problem of praxis gradually arises when the church as a whole, founded on the resurrection of Jesus, infuses Jewish traditions (baptism, prayer, Jewish meals and fasting) into a new reality that created a growing alternative to the classic Jewish institutions.<sup>9</sup> Like Baur, Lietzmann relied heavily on Stephen's speech as being indicative of a Christianity that was ready to dispense with Judaism and its Temple. The Jerusalem church, called "the Original Church", is what Lietzmann defines as "Jewish Christianity" which "stood apart from the development of Christianity into a wider religion."<sup>10</sup> The beginnings of the death of the "Original Church" starts from the execution of James, which "brought the Church to a definite decision to leave Jerusalem."<sup>11</sup> With the destruction of the Temple, Jewish Christianity "lacked not only a racial but also a religious basis for its former claims" and was thus forgotten in the Catholic Church.<sup>12</sup>

The Temple, as it appears in Lietzmann's approach, played a decisive role in the destiny of Jewish Christianity, whether in the church's attitude towards it (Stephen and James) or in its destruction. The Christians' abandonment of the Temple happened early enough to escape the catastrophe of the Jewish war, and this was behind the idea that the destruction was a divine punishment.<sup>13</sup>

Hans Wenschkewitz investigated zones of influence behind Christianity's attitude to the Temple.<sup>14</sup> He explained that we have different and numerous lines of tradition resulting in a plurality of contexts that influenced Christianity across four major zones: the Biblical/pseudo-biblical texts, Stoicism, Philo, and Rabbinic Judaism. For Wenschkewitz, there was a red thread (*roter Faden*) running from Jesus through the entirety of Christianity: the interpretation of Jesus' death as a sacrifice (*Opfer*).<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, 63.

<sup>9</sup> Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, 65–66, 84–85.

<sup>10</sup> Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, 177.

<sup>11</sup> Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, 178.

<sup>12</sup> Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, 183.

<sup>13</sup> Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, 241ff.

<sup>14</sup> H. Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe, Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament* (Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1932).

<sup>15</sup> Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe*, 162.

Isaiah 53 and prophetic words had a great influence on this thread, where biblical terms functioned as a vehicle for sacrificial thoughts.<sup>16</sup> The early church had several interpretations which generated several lines. The central tension was between Jesus' death and the question of the law and the Temple. The struggle between Hellenistic Christians and the Judaizers (*Judaisten*) played an important role in the formation of the different lines, yet the priority of Jesus had always been above the law and the Temple.<sup>17</sup>

Wenschkewitz surveyed Stoicism and its influence on Paul's ethics and Temple imagery in which physical things are not abandoned but are given a new meaning, a spiritual one, which was not acceptable in the Hellenistic synagogues.<sup>18</sup> His study of Philo argued for an influence on Johannine literature.<sup>19</sup> He pointed out that parallel trains of thought were found in Hebrews and perhaps the Epistle of Barnabas.<sup>20</sup> The Hellenistic Jewish synagogue was very important for the creation of a Temple-free Christianity in which the synagogue was an ideal model of such worship.<sup>21</sup> Christianity did not have a single unified attitude that superseded Judaism; there were several phantom lines (*angedeuteten Linien*)<sup>22</sup> of tradition running through the different Christian communities shaped by different influences in the Greco-Roman world and not only by Palestinian Judaism.

In his study on *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*,<sup>23</sup> S. G. F. Brandon aimed to study the effect of the first Jewish war on shaping Christianity. His approach shows great interest in Bauer's thesis. In his construction of how Christianity emerged, Brandon was interested in the intentionally scanty information about the first-century church of Alexandria, as it appears from Luke's controversial depiction of Apollos.<sup>24</sup> The centrality of the Jerusalem church was well maintained until

---

<sup>16</sup> Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe*, 162.

<sup>17</sup> Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe*, 163.

<sup>18</sup> Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe*, 164.

<sup>19</sup> Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe*, 165.

<sup>20</sup> Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe*, 164.

<sup>21</sup> Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe*, 164.

<sup>22</sup> Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe*, 166.

<sup>23</sup> S. G. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London: SPCK, 1951).

<sup>24</sup> Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem*, 24–26.

the destruction of Jerusalem, as represented by James.<sup>25</sup> Christianity did not lack a political element. Thus, the Gospel of Mark cannot be interpreted but as a response to the “condemnation of Israel” by God apparent in the destruction of the Temple, which pushes the Gospel’s dating shortly after 70 CE: the Little Apocalypse of Mark 13 should be explicitly understood in light of the Temple’s destruction.<sup>26</sup> In contrast, Lukan literature represents a settled catholic Christianity which saw no threat from the Jewish Christianity of Palestine hence its less urgent tone.<sup>27</sup> Brandon saw Lukan literature as a rehabilitation of Pauline theology in a way that deals with the new situation after the Temple’s destruction and the taming of Jewish Christianity in its final stronghold (Alexandria). This explains the negative depiction of Apollos and neglect of Alexandria in Luke-Acts.<sup>28</sup>

Yves Congar’s *Le Mystère du Temple*<sup>29</sup> provided another study of the problem. Congar surveyed the concept of God’s presence in his people in both the Old and New Testaments. He argued that the age of the Patriarchs,<sup>30</sup> through Moses<sup>31</sup> and to the Temple of Solomon<sup>32</sup> showed a gradual settlement of God in Israel. The cosmic dimension of the Temple imagery and cult functioned as a bridge towards the eschatological messianic times (of Jesus).<sup>33</sup> This universality paved the way to Jesus who declared that the religious system of the Temple had come to an end.<sup>34</sup> Jesus “replaced” it with his body<sup>35</sup> and the early Christian community “superseded” the Old Dispensation.<sup>36</sup> In his exegesis of the Gospels,

---

<sup>25</sup> Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem*, 53f.

<sup>26</sup> Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem*, 201–2.

<sup>27</sup> Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem*, 206.

<sup>28</sup> Brandon’s research concludes that the Gospel of Matthew, the epistles of James, and Hebrews are all products of Alexandria (*The Fall of Jerusalem*, 217–43).

<sup>29</sup> Yves Congar, *La Mystère du Temple: ou, L’économie de la présence de Dieu à sa créature de la Genèse à l’Apocalypse* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1958), ET from Reginald Frederick Trevett, trans., *The Mystery of the Temple* (London: Burns & Gates, 1962).

<sup>30</sup> Trevett, *The Mystery of the Temple*, 3.

<sup>31</sup> Trevett, *The Mystery of the Temple*, 7f.

<sup>32</sup> Trevett, *The Mystery of the Temple*, 20.

<sup>33</sup> Trevett, *The Mystery of the Temple*, 98.

<sup>34</sup> Trevett, *The Mystery of the Temple*, 118.

<sup>35</sup> Trevett, *The Mystery of the Temple*, 129–32.

<sup>36</sup> Trevett, *The Mystery of the Temple*, 111.

Congar stated that Jesus' attitude towards the Temple was the same as his attitude towards the law.<sup>37</sup> This helped early Christians to spiritualise the Temple and law. Congar, who was a devoted Catholic friar, provided a classic example of supersessionism in which the Temple no longer held significance since the conception of the ministry of Jesus, while the church and its sacraments were the valid alternative.

John Townsend's dissertation of 1958 was the first to confront the view that Christianity abandoned the Temple well before its destruction. Townsend saw that scholarship "never considered the possibility that Jesus and the early Christians truly accepted the Jewish Temple as part of their own religion."<sup>38</sup> He argued that the New Testament shows no evidence of any anti-Temple attitude in writings before 70 CE; rather, new theologies which came after the destruction were responsible for the negative view of the Temple. His survey of the Pauline writings showed that Paul's inconsistent use of the term "temple" (once for the community and another for the individuals) cannot be understood as more than a metaphor.<sup>39</sup> The fact that Paul associated the culmination of evil with the desecration of the Temple (in 2 Thess 2:4 and 1 Cor 3:17) demonstrates his devotion to it.<sup>40</sup> Likewise, the Synoptic Gospels preserve sources that show positive views of the Temple. Townsend views any negative contradictions within the Synoptic tradition as views espoused after the Temple's destruction. Jesus' presence in the Temple, for example, where it is referred to positively as "my Father's house" (Luke 2:49), must have been the earliest tradition. However, distinguishing Christ's resurrected body from the Temple "that is made with hands" (Mark 14:58) is a later enlargement of the false accusation made against Jesus.<sup>41</sup> Likewise, in his investigation of Luke-Acts, Townsend disagrees with earlier attempts to distinguish a pre-70 CE tradition which had a negative tone against

---

<sup>37</sup> Trevett, *The Mystery of the Temple*, 115.

<sup>38</sup> John J. Townsend, "The Jerusalem Temple in New Testament Thought" (PhD diss., Harvard Divinity School, 1958), 1; John J. Townsend, "The Jerusalem Temple in the First Century," in *God and His Temple: Reflections on Professor Samuel Terrien's The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology*, ed. L. E. Frizzell (South Orange, NJ: Seton Hall, 1981), 48–65.

<sup>39</sup> Townsend, "The Jerusalem Temple," 39ff.

<sup>40</sup> Townsend, "The Jerusalem Temple," 71–72.

<sup>41</sup> Townsend, "The Jerusalem Temple," 106–9.

the Temple. All the speeches of Acts, including Stephen's, are free Lukan compositions and do not reflect any historical kernel about the figures giving them.<sup>42</sup> The linguistic connections and interdependence between these speeches are the arguments for Townsend's case. This also applies to the Johannine literature and Hebrews.<sup>43</sup>

Townsend's observation that there was a pro-Temple attitude within early Christianity is certainly important, and it is regrettable that it was never published. His emphasis on the impact of the destruction in shaping Christian theology is important and strengthens the historical reading against the theological one. However, his clear-cut distinction between pre- and post-70 CE attitudes and his collective language about *the* Christian church (as if it had a single catholic opinion) raise numerous difficulties. His exegetical attempts to push any negative view of the Temple to the period after 70 CE may be questioned. For example, his attempt to eradicate any possible historical roots behind Stephen's speech is based on his view that the speech reflects Lukan theology alone in this case, one would expect to see a consistent anti-Temple presentation in Luke-Acts. However, we find contrasting attitudes of Luke towards the Temple in the description of the church meeting in Solomon's portico, for example (Acts 5:12-16).

In 1965, Bertil Gärtner offered a comparative study on the Temple symbolism of the Qumran texts and the New Testament.<sup>44</sup> The main question he examined was 'how did Temple symbolism shape the Qumran and early Christian communities?'.<sup>45</sup> To answer this question, Gärtner first offered a study of the Temple and priesthood in Qumran texts. He examined the detailed observance of the law, the role played by the priests in the community,<sup>46</sup> the demand for holiness which was "subject to the demands of the cultus," the strict selectivity of the community membership,<sup>47</sup> the liturgical life linked to the

---

<sup>42</sup> Townsend, "The Jerusalem Temple," 131–33.

<sup>43</sup> Townsend, "The Jerusalem Temple," 209–88.

<sup>44</sup> Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

<sup>45</sup> Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, x.

<sup>46</sup> Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 4.

<sup>47</sup> Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 7.

Temple sacrificial system<sup>48</sup> and table fellowship.<sup>49</sup> This study led Gärtner to conclude that the community system of Qumran was not merely a metaphor but a reality that replaced the defiled Temple.

But was this replacement indefinite?<sup>50</sup> This depends on how we interpret what the community of Qumran expected about the nature of the awaited eschatological temple. Gärtner's careful study of 4QFlorilegium convinced him that the awaited Temple was the community itself.<sup>51</sup> Gärtner then argued that this was the key to explaining the New Testament's understanding of the Temple. For Gärtner, Qumran's Temple symbolism, particularly in 4QFlorilegium, penetrates into the different Temple-as-community texts in the New Testament<sup>52</sup> and provides the best explanation for their existence:

Nowhere, it seems to me, is there textual material which is of such comparative value as that from Qumran. The bond which binds together Qumran and the New Testament is undoubtedly the intense self-consciousness of the two communities represented; both considered themselves to have been set up in opposition to the temple of the old covenant and its cultus; both believed themselves to have replaced the old temple, for in both the community was the temple. This applies quite apart from the general resemblance between the Epistle to the Hebrews and Qumran.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 9.

<sup>49</sup> Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 10–11.

<sup>50</sup> Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 14: “The Qumran community now attempted to set itself up as the true Israel, and it is probably true to say that the leaders of the community were temple priests who had settled down by the shores of the Dead Sea in the hope of creating a new spiritual centre to replace the desecrated temple until the day when God would finally reveal himself and confirm Israel's victory.”

<sup>51</sup> Cf. “And foreigners shall not make it desolate again, as they desolated formerly (6) the sanctuary of Israel because of their sin. And he promised to build for himself a sanctuary of men (טקדש אדם), for there to be in it for him smoking offerings before him, works of thanksgiving (4QFlor 1:6-7).” ET from G. J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). Gärtner's explanation of 4Q Florilegium is insightful. However, the problem that persists is that the eschatological temple is still in the future. How could it be awaited while they experienced it? The texts do not provide a “realised eschatology” to support that reading since the hope is still in the future, even if that future is impending.

<sup>52</sup> Mainly 1 Cor 3:16-17; Eph 2:18-22; 2 Cor 6:14–7:1; 1 Tim 3:15; 1 Pet 2:3-6; Heb 12:18-24.

<sup>53</sup> Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 99.

Gärtner's thesis influenced later studies on Christian-Qumran relations.<sup>54</sup> His thorough analysis of the Temple texts between the two communities showed a strong common tradition that cannot be overlooked. However, his work, which contrasts with Congar's exclusively canonical approach, also suffers from problems. First, Gärtner went too far to explain all attitudes expressed in the New Testament as being consistent with Qumran texts. Secondly, he focused on Paul and the Catholic Epistles in his research, using these as the most reliable way of representing early Christianity; even the Gospels and Acts are virtually ignored.

Lloyd Gaston's comprehensive analysis of the significance of the fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels represents the developing interest in analysing the Christian attitude toward the Temple from a historical perspective.<sup>55</sup> Appearing in 1969, Gaston's work extends its analysis to non-canonical materials in an attempt to understand how the Synoptic traditions evolved. Like Townsend, his starting point was to analyse the historicity of Jesus' apparent statement on the imminent destruction of the Temple. Also like Townsend, he concludes that it was not Jesus whose teachings brought about anti-Temple statements within the Synoptic Gospels and the speech of Stephen, but other theologies of the early church, like the anti-Temple Ebionite tradition.<sup>56</sup> The library of Qumran could also explain the possible influence.<sup>57</sup> His analysis of Stephen's speech led him to conclude that Stephen brought with him a Samaritan tradition which does not lack a rejection of the Temple of Jerusalem.<sup>58</sup> Unlike Townsend, Gaston acknowledged diversity before the destruction, and opened the way to addressing the problem of diversity in Christian attitudes to the Temple.

---

<sup>54</sup> Cf. G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).

<sup>55</sup> Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (Leiden: Brill, 1970).

<sup>56</sup> Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 140ff. On the Ebionites' attitude see *Clem. Recogn.* 1.38.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 119ff.

<sup>58</sup> Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 154–60.

Some later studies also focused on the problem of the “new Temple”.<sup>59</sup> Discussion appeared in studies that dealt with the Temple notion in each of the New Testament texts separately, after putting them squarely in their *Sitz im Leben*.<sup>60</sup> The diversity of Christian attitudes could be seen by exploring the New Testament canonical writings on both levels: history and locality. Important collected essays were published to emphasise this matter, such as *Gemeinde Ohne Tempel*<sup>61</sup> and *Templum Amicitiae*.<sup>62</sup>

James D. G. Dunn’s *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*<sup>63</sup> shows that earliest Christians had a normal Jewish adherence to the law and a firm attachment to the Temple which they found to be the right place for teaching and evangelising (Acts 2:46; 3:1; 5:12, 20f., 25, 42). Their belief in Jesus’ Messiahship did not exclude them from the spectrum of Judaism in the eyes of the Pharisees.<sup>64</sup> From these three characteristics Dunn concludes that the divisive matter between Christianity and Judaism was praxis rather than credal Orthodoxy.<sup>65</sup> Because of this, we find that the difference between Judaism and Christianity is inextricably connected with the diversity of early Christianity itself. This appears in the debates over the identity of the so-called Jewish-Christian sects of 150 years later, and whether they are Christians (for believing in Jesus’ Messiahship) or Jews (because of their adherence

---

<sup>59</sup> A. Cole, *The New Temple* (Cambridge: Tyndale House, 1950). Later, R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969); Ernst Lohmeyer, *Lord of the Temple* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1961).

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988); J. R. Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery* (New York: Peter Lang); K. S. Han, *Jerusalem and the Early Jesus Movement: The Q Community's Attitude Towards the Temple* (New York: Continuum, 1997). A. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2002); K. S. Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective* (Leiden: Brill, 2005); T. C. Gray, *Temple in the Gospel of Mark: A Study in Its Narrative Role* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

<sup>61</sup> Beate Ego, and Armin Lange, *Gemeinde Ohne Tempel* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).

<sup>62</sup> W. Horbury, *Templum Amicitiae* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991).

<sup>63</sup> James D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (London: SCM, 1990), xi.

<sup>64</sup> Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 238–39.

<sup>65</sup> “Judaism has always been concerned more with *orthopraxis* than with *orthodoxy*, the earliest Christians were not simply Jews, but in fact continued to be quite 'orthodox' Jews” (Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 239).

to the Jewish law).<sup>66</sup> However, the various perceptions of the Temple cult play an important role not only in marking the differences between a Jewish and a Hellenic Christianity but even within the Jewish-Christian sects, for we have early patristic reports showing that the Ebionites had a hostile attitude towards the Temple cult.<sup>67</sup>

Dunn's treatment of Stephen's speech in Acts concludes that there was diversity in the church: Stephen's speech and the reports about Hellenists in Acts 6–8 run against Luke's general pro-Temple attitude. This drives Dunn to conclude that Luke drew his narrative from accurate historical records.<sup>68</sup> Attributing the accusations against Jesus (Mark 14:58 and Acts 6:14) to Stephen's section shows that a new trajectory of Hellenic Christianity emerged from an interpretation of a Jesus-tradition, one that is not simply derived from a general philosophy.<sup>69</sup> Likewise, the Temple was the centre of the formation of apocalyptic theology evident in the earliest apocalyptic literature.<sup>70</sup> Apocalypticism is not a derivation from other trajectories but can be seen as originating with Jesus.<sup>71</sup> In his depiction of growing Catholicism, Dunn shows how Luke defined it within a model which asserts the centrality of Jerusalem and its Temple.<sup>72</sup> Dunn's study shows that the central role of the Temple of Jerusalem can hardly be exaggerated in the development of Catholicism itself and that this is what is represented in Luke-Acts.

---

<sup>66</sup> Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 240–41. It is noteworthy to see that Irenaeus records that the Ebionites revered Jerusalem “as if it were the house of God” (*Haer.*1.26.2), which means that they had an uncut allegiance to the Temple of Jerusalem even after its destruction.

<sup>67</sup> Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 243.

<sup>68</sup> Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 270.

<sup>69</sup> It is not clear, however, how he continued in drawing the trajectory of Hellenistic or Pauline Christianities. In dealing with Q, Dunn showed nearly complete allegiance to Koester and Robinson's “gnosticising proclivity” of the *Logoi Sophon* that took a direction towards Q and another gnostic one towards Thomas.

<sup>70</sup> Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 326–31.

<sup>71</sup> Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 321–22. In this point, it appears to me that Dunn belongs to the trajectory of “Jesus the Apocalypticist” scholarship landmarked by Albert Schweitzer.

<sup>72</sup> Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 352f. Dunn also says, “I therefore see nothing for it but to accept that *Luke is both early catholic and enthusiastic in outlook* - however strange the paradox” (357, emphasis mine).

In his *The Partings of the Ways*,<sup>73</sup> Dunn employs “the four pillars of Second Temple Judaism”<sup>74</sup> rubric as a tool to assess the divergences between the church and the synagogue. The Temple is the main factor in the four pillars.<sup>75</sup> In light of earlier research, it is completely legitimate to use the Temple as a tool to investigate the differences and partings. As seen before, from Lietzmann onwards, the Temple is seen to embody the *Orthopraxis* which defines boundaries and differences between early Jewish and Christian communities. Dunn argues that the Temple represented the existence of Israel and lay at the heart of Judaism. This includes later Rabbinic Judaism and all the sects, including those who considered that the Herodian Temple was defiled, since they did not abandon the rationale of a Temple.<sup>76</sup> In terms of Jesus’ attitude toward the Temple, Dunn’s assessment was that Jesus appears to be critical of cultic practices but by no means threatens the Temple’s existence.<sup>77</sup> This drives Dunn to conclude that Jesus’ attitude fits well within the diversity of Second Temple Judaism.<sup>78</sup>

In dealing with the church, Dunn divided early Christian attitudes into two categories:

1. Those who called the Temple an entity “made with hands”, namely the earliest Jesus movement and the Hellenists, though the latter group, represented by Stephen, had a different view regarding the meaning and role of the Temple to that of the former group.<sup>79</sup>
2. Those who believed the true temple to be “made without hands”, namely the writers who had a spiritual understanding of the Temple. This includes Paul, who had a transformative spiritual understanding of the Temple in the light of Christianity, the author of Hebrews, who believed in a

---

<sup>73</sup> James Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways*, 2nd ed. (London: SCM, 2006).

<sup>74</sup> Shema, law, covenant and the Temple. The latter represents the aspect of praxis which was the main factor in marking the divergences within Christian trajectories as seen in Dunn’s *Unity and Diversity*.

<sup>75</sup> Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 2nd ed., xiv. Cf. R. Bauckham, “The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why,” *St. Th.* 47 (1993): 135–51.

<sup>76</sup> Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 2nd ed., 46–49.

<sup>77</sup> Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 2nd ed. 73–75. Here, Dunn appears more certain in defining Jesus’ attitude than in *Unity and Diversity* where he stated that Jesus’ tradition was left open for different interpretations that generated the different attitudes in the very early stage (*Unity and Diversity*, 272).

<sup>78</sup> Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 2nd ed., 74.

<sup>79</sup> Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 2nd ed., 76f.

new true worship in the heavenly temple (not the Jerusalem one which was a mere copy), and John, who believed that the true temple had a Christological perspective, i.e. the body of Jesus.<sup>80</sup>

E. P. Sanders' pioneering study on so-called common Judaism included a substantial discussion on the question of the meaning of the Temple for the early Jesus movement. While Dunn focused on Christian unity and diversity in relation to Judaism's pillars of faith, Sanders focused on Judaism itself and how Jesus' life could be interpreted from within its traditions. The matrix of traditions, social norms and faith which Sanders called "common Judaism" was "what the priests and the people agreed on."<sup>81</sup> This normal Judaism is also normative in the sense that it established "a standard by which loyalty to Israel and to the God of Israel was measured."<sup>82</sup> It included a common opinion on faith in the One God, his Scripture and law.<sup>83</sup> This common Judaism reached all Jews, and therefore Sanders accepts what Morton Smith says: "Down to the fall of the Temple, the normative Judaism of Palestine is that compromise of which the three principal elements are the Pentateuch, the Temple, and the 'amme ha'arez, the ordinary Jews who were not members of any sect."<sup>84</sup> Physically, alongside the home and synagogue, the Temple was the focus of religion.<sup>85</sup> Of course, the frequency of attendance varies from Palestine to the Diaspora, but the Temple still embodies Judaism's practices and identity. The Temple is basically what makes Judaism distinctive. While Egypt, Mesopotamia and Greece had a multitude of temples, Judaism had only one Temple, representing its unity: one God and one cult.<sup>86</sup> The Temple was also the centre of what Sanders calls "common piety", that is, the centre of piety and devotion in Judaism.

---

<sup>80</sup> Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 2nd ed., 100f.

<sup>81</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 63 BCE–66 CE (London: SCM, 1992), 47.

<sup>82</sup> Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 47.

<sup>83</sup> Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 47–48.

<sup>84</sup> M. Smith, "The Dead Sea Sect in Relation to Ancient Judaism," *NTS* (1960–61): 347–60. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 48.

<sup>85</sup> Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 48.

<sup>86</sup> Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 49–50.

The practice of God's law, and of sacrifices and taxation gathered from all the Jews around the world were for the purpose of sustaining the Temple.<sup>87</sup> As Sanders said, "[if] one were thinking of Jews outside Palestine, whether in the rest of the Roman Empire or in Mesopotamia, the Temple tax, along with observance of Sabbath and food laws, would be a major sign of Jewish identity. Paying it marked one as a Jew; not paying it would lead others to think that one had apostatized."<sup>88</sup> Did this centrality in the life and thought of the Jews stop with the destruction of the Second Temple? According to historical sources, the Romans converted the Temple tax payment to the *fiscus Judaicus*.<sup>89</sup> However, the struggle with collecting the *fiscus Judaicus* taxation<sup>90</sup> and the Jews' intentions to rebuild it suggest otherwise. Commemoration of the first and second destructions of the Temple in Jewish annual fasts is important.<sup>91</sup> This is the matrix of common Judaism which not only Jesus was a part of, but also early Christians too.

Sanders<sup>92</sup> detected a scholarly shift found in German scholar Günther Bornkamm,<sup>93</sup> who departed from his predecessors Boussett and Bultmann, particularly concerning Jesus' critical attitude towards

---

<sup>87</sup> Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 149.

<sup>88</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies* (London: SCM, 1990), 49.

<sup>89</sup> Josephus, *B.J.* 7.218; Suetonius, *Dom.* 12.1-2; Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 67.14.1-2.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. M. Heemstra, *The Fiscus Judaicus and the Parting of the Ways* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010). This will be dealt with in the section on the Epistle of Barnabas.

<sup>91</sup> "According to Ta'anit 4.7, during the week which included the 9th of Ab (the anniversary of the two destructions of the Temple, which were thought to have happened on the same day) men neither cut their hair nor washed their clothes. It appears that people did not abstain from food entirely, though the Rabbis debated the degree of abstention." (Sanders, *Jewish Law*, 83). The Tractate Ta'anit IV.7 says: "Five calamities happened to our ancestors on the 17th of Tamuz, and five on the 9th of Abh: on the 17th of Tamuz the tables of the Holy Law were broken; on that day the continual daily offerings ceased, and the city of Jerusalem was stormed; on the same date Apostamos burned the Holy Scrolls and placed an idol in the Temple;--on the 9th of Abh it was decreed that our ancestors should not enter the Holy Land; on that day the first and second Temples were destroyed, the city of Bethar was taken, and the site (of Jerusalem) was ploughed up (like a field). From the 1st of Abh it is incumbent upon a person to lessen his participation in joyful events." M. L. Rodkinson, trans., *Babylonian Talmud*, vol. 8 (Boston: The Talmud Society, 1918), 80.

<sup>92</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).

<sup>93</sup> G. Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* (San Francisco: Harper & Row 1960).

the law.<sup>94</sup> In Bornkamm's understanding, the purpose of Jesus' visit to Jerusalem was to inaugurate the Kingdom of God.<sup>95</sup> Cleansing the Temple was carried out to prepare it for the Kingdom, and it was precisely that action which provoked the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem.<sup>96</sup> Sanders picks up this point from Bornkamm and joins it with his studies on common Judaism, concluding that the Temple action should be the surest point of departure and the interpretive means to understand the emergence of the Jesus movement.<sup>97</sup> After discussing the authenticity of Jesus' threats of the destruction of the Temple, the message should be understood as a prediction of God's coming judgement.<sup>98</sup>

Sanders' analysis of Jesus' predictions and his action leads him to conclude that Jesus himself did not aim to destroy the Temple, yet it was about to be destroyed in the breaking eschatology in order that the new Temple would arise; this is the Restoration theology that would have been remembered by Jesus' followers. Sanders is clearly concerned to understand the presentation of Luke-Acts as authentic: "Our interpretation has the additional advantage of making sense of the acceptance of temple worship by the early apostles (Acts 2:46; 3:1; 21:26). They did not think that Jesus had considered it impure, but only that the days of the present temple were numbered."<sup>99</sup> Amongst a series of blasphemous acts carried out by Jesus, his action in the Temple was identified as the factor that led to his execution.<sup>100</sup> Sanders reminds us that its effect should be understood in light of the fact that its outcome did not interrupt the continuation of Jesus' disciples as an identifiable group within Judaism.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 97.

<sup>95</sup> Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 158.

<sup>96</sup> Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 158.

<sup>97</sup> Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 61.

<sup>98</sup> Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 73.

<sup>99</sup> Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 76.

<sup>100</sup> Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 305.

<sup>101</sup> Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 301: "The best that we can hope to achieve is a general view of cause and effect, based on incidents which surely preceded the execution (the action of the temple being the most important) and the outcome (the continuation of Jesus' disciples as an identifiable group within Judaism)."

On the heels of Sanders, two recent monographs in particular have taken up the question of Jesus' attitude to the Temple. Nicholas Perrin's *Jesus the Temple* and Timothy Wardle's published thesis *Continuity and Discontinuity: The Temple and Early Christian Identity*.<sup>102</sup>

Wardle described "the Christian community" as a counter-Temple movement. As well as examining Second Temple literature, he adds an analysis of the motivations behind the building of two other temples: the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim and the Oniad temple of Leontopolis in Egypt which existed also as counters to the Jerusalem Temple with the purpose of replacing it.<sup>103</sup> However, Wardle's work deals with Christianity as a monolithic entity throughout the hundred years of literature after Jesus, and throughout his thesis he uses one phrase to describe it (77 times): "the Christian community." Unifying Christianity into that single community required only one context to explain it which in this is case the Palestinian Jewish milieu. This approach was explained in light of the model of Christianity he acquired, epitomizing the work of James Dunn and Richard Bauckham.<sup>104</sup> He returned to Dunn in the model of the parting of the ways in which the Temple played a vital role in forming the process of the parting,<sup>105</sup> while Bauckham<sup>106</sup> provided him with the argument for "the Christian perception of itself as a new temple [which] was well within the bounds of common Judaism."<sup>107</sup> The former resulted in the monolithic approach to "the Christian community", the latter in providing the exclusive Palestinian Jewish context to explain the Christian attitude. Besides, his view of Christian literature was limited to canonical writings.

---

<sup>102</sup> Nicholas Perrin, *Jesus the Temple* (London: SPCK, 2010); Timothy Wardle, "Continuity and Discontinuity: The Temple and Early Christian Identity" (PhD diss., Duke University, 2008). It was published T. Wardle, *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

<sup>103</sup> "Founded by the legitimate Zadokite priest, fuelled by a prophecy from Isaiah, and designed to replicate the temple in Jerusalem, the Oniad temple presented itself as an alternative to the one in Jerusalem" (Wardle, "Continuity and Discontinuity," 207).

<sup>104</sup> Wardle, "Continuity and Discontinuity," 9.

<sup>105</sup> Wardle, "Continuity and Discontinuity," 9.

<sup>106</sup> Richard Bauckham, "The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. J. R. Davila (Leiden: Brill. 2003), 63–89.

<sup>107</sup> Bauckham, "The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes," 10.

Nicholas Perrin also understood “the Christian community” as another counter-Temple movement on the same trajectory as John the Baptist and Qumran. He aimed to show that Jesus’ action and prophetic sayings about the Temple cannot be understood on their own. Jesus is the continuum between John and the early church. Perrin surveyed three of what he calls “counter temple movements”: the communities behind the Odes of Solomon and the Qumran literature, and also the movement of John the Baptist.<sup>108</sup> Excluding Q and Mark because of technical difficulties,<sup>109</sup> he concluded that the early church understood itself as lying in the middle of two extremes: the belief that identifying itself with the Temple is a mere metaphor and the belief that it replaced the Temple.<sup>110</sup> In the latter case, Christians functioned as a temple in an ontological sense in order to communicate with the heavenly one which broke into history through the atoning death of Jesus.<sup>111</sup> Like Wardle, Perrin writes about “*the Christians*” in their unified, yet dynamically growing understanding of the Temple set in line with the counter-Temple movements (what he calls ‘pre-Christian sects’). This reading proposes one Christianity from the Pauline texts up to the early second century.

James Charlesworth’s edited volume *Jesus and Temple*<sup>112</sup> appeared in 2014 and aimed to gather insights from different fields. Mordechai Aviam’s essay, “Reverence for Jerusalem and the Temple in Galilean Society,” focuses on recent discoveries, including the stone found in the first-century (BCE) synagogue of Migdal. The stone, which incorporates Temple imagery, gives us a better understanding of how societies outside Jerusalem were attached to the Temple. The second part of Charlesworth’s volume features a collection of essays on the Christian perspective of the Temple. Charlesworth rejects the views of earlier literature that Jesus was anti-Temple,<sup>113</sup> believing they do not do justice to

---

<sup>108</sup> Based on Joan E. Taylor, *The Immerser* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), Perrin argued that the possibility of attributing the origins of the Lord’s Prayer to John puts him, beside other factors, well in the stream of counter temple movements (*Jesus the Temple*, 37–44).

<sup>109</sup> Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*, 49–50.

<sup>110</sup> Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*, 47.

<sup>111</sup> Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*, 48–49.

<sup>112</sup> James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Jesus and Temple: Textual and Archaeological Explorations* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2014).

<sup>113</sup> Charlesworth, *Jesus and Temple*, 151ff.

the Jewish reality of Jesus. In the case of Perrin in particular, Charlesworth refutes his attempt to put multiple counter-Temple traditions on a single trajectory.<sup>114</sup>

In his rejection of these earlier views, Charlesworth has endeavoured to show how Jesus was attached to the Temple throughout his life, and that this is rightly reflected in Luke-Acts: it features in Luke's birth narrative and the early chapters of Acts. He also refuses to interpret Jesus' cleansing of the Temple as an act against the Temple. Rather, it was an act of zeal for the purity of the House of God.<sup>115</sup>

To support his hypothesis about Jesus' pro-Temple attitude, Charlesworth endeavours to show that the first Christian generations held a positive view of the Temple as well.<sup>116</sup> Radical views against the Temple, such as Stephen's, were toned down to target the corruption or rejection of the Messiah.<sup>117</sup> Paul's rhetoric about the Temple as community was seen to co-exist with the positive view of the Temple of Jerusalem.<sup>118</sup> While Charlesworth's emphasis on Jesus' strong Jewish interest in the Temple is justifiable, harmonising all the traditions in order to provide a single view is certainly impossible. He rejects Perrin's method of putting all the alleged counter-Temple movements on one trajectory while he tries to do the same on a wider scale. Further, his focus on New Testament literature exclusively, particularly on Acts, to represent the whole historical scene brings us back to the problems we found in earlier literature.

A recent work on this topic is Simon J. Joseph's *Jesus and the Temple*.<sup>119</sup> Josephus starts from Q, where he senses a "serious indictment" against the establishment in the prophetic sayings Q 13:34-35 (your house is left to you) and 11:49-51 (the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, who perished

---

<sup>114</sup> Charlesworth, *Jesus and Temple*, 153–54.

<sup>115</sup> Charlesworth, *Jesus and Temple*, 161–62.

<sup>116</sup> Charlesworth, *Jesus and Temple*, 156–58.

<sup>117</sup> Charlesworth, *Jesus and Temple*, 189.

<sup>118</sup> Charlesworth, *Jesus and Temple*, 192–95.

<sup>119</sup> Simon J. Joseph, *Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in its Jewish Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

between the altar and the sanctuary).<sup>120</sup> Jerusalem has rejected Jesus, and its Temple is now “forsaken.”<sup>121</sup> A forsaken temple is not one in which sacrifices are either efficacious or capable of reconciling Israel and God. The Temple is a place where the prophets are killed. Moving to Mark, Joseph concludes that Mark’s theology is clearly against the Temple and that the Markan Jesus has no place for the Temple in his vision of the eschaton. Albeit more conservatively, Matthew follows Mark. When it comes to Luke-Acts, Joseph deems the Lukan attitude ambiguous. Surveying the rest of the New Testament texts, he concludes: “The New Testament evidence for the historical Jesus’ relationship to the Temple is inconsistent and ambiguous.”<sup>122</sup> However, this did not tempt Joseph, like his predecessors, to harmonise evidence of available attitudes to come up with a solution. He goes beyond that to discuss Temple attitudes in Jewish Christian groups in order to find a picture of an affiliation with Temple worship that comes with a call for deep reformation.

The most recent publication on this topic reflects the persistence of the same methodological problems mentioned before. Steve Smith approaches Luke-Acts’ view of the Temple’s fate through focusing on what he defines as “temple-critical passages” intertextually and intratextually.<sup>123</sup> His definition of intertextuality is studying Luke-Acts against the OT texts and contexts while intratextuality means studying the correspondence between Luke and Acts. Smith himself acknowledges that he offers a “selective reading” which focuses only on what he sees as negative notions to the Temple.<sup>124</sup> Avoiding non-canonical materials, he challenges Edward Adams’ emphasis on the importance of post-destruction Jewish texts for being contemporary to the Gospels<sup>125</sup> by claiming that they offer no significant contribution to the text under investigation (Luke 21:20-8).<sup>126</sup> Without giving an explanation, he dismisses *a priori* the possible contribution of Greco-Roman

---

<sup>120</sup> Joseph, *Jesus and the Temple*, 105.

<sup>121</sup> Joseph, *Jesus and the Temple*, 102.

<sup>122</sup> Joseph, *Jesus and the Temple*, 132.

<sup>123</sup> Steve Smith, *The Fate of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2017), 3-5.

<sup>124</sup> Smith, *The Fate*, 5.

<sup>125</sup> Edward Adams, *The Stars will Fall from Heaven* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2007), 18-9, 159.

<sup>126</sup> Smith, *The Fate*, 100.

literature for parallels<sup>127</sup> and reminds the reader in other cases that “optimal relevance will only be found through exploration against OT context.”<sup>128</sup> It is difficult to justify his concept of an “interpretive context” which is solely the Old Testament text,<sup>129</sup> at least historically.

## **1.2 The Status Quaestionis**

The current state of scholarship on the question of early Christian attitudes to the Temple clearly focuses on attempts to understand Jesus’ attitude in his own historical context. There have also been attempts to use literature to position particular groups as pro- or anti-Temple in Jerusalem. Scholars repeatedly return to Luke-Acts for their arguments, especially the speech of Stephen or the matter of the representation of Christians meeting in Solomon’s portico.

To be more specific, we can observe the following. First, the supersessionist model presented in Eusebius’ “ecclesiastical view” presents a simplistic depiction of the church as a unified group in its rejection of the Temple (as well as Judaism and heresies) from the earliest times. His view shows a clear attempt to harmonise diverse views that pre-existed him under a catholic identity.

Second, modern scholarship since Ferdinand Christian Baur has two major lines of approach:

1. The approach that acknowledges the diversity and complexity of early Christianity. This line was not developed to be applied to questions about particular themes like the Temple, with the exception of James Dunn’s early works.
2. The majority line, which focuses on canon as a context to interpret the attitude of each text with a limited interest in specific pre-destruction Jewish texts (prominently Qumran’s collection). It suffers harmonisation of diverse views in order to give a single monolithic image of a ‘Christian’ Temple attitude. Even if the scholar presents this attitude to the Temple as a positive one, as in the case of Charlesworth, it remains unjustifiably and simplistically unified.

---

<sup>127</sup> Smith, *The Fate*, 132

<sup>128</sup> Smith, *The Fate*, 105

<sup>129</sup> Smith, *The Fate*, 66.

Third, scholars have been heavily reliant on Luke-Acts to draw their views despite the difficulties this work imposes. The overall positive Temple attitude of Luke-Acts and the speech of Stephen were two poles that created the difficulty.

Therefore, we need to consider methodologically what process of study might best provide clarity when previous studies have not resulted in persuasive results. To base an understanding of early Christian attitudes on an analysis of the attitude of the historical Jesus is not the subject of the present enquiry; our interest is in texts. The aim will be to explore the Temple attitude in Luke-Acts by first understanding the text as literature arising within a particular context at a particular time. In order to refine our awareness of this context other texts will be examined first, situating them also within contexts and time periods. This approach makes no distinction between canonical or extra-canonical texts, and it will not attempt to unify the results in a particular direction (for or against the Temple). In each case the aim will be to look for nuances.

### **1.3 Method**

The present work is primarily a historical exercise as much as a literary one, with an *a priori* assumption that regionality plays an important part in texts. Therefore, we will study the double work of Luke-Acts, which has been pivotal in studies dealing with this topic, by placing it against a set of texts selected to highlight its characteristics. Luke-Acts is chosen as a text for primary focus not only because it frequently appears as the crux of discussion but also because of its particular idiosyncrasies that have recently elicited considerable scholarly discussion. While specific examination of the date and place of Luke-Acts will be discussed in due course, it may be noted from the outset that there is a consensus that it should be situated towards the last decade of the first century and the early part of the second century.

As such, it is vital that it is considered alongside literature that comes from a similar time period, some decades after the events of 70 CE but before the events of the Bar Kokhba war of 132–135 CE. The suggested dating of Luke-Acts places it, in fact, in the context of the writings usually deemed the

‘Apostolic Fathers’: 1 Clement, the Didache, the writings of Ignatius of Antioch and the Epistle of Barnabas, some of which were included in early Christian canons.<sup>130</sup>

To some degree, this approach is, in fact, already prefigured by patterns of interpretation that are extremely ancient. Most significant is what we find already in the writings of Tertullian from the third century. Tertullian helps us even in our basic understanding of the category of these writings. The term ‘Apostolic Fathers’ has been considered a fairly recently designation. Most recent works follow Lightfoot’s suggestion<sup>131</sup> that the term appeared as late as the seventeenth century in J. B. Cotelier’s *Patres, qui temporibus Apostolicis floruerunt*.<sup>132</sup> H. de Jonge attributes that term to another seventeenth-century British scholar called William Wake.<sup>133</sup> Robert Grant goes much earlier, to the Monophysite scholar Severus of Antioch,<sup>134</sup> while Bart Ehrman corrects Grant’s observation to make the seventh-century Anastasius of Sinai the earliest witness to the term.<sup>135</sup> However, not only did Tertullian use the term, he also gave it a solid explanation that would lead us to think that he might have forged it himself.

For Tertullian, the Gospel of the Lord was handed over to the apostles, but it was also sometimes preached by their companions who took the apostles as their teachers, and hence they are “*apostolicus*” (*Marc.* 4.2.1), not apostles. Tertullian goes beyond the definition to explain the authority of those “*apostolic ones*” and the implications in terms of his own debate with Marcion. Those apostolic men cannot stand alone (*non tamen solos*) but must preach in the fellowship of the apostles lest that teaching be for vainglory (*Marc.* 4.2.1). Therefore, each Apostolic Father needs to show how, and in whose authority, amongst the apostles, his teaching comes.

---

<sup>130</sup> On the reception of the Epistle of Barnabas and 1 Clement see their introduction sections (pages 77, 104 respectively).

<sup>131</sup> J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers, Part 1, S. Clement of Rome*, vol. 1 (London: Macmillan, 1890), 3.

<sup>132</sup> J. B. Cotelier, *SS. Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt, Barnabæ, Clementis, Hermæ, Ignatii, Polycarpi opera edita et non edita, vera et supposita, græce et latine, cum notis* (Paris: n.p., 1699). See also, D. Lincicum, “The Paratextual Invention of the Term ‘Apostolic Fathers’,” *JTS* 66.1 (2015), 139–48.

<sup>133</sup> H. de Jonge, “On the Origins of the Term ‘Apostolic Fathers,’” *JTS* 29 (1978): 503–5.

<sup>134</sup> R. Grant, “The Apostolic Fathers’ First Thousand Years,” *Church History* 31 (1962): 421–29.

<sup>135</sup> Bart Ehrman, trans., *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, LCL (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2003), 1.

Tertullian applies his definition already to two of the four canonical Gospels: “*Denique, nobis fidem ex apostolis Ioannes et Matthaeus insinuant, ex apostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant*” (Marc. 4.2.2). Both Mark and Luke are “apostolic men” renewing the Gospel rather than introducing it, as in the case of Matthew and John, *the apostles*. We may well dispute the historicity of the authors of these Gospels or the literary relationship between them, but the point in Tertullian’s argument is clear: canonical Gospels themselves could belong to a different historical phase. Most importantly, he even acknowledges the theological diversity between these works, which is not a problem as long as they agree on the fundamental elements of faith (Marc. 4.2.2).

Tertullian goes further in the case of the Gospel of Luke, which is at the centre of his debate with Marcion, to say that Luke’s reliance on the authority of Paul is not enough: even if Marcion introduced his Gospel as Paul’s, he would still need to show where Paul himself got the Gospel from since Paul was a later apostle (*posterioris apostoli*), and the Gospel of Luke which Marcion allegedly mutilated needed to be held against a standard (Marc. 4.2.4-5). The Gospel of Luke was not of an apostle but was apostolic: “*non apostolus sed apostolicus*” (Marc. 4.2.2). Thus, Tertullian justifies his edition of the Gospel of Luke in light of the fact that it agrees with the apostles who accredited Paul, while Marcion despises them (Marc. 4.3.1f).

Perhaps Francis Watson is right in suggesting that Tertullian downgraded Luke to undermine the authority of Marcion’s work,<sup>136</sup> but Tertullian seems to appeal to a general understanding of authority. Tertullian categorised what we already find tacitly in Irenaeus, who puts Mark and Luke as a later generation than Peter and Paul, who had already left Rome (*Haer.* 3.1.1), which Watson also acknowledges.<sup>137</sup>

The notion of an ‘apostolicus’ level of Gospel texts is also found in the ways they are cited in patristic literature. The findings of the Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, published in 1905, shows that while Johannine and Matthean attestations are “likely” to be found in one or two of

---

<sup>136</sup> F. Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 459.

<sup>137</sup> Watson, *Gospel Writing*, 458–60.

the Apostolic Fathers (Ignatius and Polycarp), both Mark and Luke are almost completely unattested.<sup>138</sup> Barnabas and 1 Clement show no evidence of any literary dependence on any of the Gospels.<sup>139</sup> Most importantly, they are also witnesses to traditions and editions of the same materials found in the Gospels independently.<sup>140</sup> Given its status, as suggested by Tertullian and as implied in Irenaeus, and the lack of attestation in the Apostolic Fathers, Luke-Acts should justifiably be read in parallel with the Apostolic Fathers on a patristic understanding of its category.

## **1.4 An Apostolic Approach**

Therefore, we will use the Apostolic Fathers as an interpretative tool that could belong to the regional and temporal matrices that produced Luke-Acts. This approach by no means dismisses the contribution of the other canonical texts, yet it overcomes the doctrinally motivated perception of the Apostolic Fathers that views them as posterior texts that are dependent on the New Testament and consequently that they have no significance as sources for the understanding of the New Testament. By stepping into this milieu, we may find answers to the historical questions and circumstances that created a theological stance in Luke-Acts, providing historically relevant details that could shed more light on its motives, especially in materials that share the same region. Therefore, it overcomes the difficulties that the canonical approach suffers from by focusing instead on the historical and regional context of its transmission.<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> Oxford Society of Historical Theology, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1905), 137.

<sup>139</sup> Helmut Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957); E. Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Irenaeus* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1990). The most recent comprehensive treatment affirms the same results of the 1905 committee. See Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, eds., *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 39.

<sup>140</sup> We will see this in the case of the texts we are dealing with in this research.

<sup>141</sup> On the problems of the canonical approach see James Carleton Paget, "The Second Century from the Perspective of the New Testament," in James Carleton Paget (ed.), *Christianity in the Second Century: Themes and Developments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 99-100.

Based on the mentioned observations, but conscious of the need for some brevity, we will analyse the theme of the Temple in the Epistles of Barnabas and 1 Clement. These two texts are relevant because: (i) they are certainly independent from each other, which is not necessarily the case in other apostolic texts;<sup>142</sup> (ii) they maybe the earliest of that collection of texts; (iii) they were part of the canon in several circles throughout the fourth century, which shows how influential they were;<sup>143</sup> (iv) they are concerned with the question of the Temple and its related issues more than any other text in that collection, which makes them most relevant to the present research; (v) the locality of both works is confidently recognisable. This analysis could help us understand how the traditions of the Temple might have developed in their regions, which could be supported by the Koester-Robinson trajectories method.<sup>144</sup> In using the Apostolic Fathers as a means of refining our view on Luke-Acts, we may call this the ‘apostolic approach’ to reading Luke-Acts. This term is used to encapsulate the previously mentioned criteria that control the choices of texts, and therefore justifies these choices.

It is also important to take into consideration contemporaneous Jewish attitudes that might have fed the Christian texts being studied here the different responses and reactions to the destruction of the Temple. This is also meant to work against any absolute assumption of differentiation between Judaism and Christianity in this early stage, especially when we know that Christians continued to use and adapt Jewish texts written in Greek as essentially their own over many centuries, particularly those of Philo of Alexandria and Josephus. Unlike earlier approaches, these Jewish texts will be considered seriously as being relevant rather than being treated as merely providing a ‘background’ for a separate or separating Christianity. Only after this careful analysis of roughly contemporaneous texts will we then analyse Luke-Acts’ attitude to the Temple and compare it with both works in hope to find significant observations that would Luke’s attitude. This will be done with a consideration of source material.

---

<sup>142</sup> For example, Hermas knew of a Clement of Rome (*Vision*, 8.3), Ignatius and Polycarp knew each other (Polycarp, *Phil.* 9,13; Ignatius’ letter to Polycarp).

<sup>143</sup> I will deal with their reception in the introduction of their respective chapters below.

<sup>144</sup> Helmut Koester and James Robinson, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971).

This study is not *another* work that identifies only what attitude the author of the double work has, i.e. whether it was positive or negative. Acknowledging its complexities, it aims to understand that attitude in its historical context, i.e. to ask why and how it is so. It is important to understand the inner structure of the argument that leads to the attitude, and not only the final attitude, and whether it has parallels in the selected contemporaneous materials. If it does, it could shed some light on the historical and regional standing of this line of thought. This is why the regional aspect of the texts we are dealing with is important to help us locate and understand the development of that attitude.

## Jewish Attitudes to the Temple

The impact of the Temple's destruction appears in the responses to this catastrophe from the authors of apocalyptic writings, some of which went as far as questioning God's intentions. In contemporary scholarship, the Jewish response to the destruction of the Temple has been diverse. Neusner downplayed the political aspect of the destruction of the Temple as the Jews had already lost their political autonomy, ever since Herod the Great was appointed by Rome in 37 BCE.<sup>145</sup> The main impact of this was religious.<sup>146</sup> Based on this, he divided the Jewish responses into four groups: the apocalyptic, the Dead Sea community, the Christian, and the Pharisaic.<sup>147</sup> The first group (as it appears in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch) enthusiastically looked to a supernatural future vengeance; the present time was one of waiting.<sup>148</sup> The Christians and the Qumran community, on the other hand, defined their position in two ways even before the destruction so that they were not affected by it—the former indifferent toward the Temple while the latter rejected it.<sup>149</sup><sup>150</sup> Neusner considered the Pharisees as the middle point between these groups; they did not abandon hope in the Temple's restoration, yet they survived through their focus on the law and ritual purity in the life of the individuals in their houses: "As long as the Temple stood, the altar atoned for Israel. But now a man's table atones for him" (Ber. 55a.).<sup>151</sup> Furthermore, Neusner believed that the impact of the destruction

---

<sup>145</sup> Jacob Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism: Historical Studies in Religion, Literature and Art* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 34–35.

<sup>146</sup> Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism*, 35.

<sup>147</sup> Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism*, 36.

<sup>148</sup> Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism*, 37–39.

<sup>149</sup> Neusner, like many later scholars, is highly influenced by Gärtner's study on *The Temple and Community in Qumran and the New Testament* which aimed to show the similarity of attitudes by Christians and the Qumran community.

<sup>150</sup> Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism*, 40f.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism*, 45.

on diaspora Jews was almost negligible since they had already shifted their focus to the synagogues (and in some cases had a different temple, as the one in Leontopolis).<sup>152</sup>

While Neusner's identification of varieties of response is a useful model, his analysis of the responses may need further nuancing. To lump together all of Christianity is already too simplistic, indebted to what is essentially the Eusebian view outlined above. Given this, we may ask if the responses he places under the category of Apocalyptic are likewise unified.

We may look to a Diaspora Jew like Philo, who reacted to the crises posed by Caligula's intentions in 39 CE,<sup>153</sup> and also the Diaspora texts such as the Sibylline Oracles 3–5<sup>154</sup> and the strong nationalist sense that led to the 115–117 CE revolt. Diaspora Hellenised Jews could apparently appeal to Hellenistic philosophy and managed to cope with their geographical distance from the Temple, yet this should not be taken as evidence against their allegiance to the Temple of Jerusalem. Thus, while Neusner's categories are helpful, we need to revisit the sources he used and add more.

Neusner's general outline has been shared in similar scholarly approaches that have detected distinguishable responses between the different groups, but with finer awareness of the methodological problems.<sup>155</sup> The possible comparison between two concrete approaches, namely the apocalyptic and rabbinic, is not easy since, as Kirschner rightly observes, they are not completely untangled: "In short, the convenient dichotomy between rabbinic and apocalyptic literature is exaggerated."<sup>156</sup> Adding to that is the fact that the rabbinic materials we have are considerably later than the apocalyptic texts.

---

<sup>152</sup> Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism*, 35

<sup>153</sup> Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism*, 3

<sup>154</sup> Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism*, 7

<sup>155</sup> See, for example, L. Ginzberg, "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings," *JBL* 41 (1922): 115–36, esp. 131, 134. See also R. Kirschner, "Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Responses to the Destruction of 70," *HTR* 78 (1985): 27–46.

<sup>156</sup> Kirschner, "Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Responses," 31.

Apocalyptic writings show some dissatisfaction with the Second Temple and, in some cases, proposed a futuristic ideal temple. The Enochic tradition has a strong concern with priestly impurity and, as a consequence, with the defilement of the Temple, despite its glorious image (1 En. 14). Enoch's *Book of Watchers* includes a direct accusation of the Temple's defilement (15:3-4) which is seen as a reaction to Hellenistic elements in society with the rise of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (2 Macc 4:33-36).<sup>157</sup> In a stronger language, the *Animal Apocalypse* envisions a comparison between three temples: the first is glorious, the second has mighty architecture yet is polluted, and the third is futuristic and restores purity.<sup>158</sup> In the same spirit, the *Assumption of Moses* (early first century) predicts the destruction of the Second Temple as a consequence of the evil deeds of the priests (6.9), yet there is no mention of any temple in the future coming of God's Kingdom (T.Mos. 10).<sup>159</sup> In Qumran literature, there appears to be some critique of the behavior of the priests who put the purity and validity of the Temple into question (CD 1:33-34; 20:22-24; 4:12b). Ideas such as viewing the community as a holy temple were also devised in the Rule of the Community Rule (1QS). 1QS col. 8 says that the Council of the Community shall become "an Everlasting plantation, a House of Holiness for Israel, an Assembly of Supreme Holiness for Aaron. They shall be witnesses to the truth at the judgement [...] It shall be that tried wall, that precious corner-stone, whose foundations shall neither rock nor sway in their place"<sup>160</sup> The image should be read in an eschatological sense with God's judgement on the nations associated with his final coming. In his comprehensive study on the Temple in Qumran literature, Paul Swarup convincingly showed that this was also operative in the life of the

---

<sup>157</sup> Annette Y. Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 60. See also G. W. Nickelsberg and J. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: Hermeneia Translation* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2012), 9f. See also T. Levi 9:9; 10:2-4; 14:5-8; 16:1-5; 17:8-11.

<sup>158</sup> 1 En. 89:50; the Second Temple 89:73 and the eschatological one with God as its architect 90:28-29 [see Ezek 40-48, Isa 54:11-2 and Hag 2:7-9]. Cf. D. C. Olsen, *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 227. See also R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch The Prophet* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1912), 215; G. W. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: Chapters 1-36, 81-108*, Hermeneia Series (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001), 404-406.

<sup>159</sup> Cf. R. H. Charles, *The Assumption of Moses* (London: Black, 1897). See also J. Priest, "Testament of Moses," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol.1, ed. J. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 919-34.

<sup>160</sup> Geza Vermes, trans., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin, 1962). See also Isa 28:16.

Dead Sea community which understood itself, proleptically, as a sanctuary.<sup>161</sup> In fact, the Rule of the Community did not state that the Dead Sea community was the Temple. It was referring to the special mission of a special circle inside the community who were known as the Council of the Community (עצת היחיד), a court of twelve men (well versed of the law) and three priests (1QS 8) who established truth and righteousness in the wider community (יחד) and who believed the Temple would become “an Everlasting Plantation and a House of Holiness for Israel” (1QS 8). 4Q174, identified as “Midrash on the Last Days,” also states that “a sanctuary of men” is to be established by God to form a council and to replace the priestly functions of the Jerusalem Temple. The council here could be defined as the entire Dead Sea community. In 1QS itself, the council is not clearly defined in relation to the wider circle of the community (*yahad*).<sup>162</sup> However, if we resort to the definition of the Council of the Community as it appears in column 8 (which contains the Temple imagery), we should see that this temple-as-community expression refers to this elite group and the entire Dead Sea community.<sup>163</sup> Indeed, their actions and characters conflate with the whole *yahad* but they operate on a higher level.<sup>164</sup> We see that the task of this elite *yahad* appears to complement and perfect the larger *yahad*, as it appears in 1QS, and this is the core of the Temple imagery (*Legat.* 211-217).

---

<sup>161</sup> Paul Swarup, *The Self-Understanding of the Dead Sea Scrolls Community* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 171. This is not far from Wentling’s conclusions in J. L. Wentling, “Unravelling the Relationship Between 11QT, the Eschatological Temple, and the Qumran Community,” *Revue de Qumran* 53 (1989): 61–73. See also D. Dimant, “4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple,” in *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky*, eds. A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel, J. Riaud (Leuven: Peeters, 1986). Cf. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 49–60.

<sup>162</sup> Compare the notion of the council in 1QS 3 (a group led by a priest), 5 and 8 (led by three priests). See also 4Q265 4:2 and 7:7-10. It sometimes conflates with the notion of the so called “rabbim”. See C. Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 117f.

<sup>163</sup> Despite the confusion and ambiguity around the definition of this Council, Hempel shows in a comparative analysis between it and other groups that this Council is distinctively associated with priesthood and cultic setting (*The Qumran Rule Texts*, 118).

<sup>164</sup> Cf. Shalom M. Paul et al., eds, *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden: Brill 2002), 105.

As far as we are concerned, we can see that a pool of Temple images and views were already developed before the destruction. With Philo as an exception, this study will review the development of this diversity after the impactful event of the destruction.

## **2.1 Philo**

While Philo lived and wrote before the destruction of the Temple, he faced a situation highly threatening to the Temple in the decision by Emperor Caligula in 39 CE to have a statue of himself placed within it, as described in Philo's major historical work, *Legatio ad Gaium*. This threat motivated him to reflect on the Temple's significance and the possible consequences of its ruin. His wider theology expressed in his allegorical works also provided fertile soil for later Jewish and Christian responses to grow their own response to the destruction of the Temple thirty years later.

Philo introduces the shocking information of Caligula's intention to desecrate the Temple with a monumental statue of himself (to be worshipped as a god) in *Legat.* 190. Philo's palpable grief there clearly shows his great devotion to the Temple. His description indicates that Gaius was advised that it was a matter of consensus amongst the Jews that they would all unite altogether against the Empire if he insisted on desecrating the Temple. It was a place of maximum holiness that could not be compromised. Thus, Philo contrasts the Temple of Jerusalem's holiness with the statue and images that Gaius wanted to put inside: "Thus no one, whether Greek or barbarian, satrap, or king, or mortal enemy; no strife, no war, no city capture, or any existing thing ever brought such a violation when it is installed in the Temple such as an image or statue or an object wrought by hand" (*Legat.* 292).

This statement is of particular significance because it shows us that the contrast between what is made without hands and what is made with hands (χειροκμητων) does not automatically correspond to the contrast between heavenly and earthly objects. The contrast is not necessarily about the source of the materials used in the building but the archetype or the source of the design; a heavenly design in fact makes the Temple of Jerusalem better than those made with hands (*QE* 2.85). Interestingly, this is supported by a further observation made by David Runia. Based on Mayer's lexicon, the title "God

the Most High” (ὑψιστος) is used by Philo eleven times in his extant works.<sup>165</sup> Runia observed that seven of those times were in Philo’s *Legum allegoriae*, cited from Gen 14:18 (*Leg.* 3.82). The other four appear exclusively in his historical works (once in *Flacc.* and three times in *Legat.*). The term is used here in an apologetic tone to defend monotheism,<sup>166</sup> and is also associated with the Temple of Jerusalem in all of its references in *Embassy* (*Legat.* 157, 278, 317). These citations refer to Augustus’ blessing of the Jews’ freedom to sacrifice at the Temple: even he himself sacrificed at the “shrine of the Most High” (*Legat.* 317). The Temple is understood as part of an apologetic strategy in which Philo introduces it as the *real* house of the *true* God, against the pagan temples and their gods.

In terms of the allegorical works, Philo stated that there are “two temples” (δύο ἱερὰ): the world (κόσμος) and the rational soul (λογικὴ ψυχή) (*Somn.* 1.215 on the soul as a shrine and see also *QE* 2.51). Within these temples the divine Word (Λόγος) operates to connect the heavenly world of ideas with the world of forms, as well as to connect humanity and the universe together in the holy rites (*Somn.* 1.215). As for the Temple of Jerusalem, it was also the means of connecting the divine image and truth with God’s people through the symbolism of the constructed tabernacle (*Her.* 112; *Mos.* 2.74; *QE* 2.52).

The important question is whether Philo’s allegorical approach made the Temple of Jerusalem less important than it should be. Some passages might suggest that; Philo clearly says that no place made of stone is worthy of being the house of God, not even the entire world (*Cher.* 99-101). In *Cherubim* (101), he says: “One worthy house, however, is created for this - the soul. Justly and rightfully then could we say that in the invisible soul is the dwelling-house for the invisible God.”<sup>167</sup> This is in contrast to the temples made with the most expensive materials (*Cher.* 99-100). However, it seems that the relationship between these temples is complementary and not mutually exclusive in

<sup>165</sup> G. Mayer, *Index Philoneus* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974).

<sup>166</sup> David Runia, *Exegesis and Philosophy: Studies in Philo of Alexandria* (Berlin: Variorum, 1990), 196–97. In *Leg.* 3.82, Philo felt obliged to interpret the title in a way that avoided being seen as a superlative i.e. as if there are high gods (not the highest though). The apologetic tone for Runia was obvious.

<sup>167</sup> ἀξιόχρεως μέντοι γε οἶκος ψυχῇ ἐπιτήδειος. Οἶκον οὖν ἐπίγειον τὴν ἀόρατον ψυχὴν τοῦ ἄορατου θεοῦ λέγοντες ἐνδίκως καὶ κατὰ νόμον φήσομεν.

Philo's works. In the above passage, Philo talks about the pagan temples in Egypt and explains how their temple cults are defiled and debased due to their immorality and their souls corrupted due to shameless behaviour (*Cher.* 94).<sup>168</sup> This means that Philo believed that the holiness of a temple is based on the purity of souls.

Symbolism of the Temple's inner structure makes it even more difficult to distinguish between the Temple of Jerusalem and the "cosmic temple". In *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum*, Philo describes the four pillars (tetrad) of the inner sanctuary as being a symbol of incorporeal things in the sanctuary which symbolises all the corporeal things. At the same time, the bar that joins them symbolises the Logos (*QE* 2.89-93).<sup>169</sup> Philo emphasises that the world is not cut off from God and therefore, as Goodenough explains, the world is really an expansion of the tabernacle (or the Temple).<sup>170</sup>

According to Philo, a universal temple was already designed by Moses: "[Moses] thought it right that the divine temple of the Creator of all things should be made of such (*materials*) and so many things as the world was made of, (being) the universal temple (τὸ πανίερον), which (existed) before the holy temple" (*QE* 2.85). For Philo, as far as we are concerned, the Jerusalem Temple is *the only* place in the world where God dwells (*Flacc.* 46; *Leg.* 290). He explains: "God is said to inhabit a house not spatially, for He contains everything and is not contained, but it is in the sense that his foreknowledge and providence is to be implemented in it" (*Sobr.* 63). This shows that he held the Temple in Jerusalem in high esteem. Its significance was at the centre of Philo's disagreement with the extreme allegorists who considered acknowledging the inner meaning of the law to be enough to

---

<sup>168</sup> The same problem appears in the fourth Sibylline Oracles in which we find a strong critique of the idea of physical Temple worship. This begs the question of whether this critique could be extended to include the Temple of Jerusalem or not.

<sup>169</sup> Philo unfolds the imagery in the number four as the four elements of which the world is created in *Mos.* 2.88.

<sup>170</sup> E. Goodenough, *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962), 108, 157. Philo's Middle Platonic views explain the seemingly conflating statements about what is divine and what is not which complicates the task of providing a system of thought for him. Cf. David Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the "Timaeus" of Plato* (Leiden: Brill, 1986).

discard its observances and peculiarities:<sup>171</sup> “Why, we shall be ignoring the sanctity of the Temple and a thousand other things, if we are going to pay heed to nothing except what is shown to us by the inner meaning of things? It follows that, exactly as we have to take thought for the body, because it is the abode of the soul (οὖν σώματος, ἐπειδὴ ψυχῆς ἐστὶν οἶκος), so we must pay heed to the letter of the laws” (*Migr.* 92-93).<sup>172</sup> We can see that the temple of the body does not replace the Temple of Jerusalem. Thus, Philo’s allegorical exegesis should not be understood to contradict his historical writings, which clearly show his affiliation with, and dedication to, the Temple. He himself referred to a visit he made to the Temple to offer his prayers and sacrifices, as if it was a routine event, which makes it easier to believe that he made frequent visits (*Prov.* 2.64).<sup>173</sup> Some have considered the Temple to be outside of Philo’s interests,<sup>174</sup> while Kenneth Schenk concludes that “Philo’s pride in the temple related much more to his Jewish heritage than to any sense of its ultimate necessity.”<sup>175</sup> However, Schenk fails to explain Philo’s considerable usage of the Temple as a prime motif in his anthropology, cosmology and exegesis.<sup>176</sup>

In one particular passage, Philo has been read as marginalising the Temple. In *Prob.* 75, Philo introduces the Essenes by saying that their name could possibly be derived from the Greek word ὁσιότης which means holiness, and this is because “they have shown themselves especially devout in

---

<sup>171</sup> See Joan E. Taylor, “Philo of Alexandria on the Essenes: A Case Study on the Use of Classical Sources in Discussions of the Qumran-Essene Hypothesis,” in *The Studia Philonica Annual*, vol. 19, eds. David Runia and G. Sterling (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), 13

<sup>172</sup> Translation of LCL 261:184-185.

<sup>173</sup> The editor of the fifth Loeb edition (F. H. Colson) comments on this statement by saying “Philo does not imply that this was a solitary or even a rare visit to Jerusalem.” (LCL363: 501) This is true, in my opinion.

<sup>174</sup> Cf. Ursula Füchtel, *Die Kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philon von Alexandrien*. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenischen Judentums 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 81, n.2: “Indirekt lässt sich der Art und Weise, wie Philo die beiden grossen Traditionen über den Tempel weiterüberliefert, erschliessen, was er vom Jerusalemer Heiligtum hält: Es ist ganz uninteressant.” See also A. Mendelson, *Philo's Jewish Identity* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988), 18f. See Also E. R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light. The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1969), 263–64.

<sup>175</sup> K. Schenk, *A Brief Guide to Philo* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005), 37.

<sup>176</sup> Statistically speaking, Fuglseth answers this opinion by counting more than 100 places in Philo’s literature that used the Temple as a positive theological theme. K. Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 193–94.

the service of God, not by offering sacrifices of animals, but by resolving to sanctify their minds.” However, in her analysis of Philo’s views of the Essenes, Joan Taylor rejects the idea that Philo or the Essenes seek to reject the Temple per se.<sup>177</sup> For Taylor, *Prob.* 75 sets a contrast between the animal sacrifices of the Temple priests and what the Essenes do (preparing their minds for God) in terms of ministering to God. Yet, “it does not invalidate the need for sacrifices in the Temple, nor in fact does it mean that no Essenes were serving priests.”<sup>178</sup> This is true also when considering what Josephus says of the Essenes, that they “were sending votive sacrifices and offering very different purifications in the Temple (apart from the common precincts)”<sup>179</sup> (*A.J.* 18.18-19). Taylor shifts the contrast to a different domain: “Philo’s poetic imagery.”<sup>180</sup> In this way, we can see that Philo did not set the spiritual temple against the Temple of Jerusalem. It has a supremacy, in his allegorical worldview, in that all spiritual realities do, but they do not invalidate the material world.

Before concluding Philo’s views, it is important to review his depiction of the community that seemed to embody these views.

### **2.1.3 The Therapeutae**

In Philo’s *De Vita Contemplativa*, he introduces a group known as the ‘Therapeutae’ (ministers [of God])<sup>181</sup> as an ideal of Jewish spirituality superior to Greek and Egyptian philosophies. Belonging

---

<sup>177</sup> Cf. J. E. Taylor, “Philo of Alexandria on the Essenes,” 13ff.

<sup>178</sup> Taylor, “Philo of Alexandria on the Essenes,” 13. See Josephus, *A.J.* 18.22; *B.J.* 2.111, 131.

<sup>179</sup> Some scholars doubt this reading because it survives in later extant manuscripts. The exact reading cannot be easily decided. However, Taylor rightly observes that “it would be absolutely perverse to credit that the priestly Josephus’ eulogy of the Essenes as the optimum Jewish philosophy would contain any suggestion that they either rejected or Temple or refused to sacrifice as part of his commendation of the group.” J. E. Taylor, *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 98. See also T. S. Beall, *Josephus’ Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 115f.

<sup>180</sup> Taylor, *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea*, 98.

<sup>181</sup> On the definition and meaning, see Joan E. Taylor, *Jewish Women Philosophers of First-Century Alexandria* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

to the Alexandrian Hellenistic Jewish milieu, they were depicted by Philo as allegorical interpreters of the Jewish law.<sup>182</sup> In representing them, he defines them in relation to the Temple at various points.

In terms of the group's attitude to the Temple, we have three possibilities. They were:

1. Extreme allegorists who completely discarded the Temple of Jerusalem.
2. Tolerable allegorists from the Philonic perspective who therefore share with Philo a complex view of the Temple of Jerusalem, the prototypical universal temple and the temple of the soul.
3. An anti-Jerusalem-Temple movement (assumed to be like the Essenes).

Their imitation of the Temple cult of Jerusalem does not necessarily replace its centrality or significance. Philo introduces them with seemingly full agreement. This means that they cannot be extreme allegorists who abandon the Temple. Carleton-Paget makes an important observation: “[Philo] nowhere registers disapproval of their exegetical conclusions, as he does with the extreme allegorists in *Migr.* 92. Philo seems to regard the Therapeutae as striking a decent balance between the physical and the spiritual.”<sup>183</sup> They were, then, probably like other Alexandrian Jews: attached to Jerusalem from where they drew their identity.

Philo says that they considered Lake Mareotis their “fatherland” (*Contempl.* 18). The term was used in *Legatio* to describe the Jews belonging to Alexandria; the fatherland was this city, while

---

<sup>182</sup> Opinions varied on the historicity of Philo's depiction. E. Lucius, *Die Therapeuten und ihre Stellung in der Geschichte der Askese* (Strasbourg: F. Bull, 1879), considered *Contempl.* as a later Christian work written shortly before Eusebius in the light of Egyptian monasticism. In *Philo about the Contemplative Life, Or the Fourth Book of the Treatise Concerning Virtues* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1895), Fred C. Conybeare argued for the historicity of the group and the authenticity of the work. In the German speaking world, Wilhelm Bousset also defended its authenticity in *Die Religion des Judentums im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1903), 443–47. Since Bousset and Conybeare, scholars no longer register any doubts regarding the existence of the Therapeutae. Bousset's study also offered the grounds to challenge the classic view of considering the Therapeutae as Essenes (446f.). See also F. Delaunay, *Moines et Sibylles dans l'antiquité Judeo-Grecque* (Paris: Librairie Academique, 1874), 1–2.

<sup>183</sup> James Carleton-Pager, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, WUNT 64 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 196.

Jerusalem was their mother-city because of the Temple.<sup>184</sup> Therefore, the same should apply here: we should expect from Philo's use of the term that the Therapeutae had the same mother city. Most importantly, the work is probably part of Philo's defence of the Jews to Claudius.<sup>185</sup> Therefore, his description of the life of the Therapeutae includes a harsh critique of the cult of the Greeks and Egyptians.<sup>186</sup>

As for the third possibility, attributing the Therapeutae to the Essenic milieu was promoted by Schürer.<sup>187</sup> Robert Kraft proposed a theory which considered the Therapeutae as related to the Qumran Essenes.<sup>188</sup> Presuming that the Essenes and the Therapeutae were related (if not identical),<sup>189</sup> he concludes that the Therapeutae provided the sources that were edited by the Epistle of Barnabas. Thus, he finds that Barnabas' strong objection to the Temple cult can be read back into the Essenic Therapeutae position.

Considering the Therapeutae as another "Essenic" group is untenable in light of recent research on the issue. As Bousset puts it, the fundamental difference between the Essenes and the Therapeutae is the fact that members of the latter group experienced holiness without washing or cultic

---

<sup>184</sup> This point in particular should be read in light of Philo's allegiance to Jerusalem. H. Klauck, "Die heilige Stadt. Jerusalem bei Philo und Lukas," *Kairos* 28 (1986):129–51 emphasised that Philo's allegory did not overthrow his allegiance to Jerusalem in serious situations because it is what forms the Jewish communities' identity (cf. *Spec.* 1:68-69). This should apply to the Therapeutae who were represented by Philo over against the Greeks and Egyptians. Cf. David Runia, "Idea and the Reality of the City in the Thought of Philo of Alexandria," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 61 (2000): 376.

<sup>185</sup> On the historical context, see Taylor, *Jewish Women Philosophers*, 43f.

<sup>186</sup> The striking similarity between this work and the work of the Egyptian Temple priest Chaeremon, who was mentioned in Claudius' edict in 41 CE, suggests that Philo was providing an apologetic response to him. See Taylor, *Jewish Women Philosophers*, 42–44; Pieter Willem van der Host, *Chaeremon* (Leiden: Brill, 1984); R. Kraemer, "Monastic Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Egypt: Philo Judaeus on the Therapeutrides," *Working Together in the Middle Ages: Perspectives on Women's Communities* 14 (1989): 342–70.

<sup>187</sup> Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, vol. 3 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979), 591.

<sup>188</sup> Robert Kraft, "The Epistle of Barnabas: Its Quotations and their Sources" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1961), 19.

<sup>189</sup> Kraft, "The Epistle of Barnabas," 290.

purification, unlike the Essenes.<sup>190</sup> As a Jewish Wisdom group we have no evidence that their lifestyle resembled the same apocalyptic one of the Essenes, but rather they embraced a contemplative life which was not operating under any eschatological urgency or in reaction to something like the “defilement” of the Temple.<sup>191</sup> Most recently, the extensive studies of Taylor have made it difficult to challenge the independence of the Therapeutae from the Essenes, their historicity, and their belonging to the Alexandrian milieu.<sup>192</sup>

In the light of what has been said, we can conclude that the first and third options on the Therapeutae’s attitude to the Temple (above) seem untenable. The Therapeutae were not extreme allegorists and were thus not anti-Jerusalem-Temple. The best understanding of the Therapeutae, then, is that they belonged to the allegorical spectrum of Philo’s own circle, and their Temple attitude should thus be interpreted in Philonic terms. David Hay interpreted the Therapeutae in the light of Philo’s anthropology, which is drawn from his doctrine of double creation.<sup>193</sup> Hay’s comparative analysis shows how Philo depicted the Therapeutae as having the status of the second (moulded) man, struggling towards becoming the first spiritual man.<sup>194</sup> If they shared his doctrine of double creation, they may well have also sought to become a spiritual temple by means of the Logos.

Their singing and dancing practices on Sabbath days also resemble the procedures in the Jerusalem Temple court, including songs for processions, libations, and hymns relating to the altar. Philo speaks clearly of the bread eaten on that day as recalling the table of shewbread in the vestibule of the Temple (τῷ ἁγίῳ προναῶ ἱερᾶς τραπεζῆς) which implies that the community saw itself as an

---

<sup>190</sup> Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*, 446f.

<sup>191</sup> Cf. J. E. Taylor, *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea*, 46–47.

<sup>192</sup> Cf. J. E. Taylor, “Spiritual Mothers: Philo on the Women Therapeutae,” *JSP* 23 (2002): 37–63.

<sup>193</sup> D. M. Hay, “The Spiritual Regimen of the Therapeutae, and a Possible Connection with Corinth,” in *Philo und das Neue Testament*, eds. K-W. Niebuhr and R. Deines, WUNT (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 127f.

<sup>194</sup> “From the perspective of Philo’s thinking about the Double Creation of humanity, we may surmise that the Therapeutae understood themselves to be living in the ‘borderland’ condition of A-2 (molded), while straining to move as far as possible toward the condition of A-1 (spiritual), the mind modeled after the image of God. At least that may be how Philo himself interpreted the regimen and purposes of the community” (Hay, “The Spiritual Regimen,” 140).

elected priestly community undertaking a Temple task (*Contempl.* 81).<sup>195</sup> Agreeing with Taylor's observation,<sup>196</sup> this cult should be read allegorically; their devotion is not designed to replace the actual Temple, but their own activities are more sublime.

In a survey of the cult/philosophy relationship in the Hellenistic world—the stock for Philo's thoughts—Taylor makes a conclusive statement on his view of the Therapeutae:

For Philo, this Mareotic group of philosophers is the pinnacle of (cultic) piety: *θεραπευταί / ρίδες* and *ικέται* of an invisible shrine. They are the true cultic devotees, servers and suppliants of God, constantly focused on divine things as priests in a temple will constantly focus on cultic sacra and ritual. They attend to divine things, but the divine things are not in the usual physical cultic situation, but in the realm of the soul. They are then the contemplative type of the philosophers who endeavour to see those things truly worth seeing in the metaphysical universe.<sup>197</sup>

In conclusion, Philo's thought stands as evidence for loyalty to the Temple in the Jewish Diaspora and the use of it as the basis for a notion of a spiritual temple instituted by Moses. This is articulated in Philo's response to the threats of Gaius. Philo's understanding of human souls as each being a kind of Temple of the Logos would play an important role in the rhetoric of post-destruction Christian theology, as we shall see. Having said that, the Temple of Jerusalem remains as “a continuing mechanism: a constant material expression.”<sup>198</sup>

## 2.2 Josephus

---

<sup>195</sup> On the allegorical reading of the sacred space according to the Therapeutae, cf. Taylor, *Jewish Women Philosophers*, 302–10. For a general assessment of the matter according to Philo see U. Früchtel, “Die Kosmologischen Vorstellungen.” On the mystic ritual of the meal see J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 11.

<sup>196</sup> Taylor, *Jewish Women Philosophers*, 123.

<sup>197</sup> Taylor, *Jewish Women Philosophers*, 123.

<sup>198</sup> Daniel R. Schwartz, “Place beyond Place,” in *Was 70 CE a Watershed in Jewish History?*, eds. Daniel R. Schwartz and Zeev Weiss (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 115.

The Temple occupies the central place in Josephus' major works *Antiquities* and *Jewish War*. Mason observes what he calls "the Temple-oriented ring of composition" in *Antiquities*.<sup>199</sup> The whole work builds toward the Temple of Solomon and the Second Temple and they represent a turning point in the narrative.<sup>200</sup> As Per Bilde notes, it could be divided into two sections: books 1–10, which are dedicated to the history of Israel until the destruction of the First Temple and the anticipation of the destruction of the second; and books 11–20, which build towards the establishment of the Second Temple. Bilde concludes that "A.J. 1–10 may be regarded as the account of the history of the first Temple, and A.J. 11–20 as a parallel account of the period of the second Temple."<sup>201</sup> As for *Jewish War*, the work's entire aim is to explain how and why the Second Temple was destroyed and Jerusalem was sacked. In the aftermath of the destruction, *Jewish War* could be read as a reactionary work discussing how the event shaped Israel's history and identity. Like Philo, Josephus' approach to the Temple should be viewed in terms of theology and history. His view of the Temple as God's dwelling and his response to the crises of history both complement each other.

It is Solomon's celebratory speech in A.J. 8:107-118 which reflects key elements of Josephus' theology of the Temple. In this speech, Josephus raises some theological issues around the idea of the earthly Temple. First, Solomon admits that God has the whole world as his temple, yet the Jerusalem Temple is meant to help his people to experience the presence of God (A.J. 8:107-108). This does not empty the Temple of its significance as a house of God, for Solomon asks God to "send forth a *certain portion of your spirit* to the sanctuary and cause it to dwell there, so that you may appear to be with us on earth" (A.J. 8:114). God is, then, both everywhere and particularly at the Temple. As Steve Mason observes, Josephus conflates several affirmations from Solomon in 1 Kgdms 8:3// 2 Chr 6:2 about having the house built for the Lord to dwell in forever.<sup>202</sup> Josephus' reworking

---

<sup>199</sup> J. W. Van Henten and Steve Manson, eds., *Judean Antiquities 15: Translation and Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 285. Cf. Steve Mason, "Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome: Reading On and Between the Lines," in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image and Text*, eds. W. J. Dominik and A. J. Boyle (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 567–68.

<sup>200</sup> On this narratological centrality see T. Landau, *Out-Heroding Herod* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 124–25.

<sup>201</sup> Per Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome* (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1988), 89.

<sup>202</sup> S. Mason, ed., *Flavius Josephus: Judean Antiquities*, vol. 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 30.

of the materials of the biblical version of Solomon's speech must reflect his own views.<sup>203</sup> For instance, the biblical Solomon quotes Lev 16:2, that the Lord dwells in a dark Cloud (1 Kgdms 8:12), while the Josephan Solomon substitutes the cloud with "the heaven, air, earth and sea" (A.J. 8:107). The tension between God's cosmic presence and his Temple dwelling can be viewed through Stoic cosmology. Interestingly, he sometimes shows knowledge of the allegorical interpretation of the architecture, materials and content of the Temple to reflect the cosmic dwelling of God (A.J. 3.180; B.J. 5.212-213).

The second point is an apologetic one. The Josephan Solomon differs from the speech of biblical Solomon on the question of non-Jews. The biblical Solomon asks God to hear the foreigners' prayers in order that the nations might learn "to fear you [the Lord]" (1 Kgdms 8:43b//2 Chr 6:33) while the Josephan Solomon offers an alternative motivation in which there is a conflation between election and inclusiveness, in order to dispose of the Roman sensitivities towards proselytising and at the same time to counter charges of misanthropy.<sup>204</sup> This reading could be justified in light of Josephus' dispute with Apion. A central critique addressed by Apollonius against the Jews, as mentioned in Apion, is misanthropy (μισανθρωπία, Ap. 2.258, 258; 2.148). Josephus felt the urge to emphasise the good intentions of the law towards the other and its "universal benevolence" (Ap. 2.146f.).<sup>205</sup>

The problem of interpreting the destruction of the Temple clearly occupied Josephus in *Jewish War*. As Klawans states, the whole work is "a theological explanation for the destruction of the temple."<sup>206</sup> From the very beginning, Josephus made his case clear: Josephus' country "owed its ruin to civil strife", and "it was the Jewish tyrants (οἱ Ἰουδαίων τήραννοι) who drew down upon the holy temple the unwilling hands of the Romans" (B.J. 1.10-12). Consequently, Josephus attributes the destruction to Israel's sin, a vital aspect of which was the insurgents' violence. The other aspect of the sin that led

---

<sup>203</sup> On the possible Stoicism of the Josephan Solomon, see L. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (London: University of California Press, 1998), 619–22.

<sup>204</sup> Mason, *Flavius Josephus*, 33. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation*, 614–15

<sup>205</sup> Cf. J. M. G. Barclay, *Against Apion: Translation and Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 249f.

<sup>206</sup> J. Klawans, "Josephus, the Rabbis, and Responses to Catastrophes Ancient and Modern," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 10 (2010): 290.

to God's abandonment of the Temple was moral failure, for there was no impiety which that generation had not done (*B.J.* 5.401). This is found in the pollution of the Temple; its sanctuary was profaned by the bloodshed inside it (*B.J.* 2.424, 443-446; 4.314-325, 334-344, etc.).<sup>207</sup> Josephus goes beyond other texts by deeming the Roman invasion "just" (*B.J.* 5.257). On the issue of the Temple's sanctity in particular, Josephus draws a scene of the battle around the Temple, stressing his view of the crisis by condemning the rebels and presenting the Romans positively. Josephus shows that the Romans had no intention of setting holy places on fire, and demanded that the zealots stay away from the Temple. But the zealots refused and turned the Sanctuary itself (the ναός, not just the ἱερός) into a fortress surrounded by heaped corpses that turned the whole site into a common burial ground (*B.J.* 6.119-123). In a speech that summarises his view (*B.J.* 6.126-128), Josephus even puts Titus on the higher moral ground:

Was it not you, most abominable wretches, who placed this balustrade<sup>208</sup> before your sanctuary? Was it not you that ranged along it those slabs, engraved in Greek characters and in our own, proclaiming that none may pass the barrier? And did we not permit you to put to death any who passed it, even were he a Roman? Why then, you miscreants, do you now actually trample corpses underfoot within it? Why *do you defile your temple* with the blood of foreigner and native? I call the gods of my fathers to witness and any deity that once watched over this place —*for now I believe that there is none*—I call my army, the Jews within my lines, and you yourselves to witness that it is not I who force you to pollute these precincts. Exchange the arena of conflict for another and not a Roman shall approach or insult your holy places; nay, *I will preserve the temple for you, even against your will.* (*B.J.* 5.93)

---

<sup>207</sup> Most importantly, his speech to the Zealots in 5.380 in which he explicitly accuses them of polluting the Temple. His conclusion of the consequences of these acts on the Temple is made clear in the last book of *Ant.* 20.165-166

<sup>208</sup> The balustrade is what bears the sign warning the gentiles against entering the holy place.

This was Titus' message, which Josephus himself delivered (*B.J.* 6.129). Of course, it is a Josephan composition which is why it is important for gaining an understanding of his thoughts. The three sentences in italics summarise Josephus' interpretation of the crisis: it was his fellow countrymen who defiled the Temple causing God to leave it *before* the destruction, and the Romans bore no responsibility for this. Josephus' view of Rome's role in the destruction of the Temple, and particularly Titus' role, is striking. His unparalleled presentation of Titus as someone with great military courage and clemency and, most importantly, as someone who exhibited desperate attempts to save the Temple in every possible way, raises important questions about Josephus' own view of the other (Rome) and the Temple's role in defining the boundaries. Scholars have a variety of explanations to account for Josephus' motives,<sup>209</sup> but as far as we are concerned in the present study, it indicates a positive presentation of the Temple of Jerusalem and is part of a larger narrative that starts from Jerusalem and ends in Rome, at the Temple of Peace (*Templum Pacis*).

Josephus concludes *War* with a triumphant Roman procession, carrying spoils from the Temple of Jerusalem to the Temple of Peace where they would be held (*B.J.* 7.148-162). Some observations of his story should be made. First, Josephus himself chooses the Temple vessels to be put in the Temple of Peace (*B.J.* 7.161). This might suggest complete submission and an acceptance of the irreversible, hopeless, defeat of the Jews. However, this could also indicate the contrary: the vessels received an honourable and a dignified end from the Romans, which makes hope in a future restoration of Temple worship still feasible. This takes into consideration the positive image of Titus who did his best to protect the Temple from the Jews held responsible for its destruction.

We know from sources beyond Josephus that the Temple of Peace was apparently a structure built from scratch by Vespasian, inaugurated in 75 CE (Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 65.15.1; Suetonius, *Vesp.* 9.1).<sup>210</sup>

---

<sup>209</sup> Cf. B. W. Jones, "Titus in Judaea A.D. 67," *Latomus* 1 (1989): 127–34. G. M. Paul, "The Presentation of Titus in the 'Jewish War' of Josephus: Two Aspects," *Phoenix* 47 (1993): 56–66. See also J. S. McLaren, "Josephus on Titus: The Vanquished Writing about the Victor," in *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*, eds. G. Lembi and J. Sievers (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 279–96.

<sup>210</sup> Later voices attributed its inauguration to Domitian but this is discredited by contemporary scholarship (see Silvae's Statius, *Silv.* 4.3.17).

It was severely damaged in the fire of 191/2 CE but was quickly rebuilt (Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 73.42.1). We have no explanation for what sort of Pax the temple is named after.<sup>211</sup> However, both architectural evidence and Pliny the Elder's literary account converge at the suggestion that the temple was practically an art gallery or an open museum.<sup>212</sup> Pliny the Elder's evidence is important for our understanding of Josephus' narrative, which relied on the audience having some knowledge of the nature of the Temple of Peace. The vessels were said by him to be preserved in a universally accessible art gallery. Josephus' treatment is revealing for two reasons: first, he does not hide his admiration of the Temple of Peace, stating that it was built "very speedily" and in a beautiful shape that "surpasses human comprehension" (*B.J.* 7.158); secondly, he carefully avoids mentioning some important details of the temple that could conflict with Jewish piety, such as the statue of Pax. Thus, Josephus' description of the Temple of Peace might be subtly suggestive of the Jerusalem Temple.<sup>213</sup> Honora Chapman's comprehensive article on the way the Temple of Peace is described by Josephus makes a convincing case for this from an archaeological viewpoint.<sup>214</sup> She revisits a piece of gold glass found in the tomb of saints Marcellinus and Petrus in Rome around the year 1882.<sup>215</sup> The Jewish identity of the gold glass is undisputed, yet its discovery in a Christian catacomb remains "mysterious".<sup>216</sup> This gold glass shows a temple and a large menorah in a walled compound with long colonnades with entrances marked by palm trees. Most importantly, a Greek inscription is written upon it, as follows:

---

<sup>211</sup> For a complete description and discussion of its archaeological evidence see R. H. Darwall-Smith, *Emperors and Architecture: A Study of Flavian Rome* (Bruxelles: Latomus Revue d'Études Latines, 1996).

<sup>212</sup> For archaeological evidence see Darwall-Smith, *Emperors and Architecture*, 55f. For literary evidence on the works of art see Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 35.26f.

<sup>213</sup> Cf. H. H. Chapman, "What Josephus Sees: The Temple of Peace and the Jerusalem Temple as Spectacle in Text and Art," *Phoenix* 63 (2009): 107–30.

<sup>214</sup> Chapman, "What Josephus Sees," 107–30.

<sup>215</sup> It is enlisted as *CIJ* i 515 (588) in D. Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 471–74. Cf. F. Coarelli, *Rome and Environs* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007), 127.

<sup>216</sup> Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe*, 472.

ΟΙΚΟΣ ΙΡΗ[ΝΗΣ] ΛΑΒΕ ΕΥΛΟΓΙΑ

[ΜΕΤΑ ΤΩΝ] ΣΩΝ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ

The House of Peace. Have a blessing

with all those yours

Several suggestions about the identity of the building in the glass piece were made at the time of its retrieval. For example, de Rossi, who discovered the piece, suggested that it depicts Solomon's Temple because it was found in a Christian catacomb,<sup>217</sup> given the difficulty of understanding the use of Jewish motifs in a Christian context. Other suggestions that it depicted a tomb,<sup>218</sup> a Torah shrine,<sup>219</sup> and a *sukkah*<sup>220</sup> for the feast of Tabernacles did not take into consideration other archaeological factors. The best explanation that fits the literary and archaeological evidence is that the glass represents the Temple of Peace in the same way Josephus approached it.<sup>221</sup> Thus, I find Chapman's conclusion important: "The viewer could imagine in their mind's eye the Jerusalem Temple transplanted to the courtyard of the Temple of Peace at Rome, or a temple rebuilt at Jerusalem on the model of the Temple of Peace compound."<sup>222</sup>

If this piece indeed depicts the Temple of Peace, this may suggest that Josephus and other Jews felt that the Jerusalem Temple did not completely perish from their present but was somehow accommodated through an honourable preservation of its vessels in Rome, despite the less than honorific presentation of the parading of those vessels on the Arch of Titus. This raises an important question: did Josephus' pragmatic approach to the present mean he had no eschatological interest in a restoration? Josephus blames the "Jewish tyrants" for following "deluded" prophets who taught them that such revolutionary action would bring God's support into their midst (*B.J.* 6.286). His disagreement with his opponents, then, is ideological, particularly in their failure to interpret Jewish

---

<sup>217</sup> G. Rossi, "Insigne vetro rappresentante il Tempio di Gerusalemme," *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana* 20 (1882): 137–58.

<sup>218</sup> E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* (New York: Princeton University Press, 1953–1968).

<sup>219</sup> H. Gressmann, "Jewish Life in Ancient Rome," in *Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams*, ed. George A. Kohut (New York: Arno, 1927), 170–91.

<sup>220</sup> A. St Clair, "God's House of Peace in Paradise: The Feast of Tabernacles on a Jewish Gold Glass," *Journal of Jewish Art* 11 (1985): 6–15.

<sup>221</sup> Cf. Chapman, "What Josephus Sees," 107–30.

<sup>222</sup> Chapman, "What Josephus Sees," 124.

eschatology. However, Lester Grabbe rightly reminds us that Josephus himself was once on their side before he defected.<sup>223</sup> Having said that, though obscured in his writings, Josephus believed in an eschatology that would bring in a Messianic age. Bilde observes that Josephus' statement that God "now (vñv) bestowed supremacy on Rome" (*B.J.* 5.367) implies that this bestowal would be temporary and superseded by a Messianic one.<sup>224</sup> Of course, Josephus is reluctant to reflect on eschatological prophecies such as Dan 2:34-35, 44-45 lest he offend Rome (*A.J.* 10.210).<sup>225</sup> However, his hope in the glorious eschaton appears clearly in his paraphrasing of Balaam's prophecy (Num 23:13) to say that his people have experienced calamities and pain as part of their history and present but there would be fulfilment of the prophecy in the future (*A.J.* 4.125; see also 10.210). Yet, we do not have any reference to a heavenly sanctuary. Therefore, it is legitimate to say that the story of the Second Temple in Josephus awaits its concluding chapter, which is its restoration.

### 2.3 Sibylline Oracles 5

The fourteen books of the Sibylline Oracles are spread chronologically over the period between the third century BC and the seventh century CE, and geographically around the Mediterranean.<sup>226</sup> They reached their final form in the sixth century, after extensive Christian redaction, but two of the books, 3 and 5, are identified as Jewish. While Egypt is considered by the majority of scholars to be the provenance of the third book, it is almost undisputed in the case of the fifth book, though it is separated from the former by two and a half centuries.<sup>227</sup>

---

<sup>223</sup> L. L. Grabbe, "Eschatology in Philo and Josephus," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity*, vol. 3, eds. Jacob Neusner and Bruce Chilton (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 180.

<sup>224</sup> P. Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988), 188.

<sup>225</sup> However, he directly implies that it is Rome in *A.J.* 10.276.

<sup>226</sup> John J. Collins, "The Sibylline Oracles," in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, 322. John J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974). H. Merkel, *Sibyllinen*, *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* Band V (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1998).

<sup>227</sup> Cf. Collins, "The Sibylline Oracles," in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*; Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 355, 390; H. N. Bate, *The Sibylline Oracles* (London: MacMillan, 1918), 25; J. Geffcken, *Die Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902), 1–30; Kenneth Jones, *Jewish Reactions to the Destruction of*

Although the third book's date puts it outside the scope of our research (before the destruction), it is important to shed light on it to show the development of the Temple attitude in Judaism represented by the oracles in the fifth book. In Book 3, the Temple is described in an exalted way (Sib. Or. 3.213, 266-267, etc.).<sup>228</sup> This exaltation is associated with the honour of the Jewish nation and its *raison d'être* (Sib. Or. 3.213-215).<sup>229</sup> Andrew Chester observes that the Temple exercises a centripetal force upon the Diaspora Jews and also upon the gentiles (in the eschatological age) who will turn to worship God (Sib. Or. 3.715-720 [cf. Isa 2:3; Mic 4:2], 564-572).<sup>230</sup> In reading the history of Israel, the author of the third book has a thesis that runs as follows: the destruction of the (first) Temple was God's punishment on the Jews for their failure to keep the Torah (Sib. Or. 3.266, 273-281). If the Jews kept the Torah, the Temple is restored (Sib. Or. 3.282-294). Finally, observance of the Torah and restoration of the Temple worship would result in prosperity and inaugurate the golden age (Sib. Or. 3.573-5781, 586-587, 619-623).<sup>231</sup> There is a non-Jewish saviour (Sib. Or. 3.652-656)<sup>232</sup> and inclusive language about gentiles as participatory in eschatological worship, which reflects the author's political and historical interest in shaping the biblical text to fit into the positive historical *Sitz im Leben* of Ptolemaic Egypt.<sup>233</sup> Most importantly, the new Temple was not introduced as a metaphysical eschatological one but is interwoven into the history of the Jews (cf. Sib. Or. 3.656-657, 700f.). John Collins observes that the interest in the Temple was "not a necessary remark in the Sibylline literature but seems to have been characteristic of the Sibylline literature of Egyptian Judaism."<sup>234</sup>

---

*Jerusalem in A.D. 70* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 213–15. Against the majority in the case of Sib. Or. 3, see R. Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and its Social Setting* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 24.

<sup>228</sup> Cf. Collins "The Sibylline Oracles," in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, 44.

<sup>229</sup> Cf. A. Chester, "The Sibyl and the Temple," in *Templum Amicitiae*, W. Horbury, and E. Bammel (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 38.

<sup>230</sup> Cf. Chester, "The Sibyl and the Temple," 38–39.

<sup>231</sup> For the place of the Temple in the eschatological age see Sib. Or. 3.616-623, 657-658, 702-731, 772-775.

<sup>232</sup> On analysing the Messianism of this section see Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 356f.

<sup>233</sup> Agreeing with Collins (*The Sibylline Oracles*, 46f.) and Chester ("The Sibyl and the Temple," 44).

<sup>234</sup> Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles*, 47. Comparing both Sib. Or. 3 and 5 shows that Egyptian Sibylline books were distinctively interested in Temple worship.

Sib. Or. 5 was probably written as a collection of materials from shortly after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem to probably the earliest years of Hadrian's rule.<sup>235</sup> It agrees considerably with Sib. Or. 3 in the exaltation of the Temple of Jerusalem, as well as its centrality in the life of the Jews (Sib. Or. 5.150, 397-402, 422-437, 433), but its different historical setting creates substantial developments. The centrality of the Temple is expressed in cosmological terms; the heavenly nation of God lives around his city in the middle of the earth (Sib. Or. 5.248-250).

While the First Temple in Sib. Or. 3 was destroyed as a divine punishment for the Jews' abandonment of Torah, the Second Temple in Sib. Or. 5 was destroyed by Rome without blame of the Jews (Sib. Or. 5.150, 397f.). The saviour this time is "a blessed man who came from the expanses of heaven" (Sib. Or. 5.414f.).<sup>236</sup> He is described as an "exceptional one from the sky (ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἑξοχος ἀνὴρ)" who is "the noblest of the Hebrews (Εβραίων ἀριστος)" (Sib. Or. 5.256, 8). He is also the "king sent from God" to bring judgement against the returning Nero and Rome (Sib. Or. 5.206-209). The new glorious Temple of the eschaton was built by that heavenly Hebrew (Sib. Or. 5.420-433)<sup>237</sup> and the restoration of Temple piety and its offerings is the climax of God's eschatological accomplishment. This depiction of the heavenly figure who builds a new Temple is indeed exceptional in the Second Temple literature.<sup>238</sup> However, another eschatological passage announces that there will be a great holy temple in Egypt and people "fashioned by God" will worship in it. God will also grant his residence in it, but it will be destroyed by "the Ethiopians" (Sib. Or. 5.675-685). The passage is influenced by Isaiah 19, but it is unclear whether the Ethiopians are the nation known to us or whether we have a symbol of the Romans who destroyed the temple of Leontopolis in 73

---

<sup>235</sup> Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles*, 390. See Sib. Or. 5.46-50. Despite the reference to the following three emperors after Hadrian, scholars register doubts regarding the authenticity of this reference since Hadrian was portrayed favourably and there is no mention of the Bar Kokhba war. I find these observations convincing. See Jones, *Jewish Reactions to the Destruction of Jerusalem*, 213-14.

<sup>236</sup> "ἦλθε γὰρ οὐρανους νότων ἀνὴρ μακαρίτης"

<sup>237</sup> It makes sense to identify that figure with the "exceptional man from the sky" in Sib. Or. 5:255-256.

<sup>238</sup> Cf. Chester, "The Sibyl and the Temple," 51.

(*B.J.* 7.2-4; *A.J.* 13.1-3). Several hypotheses have been suggested, yet it remains difficult to find a historical parallel.<sup>239</sup>

Unlike the Temple ideology in *Sib. Or.* 3, the Temple attitude has shifted towards the eschatological and political conflict with Rome.<sup>240</sup> As Schwier observed, we need to see the attitude to the Temple espoused in *Sib. Or.* 5 in light of the bitter experience of the Jews, their rebellion against Roman-Egyptian imperial ideology, and its political and religious superiority.<sup>241</sup> This ideology should be seen “as distinct from elsewhere in the Roman Empire, in the case of the Jewish religion no syncretism would be possible; instead, a full-scale ideological-political-religious (and eventually, military) battle is involved or in prospect.”<sup>242</sup>

From this, we may conclude that *Sib. Or.* 5 reflects a shift to a developed “Temple ideology” which embodies the sense of nationalism, cultic and religio-political conflict that shaped the identity of the Jews of Alexandria and was taken into action in the revolts of 115–117 CE.

## 2.4 Sibylline Oracles 4

There is almost a scholarly consensus on the Jewish character and dating of the fourth Sibylline Oracle to the period shortly after the destruction of the Temple, circa 80 CE.<sup>243</sup> The author writes a vivid account of the details of the Jewish war and the destruction of the Temple (*Sib. Or.* 4 115-136). He also reported the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 CE (Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 6.16, 20) and the rumours of a returning Nero in Parthia (Suetonius, *Nero* 57; Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 64:4-8). These are described as

---

<sup>239</sup> Cf. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles*, 93–94.

<sup>240</sup> Chester, “The Sibyl and the Temple,” 60. See also Schwier, *Tempel und Tempelzerstörung*, 55f.

<sup>241</sup> Cf. Chester, “The Sibyl and the Temple,” 60 and Schwier, *Tempel und Tempelzerstörung*, 339–42.

<sup>242</sup> Chester, “The Sibyl and the Temple,” 61.

<sup>243</sup> Collins, “The Sibylline Oracles,” in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*. See also Lanchester, “The Sibylline Oracles,” in Charles, *Pseudepigrapha*, 393; Geffcken, *Die Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902); Schürer, *History*, 641.

events that precede God's final judgement. We have no evidence about the provenance of this work, even though several speculations on the identity of the community behind it have been made.<sup>244</sup>

The book's attitude to the Temple of Jerusalem is controversial. Its negative view of the idea of Temple worship can be detected from the beginning:

... the great God, whom no hands of men fashioned  
in the likeness of speechless idols of polished stone.  
For he does not have a house, a stone set up as a temple,  
dumb and toothless, a bane which brings many woes to men,  
but one which it is not possible to see from earth nor to measure  
with mortal eyes, since it was not fashioned by mortal hand (πλασθέντα χειρὶ θνητῇ).  
(Sib. Or. 4.6-11)<sup>245</sup>

Collins understands from this that the author is categorically against the idea of Temple worship. Beside the apparent lack of interest in the Jerusalem Temple in the author's eschatology, he concludes that the work is certainly not a product of Egyptian Judaism, known from Oracles 3 and 5.<sup>246</sup> Redmond and Nikiprowetzky disagree with Collins' conclusion because the Sibyls' critique might be anti-pagan-temple, not anti-Temple.<sup>247</sup> While they have a fair point, neither of these scholars offer sufficient evidence to connect the overall theology of Sib. Or. 4 with books 3 and 5, nor do they

---

<sup>244</sup> Nikiprowetzky suggested the Therapeutae in the case of Egypt, see V. Nikiprowetzky, "Reflexions Sur Quelques Problemes du Quatrieme et du Cinquieme Livre Des Oracles Sibyllins," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 43 (1972), 29–76, esp. 33. He follows the suggestion of M. Friedländer, "Les Esséniens," *Revue des Études Juives* 14 (1887): 184–216. Lanchester ("The Sibylline Oracles," in Charles, *Pseudepigrapha*, 393) suggested the Essenes while several scholars suggested a movement similar to John the Baptist's or a Jewish Christian group like the Ebionites who were known for their anti-Temple attitude and their emphasis on baptism. Cf J. Thomas, *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie* (Louvain: Université catholique de Louvain, 1935), 46–52. Collins is inclined towards this suggestion (*The Sibylline Oracles*, 383–84).

<sup>245</sup> Cf. John J. Collins' construction ("The Sibylline Oracles," in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*). The Greek text is from the standard work of Geffcken, "*Die Oracula Sibyllina*."

<sup>246</sup> John J. Collins, "The Place of the Fourth Sibyl in the Development of the Jewish Sibyllina," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25 (1974): 365–80. See also Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles*, 381–82.

<sup>247</sup> S. A. Redmond, "The Date and Provenance of the Fourth Sibylline Oracle" (PhD diss., University of Ottawa, 1985), 95f. Nikiprowetzky, "Reflexions Sur Quelques Problemes," 29–76.

address Collins' view that Book 4 entirely ignores the Temple in its eschatological hope. Collins also proposes that the strong purity theme in the fourth book (4.165-166) does not have any similarity in the other Sibylline Oracles. He connects it with concerns for purity elsewhere. Collins notes that "The role of baptism here and its relation to the judgment is strikingly reminiscent of John the Baptist and quite different from the ritual washings of Sib. Or. 3.592, which are not presented in an eschatological context."<sup>248</sup> Is Sib. Or. 4 categorically against the idea of Temple worship, as Collins speculated? His statement is based on two remarks: the critique in 4.6-11 and the author's lack of interest in including the Temple in his eschatology. Regarding the first point, the critique made by the author is addressed against idolatry and pagan worship (Sib. Or. 4.6-7 is explicitly mentioning this point), which is not necessarily extended to include the Temple of Jerusalem. Redmund and Nikiprowetzky are surely correct that a critique against the idea of a temple made with hands and the appreciation of the Temple of Jerusalem could co-exist, as we saw earlier in Philo (particularly *Cher.* 94-100) and even Isaiah, which provided fertile material for Christian apologetics found in Stephen's speech (Isa 66:1f).<sup>249</sup> It takes more than this criticism to conclude that it is a categorical rejection of Temple worship.<sup>250</sup> The assertion that God dwells in heaven and does not have an early man-made temple as a dwelling place is not essentially anti-Temple; it is simply a way of asserting positively what was widely believed.

The fact that the Jerusalem Temple does not exist is not an endorsement of its non-existence. The Temple plays a pivotal role in bringing the eschaton. The account of the destruction and its impact reads as follows:

An evil storm of war will also come upon Jerusalem  
from Italy, and it will sack the great Temple of God,  
whenever they put their trust in folly and cast off piety  
and commit repulsive murders in front of the Temple. (Sib. Or. 4.115-118)

---

<sup>248</sup> Collins, "The Sibylline Oracles," in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, 383.

<sup>249</sup> On Stephen's speech see p. 230.

<sup>250</sup> In the case of the Epistle of Barnabas see p. 99.

Then, after enumerating a series of wars and the return of Nero from Parthia:

A leader of Rome will come to Syria who will burn  
the Temple of Jerusalem with fire, at the same time slaughter  
many men and destroy the great land of the Jews with its broad roads. (Sib. Or. 4.125-129)

First, the author calls it “the great Temple of God” (τὸν δὲ θεοῦ μέγαν), which would have been an odd description for an establishment he categorically rejects. Secondly, the sequence of cosmic catastrophes that follow the destruction of the Temple, including the eruption of Vesuvius, is interpreted by the author as a result of the destruction (Sib. Or. 4.135-136).<sup>251</sup> These catastrophes keep rolling until the destruction of civilisation is complete, and then the resurrection of the dead takes place for the second judgement. Considering that the end of the world and divine judgement is a consequence of sacking the “great” Temple, it is difficult to imagine that the author deemed it another “house made of stone, dumb and toothless.” Interestingly, Collins rightly reads that those who “put their trust in folly and cast off piety and commit repulsive murders in front of the Temple” could possibly be the Zealots.<sup>252</sup> The author blames “them” for violence that pollutes the Temple. Later, the author exhorts them to “abandon daggers<sup>253</sup> and groanings, murders and outrages, and wash your whole bodies in perennial rivers” (Sib. Or. 4 163-165). Blaming the insurgents for what happened to the Temple is what we find in the writings of Josephus (A.J. 20.8.5 164-166 and B.J. 4.6.3 381-388 etc.) and statements of Johanna ben Zakkai (Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael Bahodesh 11). Thus, we can

---

<sup>251</sup> “Know then the wrath of the heavenly God,  
because they will destroy the blameless tribe of the pious.”

<sup>252</sup> It was generally accepted by several scholars and was not excluded by Collins, yet he still thinks it is more probable that they are the Romans. Cf. Collins, “The Sibylline Oracles,” in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, 387. The Zealots have also been suggested by Lanchester (“The Sibylline Oracles,” in Charles, *Pseudepigrapha*, 395) and Marcel Simon, “Sur quelques aspects des Oracles Sibyllins juifs” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, ed. David Hellom (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 219–34. Against this reading, see Redmond “Fourth Sibylline Oracle,” 99 and Nikiprowetzky, “Reflexions Sur Quelques Problemes,” 66.

<sup>253</sup> The word used here is φάσγανον which could be translated as a dagger or a short sword. Might it refer particularly to the Sicarii?

see the author lamenting over the Temple and exhorting his people not to repeat a grave mistake. Collins is, therefore, incorrect.

## **2.5 Fourth Ezra**

The majority of scholars date 4 Ezra to the end of the first century.<sup>254</sup> The author clearly aims to respond to the crisis of the destruction of the Second Temple and the transformation toward a Torah-centred Judaism. His vision of the three-headed eagle with its surrounding details suits well the three Flavian emperors, which puts 4 Ezra at the end of Domitian's rule (4 Ezra 3:1). Thus, 4 Ezra is written after the destruction of the Temple and before the Bar Kokhba war.<sup>255</sup>

The text aims to find answers to the question of God's intention. It consists of seven visions granted to Ezra by the Lord's angel, Uriel, in the thirtieth year after the destruction of the First Temple. Ezra faced a crisis in understanding God's action. His troubled thoughts are based on how Babylon was prosperous while the city of God was devastated (4 Ezra 3:1); if Israel were God's elect, how could this happen to them (5:14)?<sup>256</sup>

Seeking an answer, Ezra gives Uriel a detailed account of the desecration and destruction of the Temple (10:21). The vivid images show the impact of the event upon him. In return, Uriel instructs Ezra to go to the wilderness to provide some space for the heavenly Jerusalem to appear (9:23-25). While awaiting Uriel there, Ezra encountered a mourning woman whom he fails to convince to go back to the city (9:38f.). In a powerful vision, the mourning woman flashes like lighting, giving a "fearfully strong" cry before she is transformed into "an established city, and a place of huge foundation" (10:27). After this, "laying there like a corpse" in this "overpowering bewilderment" (10:28), Ezra seeks an explanation. Uriel explains the vision as follows:

---

<sup>254</sup> John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination : an Introduction to Jewish apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids, Mich. : William B. Eerdmans, 1998),196.

<sup>255</sup> Cf. Michael E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, Hermeneia Series (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990), 9; Michael E. Stone and M. Henze, *4 Ezra and 2 Baruch* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2013), 2–3.

<sup>256</sup> Cf. K. R. Jones, *Jewish Reactions to the Destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 63f.

1. The mourning woman is Zion (10:44).
2. She is mourning because for the three thousand years before the building of the First Temple there was no offering for God (10:45).
3. She bore a son during the Jewish settlement in Jerusalem, but she mourned again after that son died (10:48-49).
4. Because of Ezra's good faith, God shows him her eschatological transformation into a glorious city (10:50-51).

After explaining, Uriel asks Ezra to stay in an open field far from the city because man-made buildings cannot stand the presence of the revealed heavenly (God-made) Jerusalem (9:24-26; 10:51, 53). Later, after the sixth vision (the coming of the Son of Man), the angel promises Ezra that he will be on the top of Mount Zion when the heavenly Zion is revealed (13:36).

As we can see, the eschatological city revealed to Ezra is not in a heavenly place but it is somehow present, yet to be revealed, in the impending eschaton. It is also introduced as an alternative that cannot coexist with man-made corporeal buildings. This evokes an important question regarding the relationship between the man-made temple and the heavenly one. Hindy Najman considers the angel's explanation as indicative "that the earthly Temple *had* to be destroyed, in order to clear the way for the ultimate manifestation of the celestial Temple in its place."<sup>257</sup> On the one hand, this fits with the fact that Ezra was seeking an explanation as to why God let the Temple be destroyed. On the other hand, the reading would attribute to God, eventually, the destruction of a *less important* temple for the sake of the *better* one. But the angel does not, in fact, ask Ezra to go to Jerusalem or the place of the Temple in order to witness some sort of a replacement; he asks him to go to the wilderness. The angel never proposes the idea that God allowed the devastation of the Temple and the people of Jerusalem for the sake of a better future. The angel always reminds Ezra that he does not understand and his knowledge is insufficient, so there is no explanation needed. Yet, he offers him consolation by revealing a promising future. Like other apocalyptic writings, evil must reach climactic levels before

---

<sup>257</sup> Hindy Najman, *Losing the Temple and Recovering the Future* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 149.

the breaking in of the Eschaton. As Michael Stone notes, there is no explanation from God for what happened.<sup>258</sup> The question then becomes: what will God do about it? The fourth vision of the new Jerusalem is pivotal in the book and shows a conversion experience through which Ezra no longer fasts nor asks questions despite the fact that his earlier questions were not answered in the first place; he is basically overpowered by the vision of this mighty city which deems such questions irrelevant in the face of this reality.<sup>259</sup>

From this point, we cannot infer from 4 Ezra that God *destroyed* the Temple of Jerusalem in order to bring his heavenly one, and therefore we cannot consider 4 Ezra as indicative of a negative view of the earthly Jerusalem Temple. The contrast between the temples is not set by the author in order to undermine the earthly worship and the significance of animal sacrifices. The vision of the mourning woman shows that she wept for three-thousand years before the introduction of sacrifices (10:45). In this vision, the woman cheers up after having a son, and when this son dies at his wedding she mourns again until her complete transformation into the great city of Zion. If this woman is the city as the angel explained, and if her weeping was due to the lack of sacrifices caused by begetting a son, then this son should not be understood as anything other than the Temple of Jerusalem. If we understand her transformation as a happy end and a divine vindication then it should be inferred that the son is back—now as the imperishable Temple. Therefore, while there is no explicit mention of the Temple in Uriel’s interpretation, the association of Zion’s rejoicing with the son makes it completely plausible that the restoration of the Temple and its cult is the heart of consolation. We have to take into consideration that the whole vision is a response to Ezra’s detailed account of the Temple’s desecration.<sup>260</sup>

---

<sup>258</sup> Michael E. Stone, “Reactions to the Destructions of the Second Temple,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 12 (1981): 199.

<sup>259</sup> Cf. Stone “Reactions,” 203.

<sup>260</sup> This point contradicts Timothy Wardle’s conclusion that 4 Ezra is unclear about the future of Temple worship. See Wardle, “Continuity and Discontinuity,” 136. Agreeing with my point, see K. M. Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 174.

Another question arises: would 4 Ezra imply a contrast between material and immaterial worship? From the angel's justification of sending Ezra to an open area<sup>261</sup> to avoid an overlap between the buildings and the eschatological Zion, we can infer that the heavenly Temple was not proposed we can infer that the heavenly Temple was not proposed to counter the real Temple, or to copy or mirror the earthly one.<sup>262</sup> The contrast between the man-made one and the God-made one is surely meant to refer to the latter's indestructibility, which solves the problem of the destruction of the man-made temples that could not withstand the aggression of gentile empires.

From the context of this vision, we should see that the contrast between the man-made and God-made temples comes as an eschatological solution to the problem of the Temple's vulnerability. It is also part of the author's programme to shift the focus of Jewish practice away from Temple cult to the imperishable Torah (4 Ezra 4:19-22, 36f.), or as Hindy Najman puts it, "re-centering the world."<sup>263</sup> Thus, the readers are "absolved entirely from the responsibility, and free to receive the Torah again."<sup>264</sup> However, this is an interim solution, with the eschatological age restoring the Temple.

From this reading, we could conclude the following:

- 1- The contrast between the two temples does not imply a negative view of the earthly Temple and animal sacrifices made there.
- 2- While it is imperishable, the heavenly temple has a degree of corporeality and will be revealed on earth, which implies a continuum of cultic services in the eschaton.
- 3- The destruction and hope in the coming of the heavenly temple affected the shape of Judaism and its identity directly, and it could thus safely involve a Torah-centred life in the present.

---

<sup>261</sup> There is an opinion which sees Ezra's retreat to the wilderness as part of his preparation to receive revelation of the Torah: "It is a place that is nowhere. But then it is equally anywhere. It is an effected location that fits perfectly with a version of Judaism that is shifting its focus from Temple to Torah, from revelation rooted in a particular place and human artifice to revelation inflected by destruction (See Najman, *Losing the Temple*, 125).

<sup>262</sup> Wardle states that the authors of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch agree on describing the earthly Jerusalem as "mere copy." See Wardle, "Continuity and Discontinuity," 138.

<sup>263</sup> Najman, *Losing the Temple*, 92.

<sup>264</sup> Najman, *Losing the Temple*, 97.

- 4- The Temple is at the heart of Israel's humiliation and vindication against the oppressing empire.

## 2.6 2 Baruch

Written around the same time as 4 Ezra, the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch (2 Baruch) also aims to offer a response to the catastrophe of the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple. The exact date of the composition of this document is unknown, but it is safe to say that it was written after the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE (cf. 32:2-4), and before the war of Bar Kokhba, which does not appear in any prophecies. The end of Domitian's rule is the most plausible.<sup>265</sup>

The author writes as the prophet Baruch, the scribe of Jeremiah (cf. 1 Baruch), and uses the destruction of the First Temple as a means to reflect on the destruction of the second. Unlike the author of 4 Ezra, the author accepts that the destruction of the Temple is God's judgement on the basis of the nation's sins. However, his question concerns what should be made of this destruction. Without the Temple, Baruch claims that God's honour and credibility would be disputed: "O Lord: Now, what will happen after these things? For if you destroy your city and deliver up your country to those who hate us, how will the name of Israel be remembered again? Or how shall we speak again about your glorious deeds? [...] And where is all that which you said to Moses about us?" (2 Bar. 3:5-9)

Defending his decision, God's answer reflects conflicting views. On the one hand, God denies that his promises were intended for the Jerusalem Temple (4:2-7). They were for a celestial pre-existing one that was once in paradise but which was taken up to heaven after Adam's transgression:

It is not this building that is in your midst now; it is that which will be revealed, with me, that was already prepared from the moment that I decided to create Paradise. And I

---

<sup>265</sup> Cf. Klijn in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, 616. For a detailed analysis of the date see, M. F. Whitters, *The Epistle of Second Baruch: A Study in Form and Message* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2003), 149f.

showed it to Adam before he sinned. But when he transgressed the commandment, it was taken away from him—as also Paradise. (2 Bar. 4:2)<sup>266</sup>

It was that temple, not the one in Jerusalem, that was revealed to Abraham and Moses as the promised one:

After these things I showed it to my servant Abraham in the night between the portions of the victims. And again I showed it also to Moses on Mount Sinai when I showed him the likeness of the tabernacle and all its vessels [Ex 25:9, 40]. Behold, now it is preserved with me—as also Paradise. (2 Bar. 4:4-7)

This statement would certainly undermine the significance and the *raison d'être* of the Temple in Jerusalem. On the other hand, the way the Temple of Jerusalem is handled in 5.1–6.9 gives an opposite view. In this section, God seems to acknowledge the negative consequences of the destruction, as proposed by Baruch (5:2), and he says that Jerusalem would not be destroyed, which is what happens the next day (5:3). Lifted up on the wall of the city to see the scene, Baruch witnesses how the angels come to collect the vessels inside the Holy of Holies “lest they be polluted” in the hands of the approaching Chaldeans (6:7). Only then do the angels allow the Chaldeans to break into the city: “after these things I heard this angel saying to the angels who held the torches: Now destroy the walls and overthrow them to their foundations so that the enemies do not boast and say, ‘We have overthrown the wall of Zion and we have burnt down the place of the mighty God’” (7:1). And to assure the reader that this is undertaken under God’s control, another voice (probably that of God himself) comes “from the midst of the Temple”, inviting the enemies to come because “he who guarded the house has left it” (8:1-2). Right before that, one of the angels explains that the holy objects will be hidden as the Jerusalem Temple “will be delivered up for a time, until the moment it will be restored forever.” Thus, that earthly Temple of Jerusalem preserves the dignity and honour of God who indeed lived in it. It is also lifted up until it is restored forever. Furthermore, the remains of the Holy of Holies become the place where heaven and earth meet, as Baruch received his visions there (cf. 2 Bar. 34:1; 35:1, etc.). This implies that the Temple is of great significance and that the

---

<sup>266</sup> The pre-existing Temple is a tradition that could also be found in the Talmud Pesarim 54a.

promise and covenant are associated with it, in contrast to what was said the night before the destruction.

The paradox is clear. We now have two ‘lifted up’ temples in heaven: the pre-existing one, lifted up after Adam’s sin, and the one in Jerusalem. This probably reflects the different traditions that give the document a composite character, as Klijn suggests,<sup>267</sup> and also R. H. Charles half a century earlier.<sup>268</sup>

Here, we should refer to Rivka Nir’s comprehensive study.<sup>269</sup> Nir argues that 2 Baruch is a Christian work<sup>270</sup> reasoned on the grounds that the author has a negative attitude toward the Temple of Jerusalem, which she thinks complies with “the Christian tradition as a whole,”<sup>271</sup> and the promotion of the celestial eschatological temple. Her strategy is to interpret the whole Temple attitude throughout the text in light of the heavenly Temple section of 4:2-7 alone and argues that several notions of the Temple have parallels in Christian traditions: (i) the heavenly temple as an eschatological phenomenon is found in Paul and Hebrews;<sup>272</sup> (ii) the hiding of the vessels incident mentions that the incense altar was in the Holy of Holies, something that cannot be found elsewhere except in the heavenly temple of Hebrews;<sup>273</sup> and (iii) the priests throwing the keys to heaven shows

---

<sup>267</sup> Cf. Klijn’s comment in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, 617.

<sup>268</sup> Charles, *Pseudepigrapha*, 482: “4:2-5 is apparently an interpolation. The earthly Jerusalem is here derided, and contrasted with the one to be revealed. In 6:9, Jerusalem, though to be delivered up for a time, as in 4:1, will again be restored, forever. Further in vv. 7-8, the actual vessels of the earthly temple are committed to the earth to be preserved for future use in the restored Jerusalem.” See also R. H. Charles, *The Apocalypse of Baruch* (London: Black, 1896), 6.

<sup>269</sup> Rivka Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).

<sup>270</sup> Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, 199.

<sup>271</sup> Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, 100.

<sup>272</sup> Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, 19f. She shows that the prophetic tradition meant the restoration of the earthly Jerusalem and that the idea of a heavenly one could be found only later in the Talmud tradition. Cf. Midrash Tanhuma Pekude 1, for more citations see Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, 25. She concludes that “there is no image of a heavenly temple in the early Jewish sources” (26). She finds Gal 4:21-31 and Heb 9:11f as the closest parallels to what we find in 2 Baruch.

<sup>273</sup> Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, 44f. Perhaps this is the most interesting point in Nir’s case which makes me more confident in the existence of a common tradition between Hebrews and 2 Baruch. Enumerating the objects the angel is collecting from the Holy of Holies, the incense altar is mentioned. It is made explicit that the

that the Jerusalem Temple was abandoned because of its “false stewards,” affirming the negative Christian attitude to the Temple.<sup>274</sup> While her analysis does show affinity with some Christian texts, her presumptions and conclusion may be challenged.

Principally, the presupposition that “the Christian tradition as a whole” had a negative attitude toward the Temple remains to be proven, and we will explore this matter here.<sup>275</sup> As for 2 Baruch’s points of contact with Christian tradition, the heavenly temple as an eschatological phenomenon is well attested in other Second Temple texts before and after the fall of Jerusalem.<sup>276</sup> Locating the incense altar in the Holy of Holies, as does the covenantal temple of Hebrews (9:11f), is a good point, but this could suggest a common tradition within Judaism which was used by both. There is no evidence of dependence on one text over the other. As for the throwing of keys, it is well attested in Jewish tradition.<sup>277</sup> There are two further problems in Nir’s approach. First, her critique relies solely on the Syriac manuscript of Milan. The Arabic manuscript is a translation of a Syriac manuscript which is probably earlier and more faithful to the original reading of 2 Baruch. This manuscript does not only

---

incense altar was not put in the Holy of Holies. See Josephus, *B.J.* 5.237. As J. Moffat puts it: “Indeed no other position was possible for an altar which required daily service from the priests; inside the ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων it would have been useless.” J. Moffat, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963), 114.

<sup>274</sup> “It seeks to emphasize the end of the earthly temple and of the function of those who serve there. The fact that the temple was destroyed is the decisive proof that the priests were false wardens, who therefore need to transfer the keys to the true warden who can guard the temple” (Moffat, *Commentary on The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 100).

<sup>275</sup> This could be an indication of the significance of this research and how it aims to tackle the problem of understanding Christian diversity in light of its Temple attitudes.

<sup>276</sup> The Enochic tradition in 1 En. 90.1-2 cannot be understood as simply the final restoration of an earthly Temple, but possibly a celestial heavenly one. Furthermore, the Talmudic tradition about the pre-existent Temple (pesachim 54a) should not be dismissed as a later tradition. Most importantly, 2 Baruch itself in its extant form confuses the heavenly temple with the eschatological restoration of the Temple of Jerusalem, which is not that different from what we have already seen in 4 Ezra.

<sup>277</sup> In connection with the destruction of the First Temple, we have Leviticus Rabbah 19:6, Taanith 29a. and the closest one to 2 Baruch is in *Abot de Rabbi Nathan*, chapter 7. S. J. Saldarini, trans., *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 73.

“omit any anti-Jewish tendency,”<sup>278</sup> it also omits the possible allusions to the New Testament<sup>279</sup> and offers a different reading of the same statements Nir relied on.

For the problematic statement of the heavenly temple (4:3), the following comparison between the two texts is illuminating:

| Syriac <sup>280</sup>                                                                                                                                                               | Arabic (my translation)                                                                                                                                       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| It is not this building, built in your midst now; it is <u>that which will be revealed</u> , with me, that was prepared here from the beginning since I designed to create paradise | For this is not the structure that could be seen built in your midst, but <i>the building of truth</i> that I decreed when I created paradise. <sup>281</sup> |

The Arabic reading introduces an image of building truth and justice (not “the true building” as Nir suggested)<sup>282</sup> which is a metaphor for righteousness. This metaphor seems to have been redacted by an apocalypticist (or perhaps a Christian scribe) to become another temple “which will be revealed.” Again, the same issue appears in the tradition of throwing the keys (10:18):

<sup>278</sup> A. F. Klijn and G. van Gelder (trs., eds.), *The Arabic Text of the Apocalypse of Baruch* (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 6.

<sup>279</sup> Klijn and Gelder, *The Arabic Text*, 6–7.

<sup>280</sup> Klijn, “2(Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch,” in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, 622.

<sup>281</sup> فإنه ليس ذلك بهذا البنيان الذي يُرا مبنياً وسطكم ولكن بنى الحق الذي قضيت إذ خلقت الفردوس.

The English translators of the text mistranslated “بنى الحق” as “the building of the truth”. The word “بنى” is the act of building, not the structure itself and “الحق” is righteousness being built, so it should be “building righteousness.”

<sup>282</sup> Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, 19 n.1.

| Syriac                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Arabic (my translation)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>You, priests, take the keys of the sanctuary, and cast them to the highest heaven, and give them to the Lord and say, “Guard your house yourself, because, behold, <u>we have been found to be false stewards.</u>”</p> | <p>And let the priests take the keys of the Holy City “<i>Bait al-Maqdis</i>” and throw them toward the sky and to hand them over, saying “you keep your house because we were there in the house and <u>we all failed as we were incapable of protecting it.</u>”<sup>283</sup></p> |

The harsh statement “false stewards” which Nir used as a falsification of the Temple itself is absent in the Arabic parallel. In the Arabic text, the priests were simply “unable” to physically protect the Temple which is implied by their statement, given shortly after its destruction, that “we were there”. This “inability” in the Arabic text does not mean that the priests were corrupt or that the Temple was not a true one, unlike being “found” to be false stewards in the Syriac text which does bear a strong negative connotation against their integrity. This comparison suggests that 2 Baruch in its original form suffered redaction and interpolation possibly by Christian scribes; its original form attested in the Arabic manuscript cannot support Nir’s case for a negative Christian reading of the whole text in light of the heavenly temple only.

What R. H. Charles saw in the text as a possible Christian intrusion before the Arabic text was discovered is now confirmed in the points shown above. In the earlier text, the significance of the Temple of Jerusalem appears throughout, even in Baruch’s activity post- destruction. Whenever he

<sup>283</sup> وليأخذوا الأحبار مفاتيح بيت المقدس فيلقوها نحو السما وليعطوها وليقولوا احفظ انت بيتك فانا نحن الذين كنا وكلنا بالبيت وقد فشلنا وعجزنا

Again, the English translators mistranslate the word “Ahbar” as rabbis, while it specifically means priests. They also translated “bait al-Maqdis” to be literally “house of holies” in reference to the Temple and this is a mistranslation because it is a concrete term used by early Muslims and Christians (until now) as a name for Jerusalem. Using the Temple and the city of Jerusalem interchangeably is not uncommon in Second Temple literature. Cf. L. I. Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch* (Leiden: Brill, 2008) 32f.

laments or goes to receive a vision, he does so at the site of the Holy of Holies. There is only one temple which experienced destruction and vindication. The vessels that were buried in the earth while the Temple was delivered up until fully restored indicate that the same cultic worship continued, supported by God in the eschaton, as in 4 Ezra. The eschaton will witness the defeat of the enemies. It cannot be clearer in the following divine promise:

For after a short time, the building of Zion will be shaken in order that it will be rebuilt. That building will not remain; but it will again be uprooted after some time and will remain desolate for a time. And after that it is necessary that it will be renewed in glory and that it will be perfected into eternity. (32:2-5)

Interestingly, a sense of relative depreciation of the Second Temple could be inferred from the words of the angel that “Zion will be rebuilt again [...] and the nations will again come to honour it but not as fully as before” (68:5-8). Frederick Murphy notes that this depreciation of the Second Temple, compared to the First, is not uncommon in postexilic literature.<sup>284</sup> We have seen a similar case in the vision of the three temples in the Animal Apocalypse of Enoch. There is no explanation for this anywhere else in the text but if the focus is on the final imperishable Temple, and if this text is written after the destruction of the Second Temple, it is plausible to consider that the Second Temple was in an imperfect state, to be perfected in the eschaton.

To conclude, Baruch’s complicated Temple attitude shows hope in a final restoration of the Temple on earth, with the same vessels and objects being restored alongside it. Baruch’s eschatology is not far from that of 4 Ezra but it is more emphatic on the unity of the Temple, discussed in several revelations that indicate it will be perfected in the eschaton, yet in continuity with earthly worship. The tradition of the heavenly temple in 4:2-4, with its negative view of the Jerusalem Temple, is a later interpolation (perhaps not necessarily a Christian one since late first-century Judaism already developed this).<sup>285</sup> The author also puts this hope in the same context as the vindication of God’s

---

<sup>284</sup> For example, Hag 2:3; Ezra 3:12; 1 En. 89.73; T.Mos. 4:8. Cf. F. J. Murphy, “The Temple in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch,” *JBL* 106 (1987): 682.

<sup>285</sup> Cf. R. Charles, *The Apocalypse of Baruch* (New York: McMillan, 1918), 6. See also R. Kirschner, “Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Responses to the Destruction of 70,” *HTR* 78 (1985): 27–46.

house and people against enemies. This hope in the eschatological restoration of the Temple by God's hand shows 2 Baruch to be on the same trajectory as 4 Ezra: a call for a reshaped identity centralised around the Torah in the meantime.

## **2.7 4 Baruch and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah**

The so-called "The Rest of the Words of Jeremiah" (*Paraleipomena Jeremioi*), commonly known as 4 Baruch, is another response to the catastrophe of the destruction of the Second Temple. The author knew the vineyard of King Agrippa I (3:14, 21; 5:22) and also describes the destruction of the city and its Temple, which means it is the Second Temple. A number of scholars follow Harris' dating which puts the text shortly after, and in reaction to, the Bar Kokhba war. Harris relies on the period of Abimelech's sleep, which is 66 years (5:2) after the destruction of the Temple. This puts the date at 136 CE. Abimelech's failure to recognise the city from outside is understood by Harris to be a possible reference to Hadrian's new city and the change of Jerusalem. Thus, we can say that 4 Baruch is dated between the late first century and the first third of the second century.<sup>286</sup>

The work starts with God's warning to Jeremiah of the impending destruction of Jerusalem. Like 2 Baruch, the dilemma of keeping God's honour and accepting the destruction of the Temple is presented by Jeremiah (1:5-12). God mentions that it is he himself who will destroy it, not the enemies. He does not suggest that there is a pre-existent true temple as in 2 Baruch.<sup>287</sup> Accepting God's judgement, Jeremiah and Baruch witness the destruction similarly to 2 Bar. 6 (4 Bar. 3:1f). The vessels are hidden in the earth, but it is Jeremiah who hid them, not an angel (4 Bar. 3:9). The details of the holy objects to be saved are missing. The temporary lifting up of the Jerusalem Temple and the promise of its return do not appear here (cf. 2 Bar. 6:9). Instead, the vessels were hidden safely until

---

<sup>286</sup> Cf. J. R. Harris, *The Rest of the Words of Baruch* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1889), 12f. See also H. F. D. Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 814–16.

<sup>287</sup> It is widely accepted that 4 Baruch knew of 2 Baruch and reflected on it (as we will see several meeting points in the destruction narrative), so if 4 Baruch knew the interpolation of the heavenly temple and if he referred to the idea of a heavenly sanctuary (see 9:5), why did he not use it?

“the return/gathering of the Beloved One (τῆς συνελεύσεως τοῦ ἠγαπημένου)” (4 Bar. 3:12).<sup>288</sup> This may be a deliberate switch in the eschatological discourse, if the author knew 2 Baruch. Jens Herzer, for example, suggests that this is “probably because of 4 Baruch’s eschatological orientation toward the heavenly Jerusalem; the earthly has no eschatological salvific significance.”<sup>289</sup> Focusing the promise on the Messiah’s coming and the lack of restoration/rebuilding of the Temple could suggest some shift of interest in the author’s understanding. However, it would be an exaggeration to deny the significance of the Temple in this work entirely. Indeed, the author does not elaborate on the destiny of the Temple of Jerusalem, but neither does he mention the heavenly temple except in a statement by Abimelech as a good wish to a man he meets (4 Bar. 5:34). Furthermore, the question remains: what is the reason for preserving “the vessels of the service (τὰ σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας)” if they will be of no use in a future service? The association of the Messiah (the Beloved One) and the coming/restoration of Temple service is not inferior to other literature we have reviewed.<sup>290</sup> Given that 4 Baruch explicitly associates the Beloved One with cultic service, this might suggest a view of a priestly messiahship.<sup>291</sup>

Herzer has argued that the future eschatological temple is the pre-existent heavenly one, and clearly there is a shortage of interest in the physical Jerusalem Temple, especially in the eschaton, as found not only in the lack of reference to a promise of its restoration, but also the pessimistic tone used throughout. We are told that the Judaeans did not listen to Jeremiah. Insisting on their sinning even in Babylon (4 Bar. 7:29-30), Jeremiah throws the keys up to heaven without any hope they would have

---

<sup>288</sup> This strong Messianic tone suggests to me that the document was written when enthusiasm towards the Bar Kokhba war was building up, not in reaction to it.

<sup>289</sup> J. Herzer, *4 Baruch (Paraleipomena Jeremiu)* (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 62–63.

<sup>290</sup> Both 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch introduce the city of the eschaton and the Messiah (the Son of Man) together. See above.

<sup>291</sup> We have already seen this the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85-90) and Sib. Or. 5.420-433 (see above n.237). On priestly Messianism please see A. J. B. Higgins, “The Priestly Messiah,” *NTS* 13 (1967): 211–39.

them back (4 Bar. 4:4-5), and Abimelech fails to recognise the city because it has considerably changed (4 Bar. 5:9).<sup>292</sup>

This can be seen more clearly when we compare the story to another text. The Apocryphon of Jeremiah<sup>293</sup> narrates the same story we find in 4 Baruch but some differences in detail show a different attitude to the Jerusalem Temple. Despite the desecration of the Temple of Jerusalem by the behaviour of King Zedekiah (*Ap. Jer.* 28), and Nebuchadnezzar's success in taking away the vessels (*Ap. Jer.* 29), Jeremiah receives the promise of the restoration of the Temple worship which should take place after the return from the exile, not after the coming of a Messiah. Therefore, instead of throwing the keys away, Jeremiah wraps them with his prophetic garment and keeps them safe in the tower of the Temple. Furthermore, while everything is destroyed in the Temple, the corner stone under which he has hidden the golden plate remains (*Ap. Jer.* 28). Finally, and in a celebratory tone (not the tone of a dying person as in 4 Baruch), Jeremiah asks the Temple tower to give him back the keys and the cornerstone in order to return to him the golden plate for the sacrificial system to be restored in the Temple. The Aaronic priests officiate at several sacrificial services and they are all accepted and taken up by God (*Ap. Jer.* 41).

It is important to note that 4 Baruch was appropriated by Christians who added a Christian ending: Jeremiah rises from the dead to tell a story of seeing Jesus who raised him back to life. Stating that he saw "the God and the Son of God" enrages the Jews, who consequently viciously kill him. This Christological touch and the strong anti-Jewish tone in this ending shows that either the Christian group responsible for it approved of its views on the Temple and did not feel the need to change the promise of the restoration of the Temple liturgy in the coming of the Beloved One, or else (and perhaps additionally) made further editorial changes in the work to cohere with their concepts. The

---

<sup>292</sup> From this, Harris suggests that the text belongs to the earliest years after the Bar Kokhba war and Hadrian's transformation of the city.

<sup>293</sup> Not to be confused with Qumran's cave4 apocryphon of Jeremiah. The version we are studying is sometimes known as *The History of the Captivity in Babylon* and it survives in Coptic, Arabic and Garshuni. The Coptic version is based on the original Greek and was published in K. H. Kuhn, ed., trans., "A Coptic Jeremiah Apocryphon," *Le Muséon* 83 (1970): 95–135, 291–350. I have consulted Kuhn's edition in my work.

work, then, would then become a resource for understanding Christian temple attitudes rather than exclusively Jewish ones. In another text related to the role of Jeremiah, entitled *Lives of the Prophets*,<sup>294</sup> we can find Jeremiah associating the restoration of the services (the return of the ark of the law) with a time when the gentiles worshipped a piece of wood, in a clear reference to the true cross.<sup>295</sup> In this text, which belongs to the same period (fourth–fifth centuries), the Christian redactor did not feel the need to change the promise of the restoration of the Temple cult in its materialistic sense (the reusing of the vessels, golden plate, etc.); rather, the Christian contribution involves its Christology in the inauguration of the eschaton. No critique or categorical rejection of the Temple can be detected in the contribution of the Christian redactor.

## ***2.8 The Apocalypse of Abraham***

Unfortunately, external evidence of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is rather inconclusive and the text itself survives in six manuscripts in Slavonic only. The apocalypticist records the details of the destruction and desecration of the Temple in agreement with Josephus (*B.J.* 4.4.5) and 4 Ezra (10:21f). He situates the eschaton and the destruction of the Temple after four descents/generations of heathen empires (28, 30) which is reminiscent of the four empires in Daniel (8:22). The author situates the course of history in a vision made up of twelve hours. Each hour represents the passage of 100 years, beginning from the building of Jerusalem during David's time, right up until the author's present day (chapters 28 and 30). According to Josephus (*B.J.* 6.10), the period between David's reign and the destruction of the Second Temple was 1179 years. If the apocalypticist is writing by the end of the first century, the timescale roughly matches with the 1200 years he proposes, provided that he knows the tradition Josephus relied on. We can then date the *Apocalypse of Abraham* after the

---

<sup>294</sup> Charles Torrey has convincingly shown that the first Jewish form of the text belongs to late first century. It preserves earlier extra-biblical traditions about the prophets. It also experienced Christian redaction that could be easily inferred from the lives of Elijah and Jeremiah. C. C. Torrey, trans., *The Lives of the Prophets* (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1946).

<sup>295</sup> Torrey, *Lives of the Prophets* (on Jer 10): "This prophet, before the destruction of the Temple, took possession of the ark of the law and the things within it, and caused them to be swallowed up in a rocky cliff, and he said to those who were present: 'the Lord departed from Sinai into heaven, and he will again come with might; and this shall be for you the sign of his appearance, when all the Gentiles worship a piece of wood.'"

destruction of the Second Temple, while it is not hazardous to consider the *terminus ante quem* to be the early second century.<sup>296</sup> The first section (1–8) is about Abraham’s struggle with idolatry and his conversion. The second section (9–32) is about the apocalypse. In his vision, Abraham is foretold what his seed will experience until the end of ages. The cultic language of the vision is unmistakable; under the guidance of the angel Jaoel, Abraham goes to Mount Horeb to present his sacrifice.<sup>297</sup> Despite the attempts of the evil angel Azazel to obstruct him, Abraham manages to make his offering and there he ascends to see the future of Israel. He sees a “beautiful temple” and enquires about it:

And I said to him, “What is this idol, or what is the altar, or who are those being sacrificed, or who is the sacrifice, or what is the beautiful temple which I see, the art and beauty of your glory that lies beneath your throne?” And he said, “Hear, Abraham! This temple which you have seen, the altar and the works of art, this is my idea of the priesthood of the name of my glory, where every petition of man will enter and dwell; the ascent of kings and prophets and whatever sacrifice I decree to be made for me among my coming people, even of your tribe.” (Apoc. Ab. 25.4-5)

Later, he sees its destruction as being due to the sin of his people:

Behold, I saw (the heathen) running to them by way of four ascents and they burned the Temple with fire, and they plundered the holy vessels that were in it. And I said, “Eternal One, the people you received from me are being robbed by the hordes of the heathen. They are killing some and holding others as aliens, and they burned the Temple with fire and they are stealing and destroying the beautiful things which are in it.” (Apoc. Ab. 27.3-5)

Finally, God promises eschatological rejoicing and a vindication of those who have believed in him and walked in his commandments. In this promise, the pious of Abraham’s seed “will live, being affirmed by the sacrifices and the gifts of justice and truth in the age of justice” (Apoc. Ab. 29.18).

---

<sup>296</sup> Cf. G. H. Box, *The Apocalypse of Abraham* (New York: McMillan, 1918). B. Philonenko-Sayar, and Marc Philonenko, *Die Apokalypse Abrahams* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1982); Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, 683.

<sup>297</sup> See section 10. Mount Horeb is associated with Moses’ reception of the ten commandments (Exod 3:1; see also 1 Kgdms 19:8).

The vision of Abraham complicates the relationship between earthly and heavenly worship. It is not clear whether the promise is to restore Jerusalem or to bring about a heavenly one. God's interpretation of the "beautiful temple" shows that it is the very one that will be destroyed and at the same time its archetype flows from heaven. Unlike 2 Baruch and 4 Baruch, nothing remains from the physical Temple. The vessels are taken by the Romans, which implies that the thread of connection between the Temple and any future one does not exist. The eschatological temple is, then, a completely new one, yet there is no evidence that it descends from heaven. However, the Temple is also in the heart of polemic with the enemies (the heathen): Abraham's understanding is a response to the catastrophe of 70 CE.

As was the case with the previous texts, Apocalypse of Abraham was also appropriated by Christians at an early stage and a complete section was added. Agreeing with G. H. Box,<sup>298</sup> the section (29.3-13) interrupts the flow of eschatological events, including what happened to the Temple. It also associates the coming of the eschatological promises with Jesus, without any critique of the Temple or any supersessionist gestures. We cannot know for sure whether anything has been removed, but this may indicate a Christian seal of approval of the Temple understanding proposed by the original Jewish author.

## **2.9 Conclusion**

In conclusion, the impact of the destruction of the Temple and the need to respond to the event's effect on Israel's identity was the common denominator in these major texts that all date from approximately the same period. Yet, the details of these responses vary considerably, providing different views on what is to be expected. Christians received these texts and accommodated them, sometimes with interpolations and edits, yet without necessarily having a vastly different opinion which makes it safe for us to infer that some of these responses were at least acceptable to them.

---

<sup>298</sup> Box, *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, 78–80, also R. Rubinkiewicz, "Apocalypse of Abraham," in Charlesworth *Pseudepigrapha*, 684. Cautiously, Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *Die Apokalypse Abrahams*, 450.

## The Epistle of Barnabas

The Epistle of Barnabas was known mostly to the Alexandrian fathers of the second and third centuries. It is anonymous in that it lacks an internal indicator of authorship, but it circulated under the name of Barnabas, the companion of Paul. The Epistle survives in two major Greek codices: the Sinaiticus (S) and the Jerusalem codex (H). It also appears in the seventh-century Latin codex Claromontanus (L), other fragments (G) and the St. Petersburg MS (Q.v.I.39).

### 3.1 Provenance

Scholars have held different views on the Epistle's provenance, suggesting Alexandria,<sup>299</sup> the Syro-Palestinian area,<sup>300</sup> and Asia Minor.<sup>301</sup> Others have found the whole region of the Eastern Empire as the safest assumption.<sup>302</sup> Despite this, Alexandria has, by far, the strongest case in terms of early reception. We find that the Epistle was cited with an honourable title "apostle/apostolic" in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 2.6; 6.8; 8, 15 etc.), while Origen considered the Epistle as a Catholic one (*Cels.* 1.63). It was also found in the biblical canon of Codex Sinaiticus, associated with Alexandria. The allegorical style of exegesis in the Epistle also supports Alexandrian origins. We will explore this further through this research. As well as these two major points in favour of Alexandria,

---

<sup>299</sup>Cf. L.W. Barnard, "The Date of the Epistle of Barnabas: A Document of Early Egyptian Christianity," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 44 (1958): 101–7. Barnard, "The Epistle of Barnabas: A Paschal Homily?," *Vigiliae Christianae* (1961): 8–22.

<sup>300</sup> The strongest voices are P. Prigent, *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif: l'Épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses sources* (Paris: Gabalda, 1961), 23–4. Reidar Hvalvik suggests it to be equally strong as Alexandria, in R. Hvalvik, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 41–2.

<sup>301</sup>Klaus Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971), 118. Although Helmut Koester did not comment on the locality of the epistle explicitly, he enlisted it amongst the Asia Minor literature. H. Koester, *History and Literature of Early Christianity*, vol. 2 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 280–82.

<sup>302</sup> Cf. Philip Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die apostolischen Väter* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978), 612.

there are a few minor internal observations that also refer to Alexandria. For example, Clement of Alexandria's reliance on Barnabas' exegesis of the tradition of the Nomen Sacrum in its suspended form (IH) could suggest evidence in favour of an Alexandrian provenance since this particular form was common in Alexandrian second-century manuscripts (*Strom.* 4.11; Barn. 9.7-8).<sup>303</sup> Further, in Barn. 9.6, the author registers his knowledge of the practice of circumcision in Egypt and all Syria and Arabia. We have no evidence on such a practice in the latter two. Philip Vielhauer makes an intelligent observation by suggesting that such a generalisation could only happen if the author saw such a practice widely known in Egypt: "Ein solcher Irrtum scheint nur möglich zu sein, wenn der Verfasser nur ägyptische Priester kennt."<sup>304</sup> J. Rendel Harris endeavoured to unlock the identity of the shrub mentioned in Barnabas (7.9).<sup>305</sup> Barnabas calls the Rachel shrub "PAXIA."<sup>306</sup> In his study of the *Arak* (أراك) shrub when he was in Egypt, Harris discovered that both shrubs share the same features,<sup>307</sup> as well as having a closeness in names.

Alongside these minor observations, I would like to add another relevant one. The name 'Barnabas' seems to have been associated with early Alexandrians in the memory of later generations. The first book of the *Clementine Homilies* mentions an interesting story in which the winds force Clement of Rome's boat bound for Judaea to change its destination to Alexandria. There, Clement meets a Christian character called Barnabas who instructs him about the Son of God and Christianity before he eventually takes him to Peter in Judaea (*Clem. Hom.* 1.9f.). Barnabas also argues with the philosophers in the city. The story is probably a redaction of an earlier version found in the *Recognitions*, which states that the encounter between Clement and Barnabas was in Rome, not

---

<sup>303</sup> It appears in 45 papyri. See D. Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (California: University of California Press, 1992), 154. See also C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 83f.

<sup>304</sup> Vielhauer, *Geschichte*, 662.

<sup>305</sup> J. Rendel Harris, "On the Locality of Pseudo-Barnabas," *JBL* 9 (1890): 60–70.

<sup>306</sup> Or "PAXIA" in the Sinaiticus text.

<sup>307</sup> Harris' criteria of identification are, (1) the name; (2) the spiny nature of the shrub; (3) the shoots are in some sense edible; (4) operate as a diuretic; and (5) only the berries are sweet ("On the Locality of Pseudo-Barnabas," 62).

Alexandria (*Clem. Recogn.* 1.8-11).<sup>308</sup> In order for such a redaction to make sense, the redactor must have had good reason to locate Barnabas as an apostolic preacher in Alexandria. Pearson suggested that Barnabas' preaching in Alexandria could indicate an awareness of the Epistle of Barnabas, "widely held to be of Alexandrian origin."<sup>309</sup> However, we do not actually have any early statement associating the Epistle of Barnabas with Alexandria. The fourth/fifth century *Acts of Barnabas* has John Mark mentored by Barnabas, not Paul, and it is Barnabas who keeps him until his martyrdom. Mark escapes in an Egyptian boat to Alexandria to found the Alexandrian church.<sup>310</sup> The legend was probably used in the struggle of power between the churches, but the connection between Barnabas and Alexandria is clear. To summarise, the cumulative argument suggests Alexandria as the provenance for this work.

### 3.2 Date

The first chapter of the text indicates some developments that caused the author to take the decision to write his work. This requires understanding the historical context. The author's endeavor to prove that his generation was living in the end days before Jesus' second coming drove him to show the fulfillment of apocalyptic prophecies in contemporaneous events, so that his addressees would "understand" (Barn. 4.6).

---

<sup>308</sup> The story in the *Recognitions* makes more sense because in both versions Clement asked Barnabas to wait until Clement pays back some debts before they go together to Caesarea to meet Peter. If he was unintentionally carried by the winds to Alexandria as a ship-wrecked refugee, what debts did he have to pay in this city? Thus, several scholars believe that it is a later redaction. This redactional observation was made by Georg Strecker, *Das Judentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (Berlin : Akademie-Verlag, 1981), 43. K. Shuve considered this to be part of the anti-Allegory exegesis in *Hom* which aimed to involve Alexandria negatively. Cf. K. Shuve, "The Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and the Antiochene Polemic Against Allegory" (PhD diss., McMaster University, 2007), 9. See also S. Jones, *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity: Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.27-71*, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 117. Also Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen, Homilien und Rekognitionen* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904), 17.

<sup>309</sup> Birger Albert Pearson, "Earliest Christianity in Egypt: Some Observations," in B. A. Pearson and J. E. Goehring (eds.), *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1986), 137.

<sup>310</sup> It was first published in C. von Tischendorf, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1851).

Two major texts have been considered key in dating the letter: (i) Barn. 4.5 refers to the current emperor as the fulfillment of Dan 7:8, and (ii) Barn. 16.3 reflects on an attempt to rebuild the Temple at the time of writing.

First, in Barn. 4.5 the author believes that his contemporary emperor was the “little horn (μικρὸν κέρας)” and that he had subdued three greater emperors who were understood as related to one another as they were subdued under one<sup>311</sup> (ἐταπείνωσεν ὑφ’ ἐν τρία τῶν μεγάλων κεράτων), that little horn. Three candidates for the present emperor have been suggested: Vespasian, Nerva and Hadrian. Considering his glorious military achievements, it is impossible to identify Vespasian as an “excrement/little horn.” Nerva could be described as the “excrement horn” because he was in charge for only sixteen months, between September 96 and January 98, which could have been considered as a transitional period because he was not backed by the army.<sup>312</sup> His accession to power had put an end to the Flavian house which had three consecutive emperors before him. Like Vespasian, Hadrian left a great legacy that cannot be reduced into an “excrement horn” image. Also, there is no reason to couple Domitian, Nerva and Trajan together. Nerva, then, becomes the most fitting choice, since the three emperors are related.

Barn. 16.3-4 tells us that a prophecy of rebuilding the Temple (cf. Isa 49:17 LXX) is taking place: “This is happening (γίνεται). For due to their war, it was destroyed by the enemies. Now, those [and the] servants of the enemies will rebuild it.”<sup>313</sup> Interpreting this text is fraught with difficulties since the text is unstable and we have no external evidence in support of an attempt to rebuild the Temple after its destruction in 70 CE. The key term (γίνεται) does not appear in the earliest Greek texts (S and H) which makes its authenticity questionable, while an additional καὶ appears in S, creating further

---

<sup>311</sup> It could also mean “at the same time.” See Paget’s analysis in *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*, WUNT 64 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 11.

<sup>312</sup> Nerva’s protection of the suspects in the murder of his predecessor Domitian created uneasiness with main military figures before everything settled by the summer of 97 when Nerva ordered some changes in the high military ranks. Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 6.1-5. Cf. John. D. Grainger, *Nerva and the Roman Succession Crisis of AD 96-99* (London: Routledge, 2003).

<sup>313</sup> “[γίνεται: G, L]. διὰ γὰρ τὸ πολεμεῖν αὐτοὺς καθηρέθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν· νῦν καὶ αὐτοὶ [καὶ: S] οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρέται ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν αὐτόν.”

complexity to the meaning. A spectrum of opinions can be represented in the following three examples: Helmut Koester considers the whole of Barn. 16.3-4 to be a secondary redaction from a later scribe who witnessed the rise of Bar Kokhba revolt;<sup>314</sup> Windisch dismisses γίνεται only as an unnecessary addition;<sup>315</sup> and Paget, considering it to be the difficult reading,<sup>316</sup> argues for its authenticity as it would be more plausible to omit it rather than to add it since the Temple was not successfully rebuilt. One may wonder why a scribe who omitted γίνεται for the historical difficulty it creates kept the term “at present (vũv)”, which would be equally problematic. Regardless of the authenticity of the term, the text still suggests an initiative to rebuild the Temple during the author’s lifetime. As far as we are concerned, the important point here is that the term vũv reflects a serious initiative to rebuild the Temple in the time of Barnabas.

While some scholars followed Lightfoot on avoiding this verse (or at least a reference to a spiritual temple),<sup>317</sup> others have been divided over the possible period which could witness such a serious initiative. The main candidates, again, are Nerva and Hadrian. Many scholars, including Harnack, support the latter. Some suggest that the temple that was being rebuilt is Hadrian’s temple dedicated to Jupiter, the Aelia Capitolina,<sup>318</sup> while others suggest that it is the Jerusalem Temple itself.<sup>319</sup> The idea of a spiritual temple does not do justice to the meaning of the statement which

---

<sup>314</sup> Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 158, n.1 .

<sup>315</sup> Hans Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920), 388. See also Prigent, *Épître*, 76–77.

<sup>316</sup> Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 18. Cf. A. von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1897), 424. Martin B. Shukster and P. Richardson, “Temple and Bet Ha-midrash in the Epistle of Barnabas,” in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*, vol. 2, ed. S. G. Wilson (Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1986), 17–31.

<sup>317</sup> J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers: Revised Texts* (London: McMillan, 1891), 241; Michel d’Herbigny, “La date de l’Épître de Barnabé,” *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 1 (1910) : 432–34; J. Gunther, “The Epistle of Barnabas and the Final Rebuilding of the Temple,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 7 (1976): 150; P. Prigent and R. Kraft, *L’Épître de Barnabé* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971), 191.

<sup>318</sup> Cf. Vielhauer, *Geschichte*, 611; Klaus Wengst, *Schriften des Urchristentums*, vol. 2 (München: Kösel Verlag, 1984), 115; Hvalvik, *The Struggle*, 22; James Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 80.

<sup>319</sup> Leslie W. Barnard, “The Date of the Epistle of Barnabas: A Document of Early Egyptian Christianity,” *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 44 (1958): 101–7.

reflects a historical crisis that fulfills the mentioned prophesies. Furthermore, neither language nor meaning could support the hypothetical interpretation of the temple as a reference to Hadrian's. Further still, Barn. 16.3-4 shows clearly that the same Temple destroyed in the first war was about to be rebuilt. Hvalvik suggests that the existence of Hadrian's temple in the same place as that of the Jerusalem Temple is the reason for the author's treatment of the two temples as one,<sup>320</sup> but this suggestion is tenuous. Barnabas' argument is that the rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple ushers the apocalyptic crisis which will bring about destruction. If it was Hadrian's temple, Barnabas would not have used this event as an alarming one that needed the composition of such a long epistle to keep his addressees from leaning towards Judaism. For Barnabas, a pagan temple on the ruins of the much-hated Temple of Jerusalem would have been a positive indication of God's punishment of the Jews. Therefore, the text as it stands and as it fits in the whole Epistle suggests clearly that it was the Jerusalem Temple.

But would a rebuilding initiative take place under Hadrian's early years? The lack of evidence is not the only problem of such a suggestion. Hadrian, who witnessed his predecessor's struggle with the large-scale revolt of the Jewish Diaspora (115–117), must have already understood what it meant to rebuild the Temple. It is difficult to think that Hadrian blessed and supervised such a grave action.

On the other hand, one of Nerva's early decisions targeted the Temple directly. He abolished the *fiscus Judaicus*.<sup>321</sup> This tax was instituted by Vespasian after 70 CE to be used in building the Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome (Josephus, *B.J.* 7.218; Cassius Dio, *Historia*, 65.7.2).<sup>322</sup> Mention of the *fiscus Judaicus* is found in Jonathan B. Zakkai's homily on the Song of Songs: "You were unwilling to pay 'Shekel' to Heaven (the Temple) a Beka per head, now you have to pay fifteen Shekels in the

---

<sup>320</sup> Hvalvik, *The Struggle*, 22.

<sup>321</sup> That was minted on his coins [The Jewish coin of Nerva. RIC II 58 – Plate VII, 124 - *Fisci Iudaici Calumnia Sublata*]. See Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 68.1.2.

<sup>322</sup> While Josephus reported that all the Jews everywhere paid the tax, Cassius Dio said that practising Jews are the only taxpayers.

kingdom of your enemies.”<sup>323</sup> These taxes were collected with “utmost rigor” (Suetonius, *Dom.*12.2). Suetonius narrates a story of a ninety-year-old Jew who was dragged to court, stripped of his clothes to see whether he was circumcised and, consequently, subjected to the *fiscus Judaicus*.<sup>324</sup> Therefore, the *fiscus Judaicus* was not only a financial burden but also a psychological one.<sup>325</sup> However, the humiliation reached its climax when it was declared that living “according to Jewish customs” could be punished by property confiscation or even death, since it was considered to be a sort of “atheism (αθεότης)”.<sup>326</sup>

After the assassination of Domitian and the accession of Nerva to power the situation was dramatically changed. One of Nerva’s earliest decisions was to stop the humiliation of the Jews by the *fiscus Judaicus*, allowing the practice of Jewish customs without punishments and perhaps the total abolition of the tax.<sup>327</sup> It is hard to exaggerate the impact of removing the *calumnia* of the *fiscus Judaicus* on the Jews. It is possible that there was an urgent visit by senior Jewish figures to Rome by the end of 96 CE (Mishnah, *Maaser Sheni* 5.9, *Shabbath* 16.8, *Erubin* 4.2; Babylonian Talmud, *Sukkah* 23a.41b; Jerusalem Talmud, *Sukkah* 2.4, 52d).<sup>328</sup> It is also difficult to imagine that, by allowing the practice of Jewish customs and Jewish Temple taxation, the Jews did not seriously consider rebuilding the Temple. Nerva surely knew the background and earlier function of the Jewish tax and how it was associated with sustaining the Jerusalem Temple when he took such a decision. William Horbury’s recent comprehensive analysis of Roman and Jewish evidence confirmed the reign of Nerva as a period of strong Jewish activity that would naturally lead to an attempt to rebuild the

---

<sup>323</sup> Mekhita, Ba-Hodesh, cited by A. Carlebach, “Rabbinic References to Fiscus Judaicus,” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 66 (1975): 57–61.

<sup>324</sup> Carlebach, “Rabbinic References to Fiscus Judaicus,” 57–61.

<sup>325</sup> Cf. E. M. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 374.

<sup>326</sup> M. Goodman, “Nerva, the Fiscus Judaicus and Jewish Identity,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 79 (1989): 43.

<sup>327</sup> We do not have any evidences, amongst the survived financial documents of that era, that the *fiscus Judaicus* was paid by the Jews in Nerva’s time but we know that the later emperors continued in levying this tax at least until the time of Origen.

<sup>328</sup> However, these Jewish sources are not historically reliable enough since they are late and loaded with legendary elements.

Temple.<sup>329</sup> In light of all these factors, I agree with the position of recent scholars that Nerva (or the earliest years of Trajan) is the best candidate to fulfill the two major texts in Barnabas mentioned earlier.<sup>330</sup>

### ***3.3 The Structure of the First Part (1–16)***

While the purpose for writing the Epistle is stated to be a warning against Judaizing and advice on perfecting the addressees' "*gnosis*" (Barn. 1.5), it may well be that reports about plans for rebuilding the Temple provoked this response (Barn. 16). The issue of restoring the Jerusalem Temple might have attracted some Christians, believing that they shared with the Jews the same covenant (Barn. 5.6). This apparently disturbed the author who employed his allegorical hermeneutics to prove that what was happening was actually a sign of the end times. The impact of the news about rebuilding the Temple made him believe that the "final stumbling block is at hand" (Barn. 4.3). The apocalyptic language of Barnabas was employed to exhort his addressees to realise the signs of the "present evil time" (Barn. 1.7) and his task was to prove it to them (Barn. 1.8).

Barnabas developed a composite theological concept of the Temple. This Temple theology works against the Judaizers' claim of sharing the covenant with Jews whose stony Temple had never, and would never, be valid, even if successfully rebuilt. The contrast between the physical and the spiritual temples is the backbone of Barnabas' exegesis that invalidates Jewish customs, including circumcision and sacrifices. The author puts the discussion of the Temple at the climax of his argument, as if the whole process of exegesis leads to it. This can be seen in the structure of the work. The first four chapters constitute one unit that comprises the whole themes of the first part (1–16) of the Epistle. 5–16 of the first part unfolds the content of the first four chapters, as shown below:

---

<sup>329</sup> W. Horbury, *Jewish War Under Trajan and Hadrian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 298–307.

<sup>330</sup> Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*; M. Goodman, "Mission and Conversion: Proselytising in the Religious History of the Roman Empire" (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 4; Shukster and Richardson, "Temple and Bet Ha-midrash in the Epistle of Barnabas"; Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 280.

| Barn. 1–4                                                                                                                                                                             | Barn. 5–16                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1: explaining the aims of writing this epistle (perfecting knowledge along with faith): the three ordinances.                                                                         | 5: Exposition of the salvation obtained from Jesus’ ministry and crucifixion (unfolding the core of Christian faith).                                                                                         |
| 2–3: The invalidity of Jewish customs of: sacrifices (2.4), Sabbath (2.5) and fasting (3.1f.)                                                                                         | 6–10: The invalidity of the Jewish customs: fasting (6), sacrifices, circumcision (7-9), and Sabbath (15).                                                                                                    |
| 4: Christian claim of the covenant (4.6,7).<br><br>exhortation to read the signs of the impending end of times (4.3).<br><br>The Christian temple: Becoming the temple of God (4.11). | 12: Christian claim of the covenant (12.1ff.).<br><br>16: Call to understand the Jewish endeavour to rebuild the physical temple (16.1-3).<br><br>The Christian temple: Becoming the temple of God (16.7-10). |

The aim, which concludes the end of the two parts (chapters 4 and 16), is to clarify the existence of the Christian temple and the insignificance of the Temple of Jerusalem. The discussion recapitulates the case made against Jewish claims of the covenant. Barnabas imagines two contradicting images: the image of the Christian temple which speaks for the whole Christian truth given by God to “us” and the Jerusalem Temple of “them”,<sup>331</sup> in which God is consecrated “almost like a heathen” (Barn. 16.2). This deep contrast is drawn with the clearest possible language in the sixteenth chapter, which is the apex point in the theological programme of the first section, before it moves to the “other gnosis” (Barn. 18.1).

Based on this structure, we can now study Barnabas’ two images: the deconstructed Jewish Temple and the constructed Christian temple.

### ***3.4 Deconstructing the Jewish Temple***

#### ***3.4.1 Barnabas 5–15***

Did the Christian temple replace the Jerusalem one, just as Christianity superseded Judaism with the coming of Jesus (supersessionism), or did the author consider that the Jerusalem Temple had never been God’s holy shrine because God never dwells in a created house (categorical rejection)? Was the covenant lost when the Jews turned to idolatry in the time of Moses, or was it superseded later when Jesus was rejected? The text provides us with statements supporting both interpretations. However, they are not equally elaborated upon and they are certainly irreconcilable.

Barnabas states that the covenant was “completely” lost when the Jews worshipped the golden calf (Barn. 4.7-8; 14.1-4). Consequently, Israel could not be superseded by Christianity because there was no place for Israel in a salvation history. As Hvalvik succinctly puts it: “the Jews had no place in

---

<sup>331</sup> The contrast between “us” and “them” runs through the whole first part where Barnabas draws a clear line between what was said by God to Christians and what was said to the Jews. The form “to them he says... but to us he says...” is common in the epistle (cf. Barn. 3; Barn. 8.8, etc.)

the history of salvation; they had no independent value and importance. They were nothing but a disobedient people who had turned away from God to idols. For that reason, they were not heirs of the covenant.”<sup>332</sup>

James Rhodes’ thesis on the question of the covenant has proposed a less radical reading of the problem. He stated that Barnabas does not really mean “what he says when he asserts that Israel lost its covenant permanently (εἰς τέλος) at Sinai.”<sup>333</sup> Rhodes’ argument hinges on interpreting Barnabas’ reading of salvation in an ahistorical way which appears, according to him, in Barnabas’ confusion of post-Sinaitic events with pre-Sinaitic ones.<sup>334</sup> The promises of Jesus’ revelation in flesh were also said to the people of Israel (6:8-9) which is a post-Sinaitic event. The post-Sinaitic prophecies on which Barnabas relied also show that Israel was not abandoned entirely in Sinai. From this, Rhodes concludes that the tension between the event of Sinai and the coming of Jesus as turning points of the covenant of Israel is due to Barnabas’ approach to the apostasy in Sinai; it is “a rhetorical hyperbole: purposeful and provocative overstatement.”<sup>335</sup>

Rhodes’ argument is not unjustifiable. However, the overlaps between pre- and post-Sinaitic statements, which I do not deny, should be viewed in light of Barnabas’ own understanding of history. The Sinai event was undoubtedly a defining moment that created a long Israelite post-Sinaitic history of infidelity which reached its climax in the time of Jesus when sin reached its full measure.<sup>336</sup> Barnabas introduced Israel’s history not as one of salvation but, as Hvalvik accurately calls it, a damnation history.<sup>337</sup>

---

<sup>332</sup> Hvalvik, *The Struggle*, 330. See also Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 228; Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie*, 131.

<sup>333</sup> J. Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 33. James Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

<sup>334</sup> Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 7. He mentions an example in Barn. 12.8-10 in which Joshua was given his name before the war against Amalek (Exod 17:14). However, Joshua received that name later (in Num 13:16).

<sup>335</sup> Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 17. “The essence of hyperbole is such that one explicitly affirms an assertion that one would logically or tacitly deny outside of the immediate, rhetorically motivated context.”

<sup>336</sup> Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 15–16. Cf. Barn. 5.11; 8.1; 14.5.

<sup>337</sup> Hvalvik, *The Struggle*, 146.

Barnabas identifies two courses of history: the normal history and salvation history. These are two different domains for contradictory events. Barnabas explicitly states that the Jews lost the covenant in the golden-calf incident. It was Moses, not the Jews, who received the covenant while they were not even worthy (οὐκ ἐγένοντο ἄξιοι) (Barn. 14.1, 4). At the same time, “we received it” from Jesus’ suffering. The time gap between Moses and Jesus was for the completion of Israel’s sins (Barn. 14.4-5). Signs and wonders (in Sinai) that preceded their final abandonment (Barn. 4.15 ἐγκαταλελείφθαι) preceded the process of the completion. This means that Barnabas does not see a contradiction between the track of Jewish history and the abandonment in Sinai; he sees the history of Christianity on another track of salvation history that starts from the first creation. In this process, the covenant was building up in a course that did not contain Israel. In other words, the covenant was not transferred from the Jews to Christians but was established from creation through Moses (not the “unworthy” Israel) before he passed it to the Lord, who finally bestowed it to “us” (Barn. 4.15).

Based on that, the Temple of Jerusalem was not rejected because of the Jews’ rejection of Jesus but because it is irrational to have a house of God at all, and the practice of the cult is no different to the worship of the gentile (Barn. 16.2). This is a categorical rejection, not supersessionism.

However, two explicit statements in the Epistle remain irreconcilable with other statements on the abandonment of the Jews in Sinai. Curiously, Rhodes did not focus on their presence, although they could have supported his thesis. These two statements, found in Barn. 2.6 and 9.4, promote the supersessionist idea (that Christianity superseded a previously valid Judaism in the time of Jesus).

Barnabas 2.6 reads: “These things [Temple sacrifices] that he [God] abolished (κατήργησεν) in order that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ (ὁ καινὸς νόμος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), which is without the yoke of necessity, might have its oblation not made by man” (Barn. 2.6).<sup>338</sup>

The place and wording of the statement are problematic. Klaus Wengst noticed the oddity of the structure and order of the chapter and noticed the existence of more than one conclusion that

---

<sup>338</sup> Bracketed words are mine.

interrupts the flow of the biblical arguments.<sup>339</sup> He also noticed the oddity of the use of the word νόμος<sup>340</sup> which appears between 2.6–3.6. He concluded that this section constitutes a unity added by another redactional hand.<sup>341</sup>

2.6 bears the marks of that redactional hand more than the rest of that unit. First, the statement is given in the form of a conclusion and would thus be expected at the end of the list of Barnabas' arguments against the triviality of cultic practices. However, it is found in the middle of his list of the biblical citations. If we removed it, Barnabas' argument runs consistently and ends up with the conclusion in 2.9 (that Christians should not fall into the same error of offering burnt sacrifices), which ends the section of "what he [God] says to *them*" (2.7).

Second, the word "law" (νόμος) is otherwise used in the Epistle exclusively in statements about the Jews (2.6; 3.6). At the same time, the author used the word "ordinances" (δικαιώματά) exclusively for the statements about Christianity, to express God's granted justification that should be preserved, not further laws.<sup>342</sup> He uses "ordinances of the Lord" three times, including once more in the same chapter (2.1; 10.11; 21.1). In terms of the meaning, the author never proposed the concept of a new law in Christianity anywhere else and it contradicts the logic of the Epistle.

Third, the verb "to abolish" (καταργέω) appears four times: in both supersessionist statements at 2.6 and 9.4, as well as in 5.6 and 16.2. In 5.6, it has a different context and meaning and in 16.2 it does not bear any supersessionist meaning (defying the idea of a physical temple).<sup>343</sup> Paget senses the problematic meaning of the verb in 3.2 which appears to be "endorsing a conventional view of salvation history whereby the law was once legitimate, but now through the advent of Christ is

---

<sup>339</sup> Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie*, 18.

<sup>340</sup> On possible parallels with other texts see Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 311, for the full formula (τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) "findet sich in Barn, nur hier."

<sup>341</sup> Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 311.

<sup>342</sup> See also Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 106.

<sup>343</sup> In Barn. 5.6 it is prophesied that Jesus "might destroy (καταργήσῃ)" death. Here, it did not mean putting an end to the law or cult as it was typically used in the earlier statements.

not.”<sup>344</sup> Instead of questioning its authenticity, he suggests that it might mean “reject” rather than “cancel”, and therefore the law was never legitimate.<sup>345</sup>

Wengst and Paget express their suspicion of the nature of chapter 2 as a whole. Wengst observes the peculiarity of the expression “new law” (2.6), which is set against the law of the Jews.<sup>346</sup> Paget correctly states that throughout the letter Barnabas makes “no attempt to present that law as set over another previously existent law.”<sup>347</sup> Paget adds the expression “without yoke of necessity” to this point, which suggests that the earlier yoke was a necessary burden; an idea that appears in other Christian and Jewish texts.<sup>348</sup> Both also highlight the peculiarity of the title “our Lord Jesus Christ that appears nowhere else.”<sup>349</sup> Within the chapter itself, Wengst adds his observation of the disruption between verses 2.1 and 2.4 by verses 2.2-3, which raises concerns regarding the integrity of this chapter.<sup>350</sup> Therefore, both Paget and Wengst suggest the existence of a tradition behind it (if not the whole complex 2.6-3.4), which does not exactly agree with what Barnabas himself says.<sup>351</sup> Based on that, the redaction can be seen in the structure, terminology and meaning of 2.6 in particular.

We see a similar problem in chapter 9 regarding circumcision. An extra concluding statement is sandwiched in the middle of the biblical proofs against the literal understanding of circumcision (9.4): “*But moreover the circumcision in which they trusted has been abolished (κατήργηται)*. For he declared that circumcision was not of the flesh, but they erred because an evil angel was misleading them.” Wengst suggested that 9.4-6 constitutes a unit that interrupts the flow of the ninth chapter, yet he thinks that this unit is Barnabas’ own, for it holds the meaning about the insufficiency of the literal meaning of God’s commandments (in this case circumcision).<sup>352</sup> However, in 9.4a, the verb *κατήργηται* does imply supersessionism. The complexity of the problem created by this term does not

---

<sup>344</sup> Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 105.

<sup>345</sup> Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*. Cf. Rhodes’ comment on Paget’s opinion in Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 42.

<sup>346</sup> Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie*, 105-6.

<sup>347</sup> Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*. 106.

<sup>348</sup> Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*. 106. Paget refers to numerous examples in p.108-9 n.25.

<sup>349</sup> Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie*, 18. Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*. 107

<sup>350</sup> Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie*, 19.

<sup>351</sup> Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie*, 19; Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*. 107-8

<sup>352</sup> Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie*, 35–36.

end here. Philip Haeuser introduces an interesting suggestion that the term in this saying and in 16.2 (καταργῶν, the Temple of Jerusalem) probably reflects some historical events: for the first saying, it might refer to the Hadrianic edict<sup>353</sup> to forbid circumcision and in the second to abolishing the Temple of Jerusalem.<sup>354</sup> Daniel Schwartz revived the idea in an attempt to solve the problem of the variety of the verb's application: the verb probably meant that cult was abolished *a priori* (not superseded) in general but in the case of circumcision and the Temple, the author had a historical advantage that gave him the right to use the verb in a supersessionist meaning.<sup>355</sup> Once more, the main proponent of a supersessionist reading of Barnabas, Rhodes, praised Schwartz's hypothesis<sup>356</sup> despite the fact that it contradicts his own dating of the Epistle (to Nerva's reign).<sup>357</sup> Windisch and Smallwood failed to see any historical intention in Barnabas' statement.<sup>358</sup> The supersessionist reading faces major historical difficulties that deem it untenable:

1. To suggest that the "abolished circumcision" statement in Barn. 9.4 reflects the Hadrianic edict because the "abolished temple" in 16.2 refers to a similar historical event is an example of a circular argument. We first need to prove that 16.2 refers to Hadrian's time and the building of the Capitoline temple in Jerusalem, which is unlikely.
2. In 16.2, Barnabas cites Isa 40:12 and 66:1 to show how "the Lord invalidates (καταργῶν)" the very idea of a physical temple. καταργῶν is the word given to Isaiah about the impossibility

---

<sup>353</sup> We do not have any direct evidence that it was Hadrian who forbade castration but we know that it was allowed up until Trajan (as witnessed to by Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5) and that the decision was cancelled under Antonius Pius, Hadrian's successor (Modestinus, *Digest* 48, 8, 11, 1). This leaves us with only one possibility, which is Hadrian. Some historians claimed that Hadrian's policies on circumcision might have caused the Bar Kokhba revolt but we cannot be certain about that. For a full discussion of this point see E. Smallwood, "The Legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Circumcision," *Latomus* 18.2 (1959): 334–47.

<sup>354</sup> P. Haeuser, *Der Barnabasbrief, Neu untersucht und neu erklärt* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1912), 58.

<sup>355</sup> Daniel Schwartz, *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 153.

<sup>356</sup> Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 86.

<sup>357</sup> Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 84. He supports Hvalvik in considering the mentioned temple as Hadrian's temple for Jupiter (*The Epistle of Barnabas*, 80, 83).

<sup>358</sup> Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 352; Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 430 n.6.

of containing God in a limited man-made house. This has nothing to do with what happened in 70 CE.

In light of these observations, it appears that the statements that support the idea of Christianity superseding Judaism could belong to a later interpolation made after the heated conflict between Christians and Jews took a different shape.

In terms of theological framework, Barnabas shows an unmistakable understanding of God's rejection of Judaism even before Christianity. The Jews did not lose their covenant upon their rejection of Jesus but when they turned to idolatry, as early as Moses' reception of the Decalogue (Barn. 4.7-8). Since then, they misunderstood God's message and practised their customs and cult literally rather than spiritually. This included circumcision (Barn. 9), keeping Sabbath (Barn. 15:1f.) and, most importantly, making physical offerings (Barn. 2). Barnabas' argument is that the irrationality of the literal understanding of God's law made their offerings unacceptable.

In conclusion, Barnabas shows two attitudes towards the Temple cult: (i) the categorical rejection of cult and literal interpretation of the law, and (ii) the supersessionist notion. These do not seem to belong to the same formative layer. The supersessionist statements bear redactional marks which suggest a tendency to attenuate the radicalism of Barnabas towards a more conventional reading of salvation history. Therefore, the genuine Temple attitude should be viewed in the light of Barnabas' radical views of covenant and cult.

### **3.4.2 *Barnabas 16***

Barnabas concludes the first section with his explicit remarks against the Temple in chapter 16, which are a corollary to the case he was building against it. Based on his critique of physical worship, he explicitly accuses the Jews of worshipping God in the Temple of Jerusalem "almost like the Gentiles" (16.2). Barnabas' problem is not only with the sacrificial practices taking place in the Temple, but with the very concept of the Temple as a house for God, and because of this it was destroyed in the first Jewish War (16.1-2). Interestingly, Barnabas associates the Jews' lost hope of

the covenant with the Jerusalem man-made Temple, which consummates his argument. He concludes by saying “that their hope was vain” (16.2). Intertwining the Jerusalem Temple with the lost Jewish hope is of immense significance for his argument. The Temple of Jerusalem, like the Jewish hope, had never truly been a holy place of God and therefore it represents a dangerous doctrinal challenge for Christians who would fall into idolatry if they showed any leniency towards Judaism.<sup>359</sup> His emphasis is to divide Christianity and Judaism sharply, and was probably meant to exclude Jewish Christian groups who held that Jerusalem still hosted the house of God, as seen in Irenaeus’ report on Jewish Christian sects (*Haer.* 2.26.2).<sup>360</sup>

This is the most radical anti-Temple statement we can find in a Christian tradition. It stands in deep contrast with the ecclesiastical view.<sup>361</sup>

### **3.5 Constructing the Christian temple**

#### **3.5.1 Barnabas 4.10-11**

In Barnabas 4.10-11, the author calls his addressees not to follow some sort of an “over enthusiastic”<sup>362</sup> spirituality in which the members think that they are already made righteous (ὡς ἤδη δεδικαιωμένοι). Against it, he exhorts his addressees to keep their spirituality communal. This communal spirituality involves becoming a temple (γενώμεθα ναὸς), not individual temples, consecrated to God: “γενώμεθα πνευματικοί, γενώμεθα ναὸς τέλειος τῷ θεῷ” (Barn. 4.11b).

The language of righteousness and the Temple imagery has led some scholars to believe that Barnabas was encountering some sort of Paulinism.<sup>363</sup> Like Paul, the author uses the Temple image to

---

<sup>359</sup> Cf. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 386.

<sup>360</sup> Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 386.

<sup>361</sup> See above p.9.

<sup>362</sup> J. C. Paget, “Paul and the Epistle of Barnabas,” *Novum Testamentum* 38 (1996): 375.

<sup>363</sup> “Schließlich wäre noch anzuführen, daß nach Barn 4, 10 die Annahme schon erfolgter Rechtfertigung falsch ist ὡς ἤδη δεδικαιωμένοι 15,7; vgl. demgegenüber nur Röm 5,1; s. Tit 3,7.” Wengst, *Schriften des Urchristentums*, 118 n.75. A link to some sort of Paulinism was suggested by Andreas Lindemann: “Der

represent the community. Paul also rebuked the concept of self-righteousness (1 Cor 4:8). However, from what we have already seen, Barnabas cannot be a Paulinist himself. A literary connection between the Epistle and the Pauline literature cannot be maintained. Furthermore, Barnabas' views of Israel and Jewish practices are substantially different to those of Paul, who never rejected Jewish cult per se.<sup>364</sup> His use of temple imagery to imply unity and orthodoxy may be a parallel tradition known to several contemporaneous churches (1 Pet 2:5; Ign. *Eph.* 9.1; 15.3; Ign. *Magn.* 7.1; 2 Clem. 9.3). The community-as-temple image was already developed in pre-destruction texts such as 1QS, as we saw earlier.<sup>365</sup>

Barnabas 4.10-11 points to a concrete situation and is not different to the wider message of the Epistle. Windisch leaves the question about Barnabas' targeted spirituality open with an allusion to the Jewish mystical groups.<sup>366</sup> Given that the author's concern throughout the Epistle is to refute the notion of any fellowship with Judaism (*them*), and the Epistle is addressed to Alexandrian Christians of the late first century, we need to find some kind of group that advocated Jewish customs and cult for Christian believers. In this case, the community of the Therapeutae could be a possible target, but this remains as a suggestion.

### **3.5.2 The Son and Creation: Barnabas 5–6 / Genesis 1:26-28**

In order to argue for a Christian temple that nullifies the Jerusalem one, Barnabas carefully constructs his view of creation in which the role of the Son is meant to bring the Christian temple into existence. Chapters 5 and 6 are dedicated to this.

---

Verfasser des Barn. hat das Abraham Beispiel also offensichtlich einer christlichen Tradition entnommen, die zumindest von Paulus beeinflusst war." See Lindemann, *Paulus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 279.

<sup>364</sup> On the difference between Barnabas and Paul, particularly on the way the term καταργέω is used, see Paget, "Paul and the Epistle of Barnabas," 359–81.

<sup>365</sup> See above p.51.

<sup>366</sup> Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 324–25.

After concluding chapter 4 with the call to become *ναὸς τέλειος*, chapter 5 begins with the statement that to be so was the goal of Jesus' death (giving his body to corruption, Barn. 5.1).<sup>367</sup> To achieve the connection between his death and the creation of the *ναὸς τέλειος*, Barnabas starts to explain the process from creation. He intertwines the text of Gen 1:26-28 with Exod 33:1-3, the promise of giving the land flowing with milk and honey, by quoting the two passages interchangeably and interpreting them together.<sup>368</sup> As a result, the creation and eschatology become intertwined. Based on the revelatory role of the incarnation, Barnabas' community should understand the promise of Exod 33:1-3 as a parable (*παραβολήν*) of Jesus in which he creates "us" anew again. It is the second eschatological creation (*δευτέραν πλάσιν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων*) which Jesus creates with his incarnation and, according to an unknown source quoted by him, makes "*τὰ ἔσχατα ὡς τὰ πρῶτα*" (Barn. 6.13).

Like Barnabas' Son, Philo's Logos was present in the creation, and through him the world was created (*Leg.* 3.93; see also *Conf.* 146). The Logos was the tool which God used to create the cosmos (*ἐκκοσμοποιεῖ*). In his interpretation of Gen 2:8, Philo distinguishes between the "moulded man (*πλάσματος*)" constituted of body and soul and placed in paradise to be able to communicate with his materialistic senses, and the "man after His image" who is intelligible and invisible (*QG* 1.8).<sup>369</sup> In Philo's exegesis of Gen 1:26, the mind (*νοῦς*) is the element that bears the divine image (*εἰκὼν*)<sup>370</sup> which is the image of the Single Mind of the Universe (*Opif.* 69). He thus distinguishes between "two categories of man (*δύο ἀνθρώπων γένη*)"; an earthly one and the one after God's image (*Leg.* 2; see also *Leg.* 1.31).

Philo also connected double creation, the Logos and the Temple. In his interpretation of the double creation, Philo drew a clear analogy between the Temple and the mind of man, as both should be treated as shrines that deserve reverence: the mind (reason) is a god for the man who bears it (*Opif.*

<sup>367</sup> ὁ κύριος παραδοῦναι τὴν σάρκα εἰς καταφθοράν.

<sup>368</sup> Gen 1:26-28 and Exod 33:1-3 are quoted interchangeably in Barn. 5.5; 6.8; 6.12; 6.13; 6.18.

<sup>369</sup> The antithesis between the "plasmatic" and heavenly man will be used by Origen, cf. *Hom. Gen.* 1.13; *Hom. Jer.* 1.13; *Comm. Cont. Prol.* 63.31.

<sup>370</sup> Ronald R. Cox, "The Intersection of Cosmology and Soteriology in Hellenistic Judaism" (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame), 137.

69).<sup>371</sup> Like Barnabas, this temple was made in the second creation, which distinguishes the godly from the bodily: the soul was designed or fitted (ἐπιτήδειος) for that purpose, and therefore the soul becomes the temple for His dwelling, which is the second creation (*Cherub.* 100-101). He states that there is no worthier temple on earth than the reasoning faculty (λογισμός, *Virt.* 188). The mind (διάνοια) could also be considered a house of God (*Praem.* 123). Although Barnabas talked about the faithful heart as a shrine, not the mind, he attributes to that shrine the faculties of Philo's mind, stating that "the Lord" placed (or planted) wisdom and reason to understand his secrets (Barn. 6.10).<sup>372</sup> Likewise, in Philo's allegorization God plants the tree of life as the only wise thing (ὁ μόνος σοφός) just like the trees of virtue and reason are planted by the rational souls (ψυχαῖς λογικαῖς, *Plant.* 12.46).

Therefore, Barnabas believed in a doctrine of double creation in which the second creation is eschatological (ἐπ' ἐσχάτων) and related to Jesus' incarnation. The story of Adam's creation in Gen 1:26 becomes the story of Christian re-creation.<sup>373</sup> But this salvific act is not only about defeating sin; it is also a revelation of God. Since then, Barnabas frequently repeated to the reader what seems to be a formula: that the Son of God was revealed/came in the flesh, "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐφανερώσεν/ἦλθεν ἐν σαρκί" (Barn. 5.6, 10, 11; 6.7). This formula reminds us of John 1:14 and 4:2: "ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα." The Logos of Philo reveals and connects two worlds through his role in the creation of spiritual humanity. In *Deus* 78, Philo stated that it is impossible to grasp God's light and energy. If man's eyes cannot put up with the radiation of the sun, how is it possible for him to stand God's disclosure? Barnabas repeats the same idea in order to justify the incarnation of the Son (Barn. 5.10-11). It is difficult to see that as a coincidence.<sup>374</sup>

Through the goal of incarnation (revelation), hope is placed in the body of the Son, not in a stone: "ἐπὶ λίθον οὐκ ἡμῶν ἢ ἐλπίς; μὴ γένοιτο" (Barn. 6.3). This is an unmistakable reference to the Temple

<sup>371</sup> However, in a rare statement (*Opif.* 136), Philo used the Temple as an allegory for the beauty and perfection of the body of the primeval Adam "as a shrine for a reasonable soul."

<sup>372</sup> "εὐλογητὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ὁ σοφίαν καὶ νοῦν θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τῶν κρυφίων αὐτοῦ."

<sup>373</sup> Cf. Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 131.

<sup>374</sup> Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 127. See also a list of parallels to this argument in late antiquity in Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 330–31.

of Jerusalem against the body of Jesus. Barnabas explains his definitive response (μὴ γένοιτο) by saying “the Lord has set his flesh up in strength” (6.3c).<sup>375</sup> This transition in interpretation from the stone (Jerusalem) to the body of Jesus is uniquely reminiscent of John 2:19-21, where Jesus’ statement on the destruction of the Temple and its rebuilding was misunderstood by the Jews as being about the Jerusalem Temple, yet it was meant, according to John, to refer to Jesus’ body: “ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔλεγεν περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ” (2:21).

Again, Barnabas repeats the contrast between Jesus’ incarnation and hope in a stone in his interpretation of Ezek 11:19 (“I will remove from these people their hearts of stone and cast into them hearts of flesh”) by recalling the formula, “ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐν σαρκὶ ἔμελλεν φανεροῦσθαι καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικεῖν” (Barn. 6.14), which is strikingly close to John 1:14.

From this section, we can see that Barnabas understands that Jesus’ incarnation contrasts the existence of the Temple of Jerusalem, and that through the double creation, humanity receives the dwelling Son creating it anew. Consequently, hope on Jesus’ flesh is set against the “false” hope built on the stone of the Temple of Jerusalem. Therefore, he concludes this exegetical section with a statement that connects creation, incarnation and the new temple skillfully: “ναὸς γὰρ ἅγιος, ἀδελφοί μου, τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ κατοικητήριον ἡμῶν τῆς καρδίας” (Barn. 6.15).

### **3.5.3 The Vessel of the Spirit: Barnabas 11.1-11 / Ezekiel 47:1-12**

Related to this discussion is how the dwelling of the Son in his body creates the believer as a Temple. We have partly discussed this already in relation to the double creation, but in 11.1-11, Barnabas goes further by explaining that this act of second creation transforms the believers through baptism. Barnabas commences this section by a contrast between the believers’ reception of baptism and Israel’s refusal to receive it: “but they will build for themselves” (Barn. 11.1).<sup>376</sup> The meaning is not clear as it does not specify exactly what it is that they “will build (αἰκοδομήσουσιν)” and why it is a replacement for baptism. Barnabas backs this statement with Jer 2:12-13, where it is mentioned that

<sup>375</sup> ἰσχύϊ τέθεικεν τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος. λέγει γάρ

<sup>376</sup> ἀλλ’ ἑαυτοῖς αἰκοδομήσουσιν

the people of Israel dug for themselves a pit of death (Barn. 11.2-3). But Barnabas refers to a future building, not past digging. Further, in light of the continuous theme of contrasting the Christian temple with the Temple of Jerusalem which will be fully explained in chapter 16 of the Epistle in reference to a serious attempt to rebuild the latter (Barn. 16.4), Barnabas is likely alluding to the Temple of Jerusalem and that Jeremiah's prophecy was edited in support of this. This could also be seen in the reference to Ezekiel's Temple vision (47:12) in Barn. 11.10, as we will see later.

Before his exposition of Jeremiah's prophecy, Barnabas makes an important reference to the cross. In 11.9, he quotes an unknown source saying: "And the land of Jacob was praised above every land," and interprets it "to glorify the vessel of his spirit."<sup>377</sup> The expression "vessel of the spirit (τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος)" was also used earlier to refer to Jesus' own body: "because he himself was about to offer the vessel of the Spirit (τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος) as a sacrifice for our own sins" (Barn. 7.3). In both cases, the Lord who gives the prophecy is also the subject of the act (sacrificing, glorifying) which concerns the vessel of the Spirit (his body, as it is clear in 7.3). From the symmetry of both verses, we should understand that the vessel in 11.9 is Jesus' own body and *not* the church (yet).<sup>378</sup> Therefore, the first suggestion of Prigent that it is "le vase de l'Esprit désigne le Christ incarné"<sup>379</sup> is justified with our previous analysis. The image of glorifying his body to become a vessel for his Spirit is unmistakably referring to the temple of his body which correctly compels Windisch to associate it with John 2:19.<sup>380</sup>

Barnabas 11.10 cites Ezek 47:12, with its Temple vision that has water flowing from it to surrounding trees, but Barnabas' source adds to Ezekiel's verse: "whoever eats from these will live forever

---

<sup>377</sup> τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δοξάζει

<sup>378</sup> Both Knopf and Haeuser suggested that it is the church without providing any evidence on that other than reading it in light of the later verses. R. Knopf, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1905), 282; P. Haeuser, *Der Barnabasbrief: neu untersucht und neu erklärt* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1912), 70–71. Therefore, Windisch's suggestion that the vessel here is Jesus' body is welcome (*Der Barnabasbrief*, 368). Cf. Ferdinand Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 428.

<sup>379</sup> P. Prigent, *Épître de Barnabé*, Source Chrétiennes 172 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1971), 165 n.3.

<sup>380</sup> Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 368. See also D. Völter, *Die apostolischen Väter: neu untersucht*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1904), 441.

(ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα)” (Barn. 11.10c).<sup>381</sup> The expression ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα appears in several places in the Epistle (6.3; 8.5; 9.2) which might suggest that this is Barnabas’ addition. Yet, the quotation itself does not show any distinction between the prophecy and this sentence and Barnabas offers an interpretation of it which means it is not his own addition. I agree with Paget and Bartlett’s reluctance to acknowledge a Johannine influence behind the expression,<sup>382</sup> but its predominant feature in both texts deserves our attention. In the case of Barn. 11.10, the expression is used in a sacramental context in which baptism is discussed. In his interpretation of the verse, Barnabas associates the water of the river in Ezekiel’s Temple vision with the water of baptism that cleanses humans from sins while “whoever eats from it lives forever” refers to those who hear the words of God (symbolised by the trees) and believe in them living forever (Barn. 11.11). The theme of water is an essential theme in John’s Gospel (John 3:4-6; 6:35c; 19:34), particularly the “living water” (4:10-14; 7:37-39). This theme exists in several Jewish texts with different meanings.<sup>383</sup> However, the essential tradition of the living water that flows from new Jerusalem/Temple with its eschatological context could be seen behind John’s realised eschatology in which Jesus embodies the new temple which gives the life-giving Spirit (6:63; 7:38) like water flowing from Ezekiel’s Temple.<sup>384</sup> This is seen in Jesus’ encounter with the Samaritan woman (John 4:14b): “The water that I will give will become in them a spring of water gushing up (εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον).” Like Barnabas, the encounter with the Samaritan woman culminates in a strong contrast between worship in physical temples (Jerusalem or that of the Samaritans) and the worship in Spirit and truth (John 4:21-25). The connection between the Temple and the living water in John 7:37-39 is more obvious as the elements of Ezekiel’s vision (new creation

---

<sup>381</sup> It is not clear whether this was added by the author himself or if he received it this way, but the text does not suggest that it comes from Barnabas who later interprets it as part of the body of the text.

<sup>382</sup> C. Paget, “The Epistle of Barnabas” in Gregory and Tuckett, *The Reception of the New Testament*, 237. J. Bartlett, “The Epistle of Barnabas,” in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, 17.

<sup>383</sup> On water as a reference to the Spirit see Isa 32:15; 44:3; Ezek 36:25-26; Joel 2:28-29. On cleansing see Lev 14:5-6, 50-52; Ezek 36:25; Zech 13:1 On the Torah see Sir 24:23-29; CD 3:16; 6:4-11; 19:34. On God himself see Jer 2:15; 17:13; 1 En. 96:6.

<sup>384</sup> See Jer 2:13; 17:13; Isa 43:19; Ezek 47:1-12; Zech 13:1; 14:8; Joel 3:18. Cf. C. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A commentary*. 2 vols (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 604; Dale C. Allison Jr., “The Living Water (John 4:10–14; 6:35c; 7:37–39),” *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 30 (1986): 143–57.

and restoration) are consistent with John's living water imagery.<sup>385</sup> Most importantly, Jesus does not promise living water flowing from *another* temple but from himself, embodying the Temple, as in the earlier statements we discussed before (John 1:14; 2:19-21), and becoming the equivalent of Barnabas' vessel of the Spirit.

As for the element of eating that leads to eternal life, Ferdinand Prostmeier has already observed the similarity between Barnabas and John 6:51b-58c which is "aufällig nahe."<sup>386</sup> Interestingly, Schnackenburg's statement that the promise of eternal life through the act of eating the living bread in John 6:51b is a Eucharistic formula that comes exclusively from a Johannine province was questioned by Prostmeier because it already exists in Barn. 11.10.<sup>387</sup> However, this could also be read as a possible shared milieu between both texts. Beyond Prostmeier's observation, the similarity is more obvious in their interpretation as both Barnabas (11.11) and John (6:63) spiritualise the act of eating into hearing and believing the words of preaching. This is in line with their references contrasting the Jerusalem Temple with true worship (the spiritual temple).

### **3.5.4 Sabbath and Continuous Creation: Barnabas 15.4-6 / Genesis 2:2-3**

Between the first (earthly) and second (eschatological) creation (Barn. 6.13), the process of creation continues through the world's history. This is what we find in the interpretation of the six days of creation as six thousand years, which is the age of the world before the second coming (Barn. 15.3-5). These thoughts also resonate with those of Philo. Philo did not explain the six days of

---

<sup>385</sup> Cf. G. T. Manning Jr., *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 181–82. See the comprehensive analysis of Stephen T. Um, *The Theme of Temple Christology* (London : T & T Clark, 2006), 160–61, 182–83. On Ezekiel as a primary source for John 4:13-4 see M. L. Coloe, *God dwells with us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001), 95-96. See also M. L. Coloe, "Temple imagery in John," *Interpretation* 63 (2009): 368–81. Paul M. Hauskins, *Jesus as the fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John* (Milton Keynes : Paternoster, 2006), 165-6. See also Carson, *John*, 327.

<sup>386</sup> Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 429.

<sup>387</sup> "Die Auslegung in V 11b spricht indes kaum dafür, daß dem Vf. Forderung (ὅς ἂν φάγη ἐξ αὐτῶν) und Verheißung (ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) nur als exklusive eucharistische Formelsprache johanneischer Provenienz gefällig war" (R. Schnackenburg, *Johannesevangelium*, 81f.).

creation as six thousand years; he considered creation as continuous, “as He never ceases making” (*Leg.* 1.6; on his logic of the six days, see *Opif.* 3.13). Nevertheless, he puts the second creation after the completion of the creation process (*Opif.* 77f.).

In his exegesis of Gen 2:2-3 (“On the seventh day God finished his work”), Barnabas does not provide us with a coherent understanding of the place of the seventh day and the eighth day in the eschaton but he clearly invalidates the Jewish Sabbaths because the true Sabbath is the one on which the Son does not “have a rest” as he takes up the final act of restoring cosmic order (Barn. 15.4-6). This means that Barnabas christologised the verse by putting the creative task on the shoulders of Jesus himself. Likewise, John shows us that God’s providential act does not stop on the Sabbath as Jesus reveals: “Ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται καὶ ἡγὼ ἐργάζομαι” (John 5:17b). Like Barnabas, John does not only understand that God is active on the Sabbath but he also locates Jesus in that activity which brings about the predictably angry reaction from the Jews for not only breaking the Sabbath but also making himself equal with God by calling him his Father (5.18). Peder Borgen correctly refers to the notable similarity between Philo’s *Migr.* 91 and the Sabbath controversy in 5:1-18 as both texts embed the text of Gen 2:2-3 in the problem of Sabbath observance and creation.<sup>388</sup> As we will see in the next section, the Son’s eschatological task on the Seventh day is to set up an imperishable temple.

### 3.5.5 Barnabas 16

The sixteenth chapter of Barnabas is the “Schlüssel zum ganzen Barnabasbrief”, as H. Veil puts it.<sup>389</sup> Here, Barnabas unfolds his theological programme with explicit remarks, not allusions like before. He directly targets the Temple: “I will also speak to you concerning the Temple, and show how these wretched men hoped in the Temple and not the God who made them, as if it was the house

---

<sup>388</sup> P. Borgen, *Philo, John, and Paul: New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity* (Scholars Press, 1987), 185.

<sup>389</sup> H. Veil, “Barnabasbrief,” in *Handbuch zu den Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, ed. Edgar Hennecke (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1904), 225.

of God” (16.1). While the first half of the chapter is about the Jerusalem Temple, which was described as a house of idolatry as we saw earlier, the author dedicates the second half to proving that a Christian temple exists: “ζητήσωμεν δέ, εἰ ἔστιν ναὸς θεοῦ ἔστιν” (16.6). From the unbelieving heart that is “corrupt, feeble since it was a temple built by hand (χειρόκμητων)”,<sup>390</sup> the Christian temple becomes the opposite (Barn. 16.7).

To answer the question of “how?”, Barnabas connects the three major themes of double creation, the Son’s dwelling, and the Christian temple, concluding his exegetical efforts which we saw in the earlier chapters. Even though he does not mention the Son, Barnabas shows the same divine role, in which Jesus was involved, to create the Temple. We have already noted that the contrast between hope in Jesus’ flesh and the Temple of Jerusalem (Barn. 6.3) becomes in this chapter hope in God and false hope in the Temple (Barn. 16.1), but the process includes:

- Dwelling amongst us (God 16.8 // the Son 6.14);
- The dwelling is in our heart (God 16.7 // the Son 6.14-15);
- Creating us anew again (God 16.8 // through the Son’s “manifestation in the flesh” 6.9-11, the Son creating the new heart 6.14).

Therefore, through this process, God brings the community of believers into the imperishable temple, εἰσάγει εἰς τὸν ἄφθαρτον ναόν (16.9).

### 3.6 Conclusion

This analysis suggests some key points.

---

<sup>390</sup> This is an obvious allusion to the one in Jerusalem. Cf. Prigent, *l'Épître de Barnabé*, 193 n.2; Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 174. On the term’s application see R. Rodriguez, *Structuring Early Christian Memory* (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 13.

First, the Epistle of Barnabas overall does not present a notion of the Temple's redundancy after Jesus' death and resurrection; it was always redundant. There is no supersession; Judaism, centred on customs, cult and literal interpretations of Moses, was always wrong.

Second, Christianity, which owes Judaism nothing, has its own Christian temple which exists through the Son's "manifestation in the flesh" and his "dwelling amongst us". The themes of double creation, the Son's dwelling, and the new temple are knitted together in order to produce the new people of God, the "spiritual temple". While it is not clear how the temple of the community co-exists with the temple of the Son (which is set against the Temple of Jerusalem), Barnabas (Barn. 11) gives a mystical understanding of baptism (and possibly the Eucharist) as the means of connection to explain this.

Third, Barnabas' background is not just of the school of Philo; the fact that his language is free from Philo's own terms makes this clear. However, the intellectual and cultural influence of Philo is present in the text and Barnabas' agreement with Philo's thoughts is not minor. Their agreement in their views of creation, the role of the Logos/Son in the world, second creation, symbolism and reality, and eschatology leads them both to have a common understanding of the true temple in which God dwells. They do not only agree on these elements but also in the scenario building up to the creation of the spiritual temple, which starts from first creation and ends up in the second creation in the dwelling of the Logos/Son in humanity. It was also found that the Gospel of John correlates with Barnabas and Philo in these themes.

## Chapter Four

# 1 Clement

### 4.1 Introduction

#### 4.1.1 Date

In Lightfoot's comprehensive work, followed by Harnack's important study, it was concluded that 1 Clement should be dated to the end of Domitian's reign (or the very beginning of Nerva's reign) in 96 CE, and this opinion has been held by the vast majority of scholars since then.<sup>391</sup>

A minority of voices have argued for an early date after the Neronian persecution and before the destruction of the Temple, perhaps shortly before 70 CE. Edmondson's Oxford University Bampton Lecture in 1913 argued for the early date, breaking the consensus for the late date. J. A. T. Robinson supported it further. While these studies did not gain enough credence in scholarly circles,<sup>392</sup> more

---

<sup>391</sup> Lightfoot attributes this dating to the first editor of this work (Patrick Young in 1633 CE). By the time of the composition of Lightfoot's research, he observes that it has become almost the "received opinion." See Lightfoot, *S. Clement of Rome*, vol. 1, 346. A. von Harnack, *Einführung in Die Alte Kirchengeschichte: Das Schreiben Der Römischen Kirche an Die Korinthische Aus Der Zeit Domitians (I Clemensbrief)* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1929), 52, 86–87; W. Clarke, ed., trans., *The First Epistle of Clement* (London: McMillan, 1937), 11; Joseph A. Fischer, ed., *Die Apostolischen Väter*, vol. 1 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1958), 19; Vielhauer, "Geschichte," 540; Annie Jaubert, *Clément de Rome: Épitre aux Corinthiens*, Sources Chrétiennes 167 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1971), 20; D. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 1; A. Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 12; H. E. Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 77–78.

<sup>392</sup> It is believed that the breaking of the first world war was the reason for overshadowing Edmondson's lecture (Thomas J. Herron, "The Most Probable Date of the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians," *Studia Patristica* 21 [1989]: 106–21) while the controversial reputation of Robinson's *Redating the New Testament* had a negative impression on the whole content which included his arguments for the early date. It was called by Raymond Brown a "maverick" work. Cf. R. Brown, *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind* (New York: Paulist Press, 1999), 14.

literature in favour of the early date was produced.<sup>393</sup> The difference between the two dates is important, given the significant implications for Clement's Temple attitude. Did Clement write in light of an existing Temple of Jerusalem or a destroyed one? We need to study the matter in more depth.

### **1 Clement 1.1**

Those who argue for dating 1 Clement to the end of Domitian's rule (96 CE) find in 1 Clem. 1.1 an allusion to Domitian's persecution of the Christians. Scholars believe that the "misfortunes and calamities (συμφορὰς καὶ περιπτώσεις)" mentioned in the text are Domitian's persecution of Roman Christians, which obstructed the author from writing to the Corinthians any earlier. However, two main challenges have been raised against this interpretation: (i) Does the statement necessarily imply an actual persecution?; (ii) Did Domitian really persecute Christians? As for the first point, the words used by Clement do not imply the occurrence of persecution with any certainty. E. T. Merrill has stated that the language of Clement is "curiously like an apologetic introduction to a modern letter."<sup>394</sup> Linguistically, the word συμφορὰς could simply mean "events" or "circumstances"<sup>395</sup> while περιπτώσεις simply means "accidents" or "fortuitous events".<sup>396</sup> In a survey of the usage of these words in Clement's contemporary literature, L. Welborn has shown that the sentence is no more than an apologetic formula as found in the introductions of many other writings of the same time.<sup>397</sup>

---

<sup>393</sup> Cf. A. Hooijbergh, "A Different View of Clemens Romanus," *The Heythrop Journal* 16 (1975): 266–88. Herron, "The Most Probable Date," 200ff. For a detailed survey on the matter see John Fuellenbach, *Ecclesiastical Office and the Primacy of Rome: An Evaluation of the Recent Theological Discussion of First Clement* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1980), 348.

<sup>394</sup> E. T. Merrill. "The Alleged Persecution by Domitian," *Essays in Early Christian History* (London: Macmillan, 1924), 160. See also Laurence L. Welborn, "The Preface to 1 Clement: The Rhetorical Situation and the Traditional Date," in *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement*, eds. Tobias Nicklas, C. Breytenbach, and L. L. Welborn. (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 202.

<sup>395</sup> Liddell-Scott-Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 1688. J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 598.

<sup>396</sup> G. W. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), 1070.

<sup>397</sup> L. Welborn, "The Preface to 1 Clement," in Nicklas, Breytenbach and Welborn, *Encounters with Hellenism*, 202.

Whether the terms reflected real troubles amongst the Christian community of Rome or not, it cannot give us enough confidence in dating the Epistle right after Domitian's persecution.

But if the phrase does reflect a post-persecution situation, this does not result in the persecution of Domitian automatically since the persecution of Christians by Domitian is itself questionable.<sup>398</sup> Welborn believes that Christian tradition of Domitian's persecution was misled by the single report of Melito, bishop of Sardis, in a letter addressed to Marcus Aurelius (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.26). Melito could have misinterpreted Juvenal's (*Sat.* 4.38) and Pliny the Younger's (*Pan.* 53.3-4) coupling of Nero and Domitian by calling the latter a second Nero.<sup>399</sup> However, it remains hypothetical to give all this weight to Melito's report for the reputation of Domitian's reign amongst Christians.

The execution of Flavius Clemens has been used as evidence of Domitian's persecution of Christians. While Suetonius did not mention the reason for his execution (*Dom.* 14), Cassius Dio said that he was accused of "atheism" for conducting Jewish customs (*Hist.* 67.14). I agree with Welborn that this could have been just an excuse at a time when he became paranoid and was willing to kill anyone he was suspicious of.<sup>400</sup> L. W. Barnard believed that the accusation of "atheism" and "conducting Jewish customs" are irreconcilable unless Dio confused Christianity with Judaism,<sup>401</sup> which is not improbable. Allen Brent agrees with Barnard by adding that Dio never mentioned Christianity, despite his awareness of it. This makes it unsurprising that he did not state that Flavius Clemens was Christian.<sup>402</sup> However, the accusation of atheism was directed to the Jews as well (Josephus, *C. Ap.* 2). Barnard's enthusiastic support of the Christianising Flavius Clemens hinges on the fact that Judaism

---

<sup>398</sup> The assumption of a Christian persecution by Domitian might have had its effect on the translation of the mentioned phrase. "But convinced that the Roman church suffered under Domitian, scholars have colored up the dull prose of 1 Clement. Thus, Kirsopp Lake renders συμφοραί καὶ περιπτώσεις misfortunes and calamities." Welborn, "The Preface to 1 Clement," in Nicklas, Breytenbach and Welborn, *Encounters with Hellenism*, 204.

<sup>399</sup> Cf. Welborn, "The Preface to 1 Clement," in Nicklas, Breytenbach and Welborn, *Encounters with Hellenism*, 206: "There is nothing to suggest that Melito's statement was informed by knowledge of events; rather, he is guided by an apologetic motive: to show that only those emperors who had suffered *damnatio memoriae* had been opponents of Christianity."

<sup>400</sup> This is clear in Suetonius' depiction of that period. See below p.255.

<sup>401</sup> Leslie W. Barnard, *Studies in Church History and Patristics* (Athens: Patriarchikon, 1978), 144.

<sup>402</sup> Allen Brent, *The Imperial Cult and the Development of Church Order* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 142.

was *religio licita*, which makes it hard to believe that it could be condemned.<sup>403</sup> However, we also know, as discussed in the previous chapter, that the *fiscus Judaicus* was collected from the Jews with utmost rigour.<sup>404</sup> It is important to observe that one of Nerva's earliest reconciliatory accomplishments was to stop people from accusing anybody of "adopting the Jewish way of life" (Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 68.2), which suggests that it was a grave accusation in the time of his predecessor. Barnard admits that the nature of Domitian's assault was not against Christians *en masse*, but he "carefully selected and struck down his victims one by one, driven on by madness and jealousy and the belief that everyone of note was his enemy."<sup>405</sup> These sorts of attacks could be interpreted as an endeavour to get rid of some political challenges and are not necessarily examples of "persecution."

It appears to me that the line of argument which is subject to this debate amongst scholars is itself the problem: the focus on whether Domitian targeted Christians in particular and whether Clement intended religious persecution is futile. Indeed, the fact is that Clement reflects some problems and misfortunes and this does not mean the persecution of Christians in particular. On the other hand, Domitian's era, especially near to its end, was a reign of terror and oppression that also brought troubles and misfortunes to Rome and which was reversed by Nerva and Trajan. This is indicated by the main biographers of that period, as we shall see later.<sup>406</sup> This suggests that the author must have simply referred to what he and his fellow residents of Rome encountered, before expressing the same relief we find in the introductions to the biographies of Pliny, Plutarch, Tacitus and Suetonius.<sup>407</sup> This cannot make the customary dating of 96–68 CE a certainty but it makes Nerva's reign, not Domitian's, a better candidate, until we assess the rest of the evidence.

### **Minor Observations**

---

<sup>403</sup> Barnard, *Studies in Church History*, 144.

<sup>404</sup> See the previous chapter on Barnabas.

<sup>405</sup> L. W. Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), 12.

<sup>406</sup> See below p. 255.

<sup>407</sup> See below p. 255.

There are other minor observations that could be understood both ways, such as calling the Corinthian church “ἀρχαίον” (1 Clem. 47.6), which could be used as evidence against the early date. However, the word does not only mean “ancient” but also original and senior, indicating the church’s special place in the Christian world. Furthermore, even if the author meant “ancient”, it is relative;<sup>408</sup> since it is one of the earliest churches, it could have been considered ancient in comparison to the history of Christianity itself. Mentioning that Clement’s mission to Corinth is formed by people who were young until they became “old” (1 Clem. 63.3) does not suggest that they have been Christian since their youth. On the other hand, an example that supports the early date is Clement’s use of the adjective “near” (ἐγγυς) in its superlative form to describe how close his time is to the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, held to have occurred during the persecution of Nero, ca. 64 CE. Their martyrdom was proposed by Clement to be examples that belong to “our own generation (τῆς γενεᾶς ἡμῶν)” (1 Clem 5.1). However, the context clearly makes the statement as part of a contrast between the post-Jesus age and the “ancient examples (ἀρχαίων ὑποδειγμάτων)” (1 Clem. 5.1) he previously enlisted (1 Clem. 4).

Nevertheless, a pre-destruction date may be suggested given how the Temple in 1 Clem. 40–41 is treated.<sup>409</sup> In this unit, Clement exhorts his Corinthian addressees to offer their oblations according to God’s order and his appointed people. He explains that God’s order works through the priestly and sacrificial system of the Temple of Jerusalem. In his explanation, Clement uses the present tense, which made some scholars think that the Temple was still standing.<sup>410</sup> Lightfoot believed that such an argument is “specious,” however, since this style of writing, that is, writing about the past in the simple present form, was common at this time.<sup>411</sup> Agreeing with him, Raymond Brown considered *Contra Apionem*, in which Josephus describes the sacrificial order in the Temple in the simple present

---

<sup>408</sup> Interestingly, Herron mentions how Paul used the word “ἀρχῇ” in Phil 4:15 for a time interval of a decade. Cf. Herron “The Most Probable Date,” 115; J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London : SCM Press, 1976), 332.

<sup>409</sup> See below p.148.

<sup>410</sup> Herron, “The Most Probable Date,” 108f.; Hooijbergh, “A Different View of Clemens Romanus,” 275.

<sup>411</sup> Lightfoot, *S. Clement of Rome*, vol. 1, 353.

tense (*C. Ap.* 12.7), to support his case.<sup>412</sup> Although the text does not belong to the previously mentioned categories, the normal present itself could express a timeless truth as in any language without the necessity of having the Temple existing and functioning. For example, Clement himself discussed the story of the resurrection of the Phoenix which involves the temple of Heliopolis in Egypt (1 Clem. 25). Whenever Clement wrote his epistle in the second half of the first century, the whole city of Egyptian Heliopolis, with its temple of the sun, was already abandoned, with the remaining monuments in good shape transferred to Rome.<sup>413</sup> Yet, he was giving a description, in the present tense, of the life-cycle of a bird he believed to live in Arabia and of the altar of the Sun in Heliopolis.<sup>414</sup> Clement believes that God's order of the Temple and the appointed tasks to specific groups reflects the order and will through which God governs the world. The physical destruction of the Temple does not deny how God implemented his order, especially when the belief in its rebuilding is still vivid. At this early stage, giving up on the Temple and its cult would mean a radical shift. Therefore, writings such as 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch show an impending eschatological/apocalyptic expectation in which the Temple is a central theme. While the Temple was destroyed in 70 CE, the cult was alive in memory and hope as it appears in those texts.

Finally, a significant reference that the proponents of the early date fail to deal with adequately is 1 Clem. 42.4. Clement speaks of ἐπισκόπους and διακόνος whom the apostles appointed, and in 44.3-5, this generation has died. The envoys sent to Corinth were said to have lived an exemplary life in the church from youth to old age (1 Clem. 63.3). This particular observation appears to me to be a good case to create a generational distance between the age of Peter and Paul and the author's time. This

---

<sup>412</sup> Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 1983), 149–50.

<sup>413</sup> In his visit to the city, Strabo registers his knowledge of the temple of the sun yet he finds the city “entirely deserted” (*Geogr.* 17.27-28). The city was later transformed into a Roman one with a large Arabian settlement. Cf. Donald B. Redford, *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Ancient Egypt: G-O vol. 2* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 88–89.

<sup>414</sup> For more about the Phoenix myth, cf. R. Van den Broek, *The Myth of the Phoenix: According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions* (Leiden: Brill, 1972); Misako Himuro, “The Phoenix in The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians,” *Renaissance Studies* 12 (1998): 523–44.

also explains the difference in the generations between the time of the rift between the followers of Paul and those of Apollos and the time of Clement's generation. Clement apparently refers to it as of a distant past (1 Clem. 47). As we will notice later, by that time, Apollos becomes of a lower status in the memory of the church, reduced from a partner of Paul in 1 Corinthians to a man "approved by" the *apostles* Paul and Peter.

In conclusion, it appears to me that a safe margin to date 1 Clement to could be around 80 CE and anywhere before the mid-second century (where references to it appear with authority),<sup>415</sup> yet the internal observations mentioned above incline me toward the age of Nerva and the early years of Trajan.

#### **4.1.2 Background**

With its rich content and clarity, the first epistle of Clement to the Corinthians is a mine of information about first-century Christianity in Rome. The great importance of the text for ancient Christians can be verified from its presence in three of the oldest biblical codices as part of the canon as well as its second-century attestation in Syria and Egypt. The earliest Greek text is found in Codex Alexandrinus (A). It is also present in a fifth–eighth-century Coptic codex (K) preserved in the library of the University of Strasburg.<sup>416</sup> Along with 2 Clement, it was also found amongst the epistles of the Catholic and Pauline corpus in an ancient Syriac New Testament in Edessa, the eleventh-century Jerusalem codex (H) and Latin manuscript (L) (ca. fourth century) which is the earliest known translation of the text.<sup>417</sup> 1 Clement has been associated with the question of the formation of ecclesiastical order in early Christianity. Scholarship has been increasingly moving towards

---

<sup>415</sup> Eusebius shows it was known to Hegesippus (*Hist. eccl.* 3.16; 4.22) and Dionysius of Corinth (*Hist. eccl.* 4.23.11). Cf. David Brakke, *The Gnostics* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), 30-1. See also, A. Gregory, "1 Clement: An Introduction," *The Expository Times* 117 (2006): 226–28; M. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Michigan: Baker, 2007), 35–36; James C. Paget, "1 Clement, Judaism, and the Jews," *Early Christianity* 8 (2017): 218-250.

<sup>416</sup> C. Schmidt, ed., trans., *Der Erste Clemensbrief in Koptischer Übersetzung* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908), 79.

<sup>417</sup> Cf. R. Knopf, *Erste Clemensbrief* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901). Cf. A. von Harnack, *Einführung*, 9–12.

investigating the theological background of the conflict in light of the fact that the letter is heavily loaded with theological arguments.

Rudolph Sohm's two-volume *Kirchenrecht* gave 1 Clement a pivotal role in the history of the development of church structure; not only did it emphasise the new apostolic-episcopal system against the prevalent charismatic-divergent system, but it also set out the pillars of Catholicism.<sup>418</sup> This idea was not about episcopacy or apostolic succession since, according to Sohm, it could be traced back even to the Greek-speaking churches of Asia Minor.<sup>419</sup> It was also not a proposal for the concept of monepiscopacy (*Einzelepiskopat*) since we have no known evidence for its existence in Rome before the middle of the second century.<sup>420</sup> Clement's letter founded the roots of church order (*Kirchenrecht*) in the divine realm, a truth against man-made systems, and this model is what creates a new Christian Catholicism.<sup>421</sup> This appears in Clement's appeal to the presence of God's governance of the world, and his will as manifested in his own order of the Temple.<sup>422</sup> Thus, through his rhetoric and will for structural reformation based on the divine system, Clement moves the church from the primitive state (the charismatic pluralistic system, as Sohm explains) to the Catholic state.<sup>423</sup>

Sohm did not go beyond the conflict in Corinth in his discussion and focused only on the ecclesiological aspect of the problem. Both Lightfoot and Wrede then sensed some sort of a doctrinal Catholicism in which a variety of influences (including Jewish Hellenistic, Gnostic<sup>424</sup> and Jewish Christian views) are brought into the discourse.<sup>425</sup> A clear sympathy to Jewish-Christianity can be

---

<sup>418</sup> R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht Band I: Die Geschichtlichen Grundlagen* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1892) 163–66.

<sup>419</sup> Sohm, *Kirchenrecht Band I*, 167.

<sup>420</sup> Sohm, *Kirchenrecht Band I*, 167.

<sup>421</sup> Sohm, *Kirchenrecht Band I*, 165.

<sup>422</sup> Sohm, *Kirchenrecht Band I*, 158–59.

<sup>423</sup> Sohm, *Kirchenrecht Band I*, 165.

<sup>424</sup> Cf. his non-esoteric application of terms familiar to the Gnostics such as τῆς ἀθανάτου γνώσεως (36:2) and θείας γνώσεως (40:1).

<sup>425</sup> Cf. Lightfoot, *S. Clement of Rome*, vol. 1, 378f; W. Wrede, *Untersuchungen zum ersten Klemensbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1891), 81 n.2.

found in Clement's arguments drawn from Scripture and the Temple.<sup>426</sup> In explaining the nature of Clement's Christianity, Lightfoot states that it is a new catholic identity based on the combination of the "canonical" apostolic traditions, with the exception of the Johannine tradition, as it appears from the author's knowledge of their texts.<sup>427</sup>

Against Lightfoot, Harnack warned against identifying Clement's Christianity in light of "a common denominator" of New Testament canon since this canon came much later.<sup>428</sup> Even if the author knew 1 Peter, Hebrews and James, he did not utilise them, as Lightfoot thought. Indeed, this is what we find, as we shall see, in Clement's understanding of cult and the Temple which is a contrast against the view of Hebrews. The only exception is his perception of Paul as an apostolic pillar.<sup>429</sup>

For Harnack, Roman Christianity expressed in the letter is a divine "moral movement": "Der stärkste Eindruck, den man aus dem Brief erhält, ist der, daß die neue Religion in erster Linie *keine kultische*, auch keine enthusiastische, noch weniger eine gnostische oder spekulativ-mysteriöse, sondern *eine sittliche Bewegung* gewesen ist [...] auf dem Grunde der Wirklichkeit Gottes."<sup>430</sup> Clement's definition of expressions like "immortal knowledge" (1 Clem. 36.2) and "divine knowledge" (1 Clem. 40.1) shows his attitude against gnostic esotericism. The analogy drawn from Scripture and nature also defies mystical speculation. But is this *sittliche Bewegung* not cultic by necessity. As Knopf says, although we know little about the dispute in Corinth,<sup>431</sup> the liturgy is at the centre of the available data on the dispute and the rejection of cult could lead to such leadership crisis, not ecstasy.<sup>432</sup>

---

<sup>426</sup> Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers, Part 1, S. Clement of Rome*, vol. 2 (London: McMillan, 1891), 121.

<sup>427</sup> Lightfoot, *S. Clement of Rome*, vol. 2.

<sup>428</sup> Cf. Harnack, *Einführung*, 55.

<sup>429</sup> Harnack, *Einführung*, 55.

<sup>430</sup> Harnack, *Einführung*, 58.

<sup>431</sup> R. Knopf, *Erste Clemensbrief*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901), 174.

<sup>432</sup> Knopf, *Clemensbrief*, 172–73.

Hans Lietzmann radicalised Harnack's emphasis on the "moral movement" identity. This led him to think that 1 Clement allegorised Israel and its cult,<sup>433</sup> appropriated its Scripture,<sup>434</sup> and superseded it by putting Jesus at the end of the salvation history line. This led him to propose a trajectory starting from Stephen's Hellenistic community to that of 1 Clement.<sup>435</sup> These statements are untenable and they contradict what we have in the Epistle regarding the same themes Lietzmann mentioned.

The previously mentioned scholars focused on two major elements that form the emerging Catholicism as witnessed in 1 Clement: church order and liturgy. While Sohm's work emphasised the first, the second was increasingly reflected upon in the investigation of the nature of Clement's Christianity. The Temple passages (40–41) in the letter play an important role in their attempt to identify which Christian theology Clement's Christianity belonged to.

1 Clement plays a key role in Bauer's understanding of Rome's place in Christendom. For Bauer, 1 Clement was written to emphasise Rome's authority through its protection of orthodoxy against heresies.<sup>436</sup> However, his argument is internal since we do not have the writings of the Corinthian opponents nor any explicit accusation about a doctrinal heresy in the letter.<sup>437</sup> Along with Harnack and Knopf, Bauer noticed the section of admonition that is not related to the problem Clement was addressing. He saw that there must have been different reasons to write the letter. Agreeing with Lietzmann,<sup>438</sup> he stated that Clement supported the authority of Rome.<sup>439</sup> But he went further to show that Clement was facing some sort of a heresy in Corinth, perhaps as an excuse to introduce his orthodoxy.

---

<sup>433</sup> Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, 196, 200.

<sup>434</sup> Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, 195: "the Old Testament had, therefore, already been wrested from the Jews and had become the special property of Christians to such an extent that its commandments could be regarded as 'types', and used to regulate church life."

<sup>435</sup> Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, 201.

<sup>436</sup> Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 95f.

<sup>437</sup> Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 95-6.

<sup>438</sup> Lietzmann, *History* 1, 192.

<sup>439</sup> Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 98.

Clement explicitly referred to a pastoral problem, but the issue was beyond that. Since 1 Clement was used by later fathers as a seal of orthodoxy and unity in disputes (*Haer.* 3.3.3),<sup>440</sup> and since Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians reflects some sort of "heretical" views in Corinth that lasted until after Clement's time, we can deduce that Clement encountered a division in Corinth that suffered the existence of these "heretical" views, and not just pastoral problems.<sup>441</sup>

Bauer's construction did not pass without critique. A. Heron stated that Bauer's inadequacy hinged on two issues: 1) his evidence is drawn from late second-century materials that do not necessarily reflect 1 Clement's earlier views; 2) there is no support in the text for describing the situation in Corinth as a heretical division.<sup>442</sup> The same points were recently repeated by Andreas Köstenberger and Michael Kruger, who added that there was no theological position to be imposed by Clement who appealed to the same authoritative source of teaching in Corinth (1 Corinthians).<sup>443</sup>

While it is difficult to determine exactly the theological problem associated with the pastoral issue in Corinth, something admitted by Bauer, it is no less difficult to reduce the purpose and context of the letter into a mere pastoral problem. The objections mentioned above appear to be fair but are not necessarily accurate. These objections did not treat Bauer's method in depth. His interpolation was not between 1 Corinthians and a selection of late second-century writings but all second-century writings in consensus introduced 1 Clement as a letter that championed orthodoxy against heresy. This is all of the evidence we have, not just a selection. As Irenaeus puts it, 1 Clement is a letter for "the renewal of the faith" for those who "believed in another God superior to the creator of all things" (*Haer.* 3.3.3). This shows Irenaeus' understanding of the dispute as a theological problem.

---

<sup>440</sup> As indicated by Dionysius' letter to bishop Soter of Rome in Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 4.23.11. Polycarp, who dedicated his works to face heresies, shows possible knowledge of 1 Clement in his epistle to the Philadelphians. On a list of scholars who investigated this point see P. Hartog, *Polycarp and the New Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 176.

<sup>441</sup> Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 104–5. The term "heretical" is used by Bauer in a retrospective sense, i.e. according to the perspective of the later Catholic Church which used 1 Clement to defend its "orthodox" views.

<sup>442</sup> Cf. D. Harrington, "The Reception of Walter Bauer's 'Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity' During the Last Decade," *HTR* 73 (1980): 293. See also Robinson, *Bauer Thesis Examined*, 69–77.

<sup>443</sup> A. Köstenberger and M. J. Kruger, *The Heresy of Orthodoxy* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010), 50, 136–38.

Two major points are often ignored when Bauer's thesis is assessed. First, the long section of ethical admonition is not a pure teaching on moral conduct. It is interconnected with doctrinal themes such as divine personal gifts (1 Clem. 23), Parousia, bodily resurrection (1 Clem. 24-26), cosmic order as the manifestation of the divine will (1 Clem. 23), role of women (1 Clem. 1.3), and other subjects. Some of these themes were put in a rhetorical form as if Clement felt obliged to prove them, as in the case of bodily resurrection, while some other issues, like the role of women, were alluded to in several passages (1 Clem. 1.3; 6.2; 12.8; 55.3). Even without Clement's reference to 1 Corinthians, a connection with the circumstances addressed in Paul's letter could be inferred from the range of these topics. This leads us to the next point.

The second point, which is also in the line with the first, concerns the typology (or perhaps connection) that the author himself makes between the Corinthian inner dispute at the time of Paul and the one he was addressing (1 Clem. 47). Undoubtedly, the division amongst the Corinthians "concerning Paul, Cephas and Apollos" was loaded with doctrinal problems. Yet, it was "relatively minor (ἥττονα ἁμαρτίαν)" compared with the current division since his addressees were divided "over well testified apostles and a man approved by them" (1 Clem. 47.3-4).

The analogy between Peter and Cephas (the apostles) with the canonical pastors (the presbyters) on the one hand, against the "one or two persons" (1 Clem. 47.6) with Apollos, who is also merely "a man approved by the *apostles*" (1 Clem. 47.6), is obvious, and the problem of canonicity and order is similar. We can notice two things:

- 1) Clement reverses the order of the names as mentioned in 1 Cor 1:12 from Paul, Apollos, Cephas to Paul, Cephas, Apollos;
- 2) Paul and Cephas (the apostles) are brought together by Clement against Apollos who was put in a lower rank, with a position in the church only validated by them.

Of course, this fits into Clement's argument for the superiority of the apostles over any other charismatic or intellectual manifestation in the church. This reading colludes with Bauer's conjecture

that the parties of Paul and Cephas drew closer in their rejection of the syncretistic spirit of the Alexandrian Apollos.<sup>444</sup>

Bauer presents a legitimate interpretation which recapitulates all the traditions that dealt with 1 Clement and the external evidence on possible doctrinal disputes in Corinth at the time of 1 Clement. He also presents the theological themes that the author felt the need to defend, most of them in common with the issues in 1 Corinthians. From his study, we may conclude that Clement encountered a theological division in Corinth which is understood within the horizons of the Paul/Apollos debate. Bauer writes: “In its positive exposition of the common faith of the church, markedly moralistic in approach and based on the Old Testament and the sayings of the Lord, 1 Clement offers the best refutation of any Gnostic tainted Christianity—soberly objective and free of the temptation to probe into the depths of the godhead.”<sup>445</sup> This is the theological situation in which the Temple in the letter is used as part of Clement’s rhetoric. Despite the voices that limit the conflict to its pastoral element only, later scholarship took the theological themes in this conflict seriously. The studies of H. Lona, Otto Knoch, Louis Sanders, and others, focused particularly on the perspectives of eschatology and Clement’s worldview to identify the nature of the problem and why Clement approached it that way.<sup>446</sup> It is important to refer to two recent warnings against the excessive understanding of Clement as a shift towards the church of hierarchical structure. Andrew Gregory first warns against locating 1 Clement in a trajectory of Roman texts since the uncertainty of dating these texts cannot give a chronology that would define the role of each text in that trajectory.<sup>447</sup> John S. Kloppenborg secondly challenges the idea of looking at 1 Clement as the founder of the ecclesiology. Drawing from earlier

---

<sup>444</sup> Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 101.

<sup>445</sup> Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 104.

<sup>446</sup> Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*; Otto Knoch, *Eigenart und Bedeutung der Eschatologie im theologischen Aufriss des ersten Clemensbriefes* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1964); Louis Sanders, *L’Hellénisme de saint Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme* (Lovanii: Studia Hellenistica in Bibliotheca Universitatis, 1943). I will deal with literature post-Bauer in the following sections.

<sup>447</sup> A. Gregory, “Disturbing Trajectories,” in *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*, ed. Peter Oakes (Exeter: Paternoster, 2002), 142–64

Pauline and Greco-Roman texts, Kloppenborg justifiably proposes that 1 Clement's ecclesiastical order had its roots in the social and religious spaces of Christians in Asia Minor and Rome.<sup>448</sup>

## 4.2 The Temple in Clement's Rhetoric

Based on Harnack's view that Clement's Christianity was not cultic, Lietzmann saw that Clement's mention of the Temple and cult is completely allegorised.<sup>449</sup> It is important to assess Lietzmann's statement: was the Temple a symbol, a shadow or merely a pointer to a higher reality? Did Clement treat the Temple allegorically or was it a reality with relevance for Clement's case? We need to understand his intention to use the Temple as an example within his overall argument of *exempla*.<sup>450</sup> As Bakke succinctly defines it: "Proof by means of example, in many cases, followed by an explicit appeal to imitate the actual examples given, is abundant in deliberative texts throughout the rhetorical tradition and is to be found in discourses approximately contemporary with 1 Clement."<sup>451</sup> These discourses are to be found primarily in Stoicism, which Clement had access to, although there is disagreement on the extent of its influence.<sup>452</sup> As far as we are concerned, the common denominator is

---

<sup>448</sup> John S. Kloppenborg, "Pneumatic Democracy and the Conflict in 1 Clement," in *Christian Communities in the Second Century: Between Ideal and Reality*, eds. M. Grundeken and J. Verheyden (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 61–81.

<sup>449</sup> Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, 196, 200.

<sup>450</sup> Cf. C. A. Barbarick, "The Pattern and the Power: The Example of Christ in 1 Peter" (PhD diss., Baylor University, 2011).

<sup>451</sup> Odd Magne Bakke, "*Concord and Peace*": *A Rhetorical Analysis of the First Letter of Clement with an Emphasis on the Language of Unity and Sedition* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 57.

<sup>452</sup> The three main elements in studying the Stoic influence on Clement are his worldview which includes the stability and indestructibility of the world in which God's power works. Cf. R. M. Thorsteinsson, *Roman Christianity and Roman Stoicism: A Comparative Study of Ancient Morality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010). See also, A. Brent, *The Imperial Cult and the Development of Church Order* (Leiden: Brill, 1999). For an overall assessment see the important essay of W. Jaeger "Early Christianity and the Greek Paideia: 1 Clement," in *Encounters with Hellenism*, eds. Tobias Nicklas et al., 106f. Louis Sanders concludes that "Clément fait figure de disciple du stoicisme moyen, plus ou moins pythagorisant." Sanders, *L'Hellénisme de saint Clément de Rome*, 130. Rudolf Knopf earlier said "ganz unjüdisch und überhaupt unorientalisch." R. Knopf, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel, die zwei Klemensbriefe* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920), 76.

Clement's belief in the importance of nature's capacity to show God's power, though Clement's argument is drawn both from God's actions in the world and the history of Israel.<sup>453</sup> God's will sustains the natural order, and peace and harmony provide compelling evidence for that.<sup>454</sup> In the twentieth chapter, Clement explains God's governing of the heavens, earth, planets and seasons in peace and order. These represent Clement's evidence and support his claim for order and stability in the church as a divine will.

The validity of his argument is not based on an allegorical reading designed to find copies and shadows of a higher reality (as in Philo's Middle Platonism, for example), but rather hinges on the reality of the historical and cosmic phenomena that are universally accessible. Even Jesus' resurrection is plausible because it is not an unparalleled phenomenon, for resurrection can be found in nature according to the appointed order of God.<sup>455</sup> Analogy, not allegory, requires the reality of the archetype in order to make the conclusion valid. The reality of his claims is placed in correlation to the reality of these universal observations which always manifest God's will for peace and order.

This is also evident in Clement's exegesis of the Septuagint. With the exception of two cases that show his access to allegorical exegesis,<sup>456</sup> Clement's interpretation of Scripture is almost literal. In his important thesis on Clement's use of the Old Testament, Hagner sets Clement and Barnabas as

---

<sup>453</sup> Cf. Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, 40. Lona offers the following list of *exempla* in 1 Clement:

- a. "Beispiele aus der Schrift": 4.1-13; 7.5-7; 9.3ff.; 10.1ff.; 11.1ff.; 12.1-7; 16.1-17; 17.1-6; 18.1-2; 31.1-4; 43.1-6; 45.6ff.; 51.3-6; 53.2-4; 55.3-6.
- b. "Beispiele aus der christenlichen Geschichte": 5.1-7; 6.1; 55.2.
- c. "Beispiele aus der heidnischen Kultur": 6.2-4; 25.1-5; 37.2ff.; 55.1.
- d. "Beispiele aus der Natur": 24.3ff.; 25.1-5; 37.5.

<sup>454</sup> Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, 40. See also D. W. F. Wong, "Natural and divine order in I Clement," *Vigiliae Christianae* (1977): 81-87. However, Van Unnik warns us of exaggerating the Stoic impact on Clement by providing good defence of the Old Testament's influence which prevents us from stating that "1 Clement 20 was purely Stoic." See W. C. Van Unnik, "Is 1 Clement 20 purely stoic?," *Vigiliae Christianae* (1950): 181-89.

<sup>455</sup> Cf. the examples of the rising sun, the growing crops and the phoenix in 1 Clem. 24-25.

<sup>456</sup> the exceptions are the sign of blood in Rahab's story (12.7) and the gate in 48:2. Both do not affect the line of Clement argument and do not reflect his overall theology. Cf. D. A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (Leuven: Brill, 1973), 130.

contrasting in their exegesis despite their shared extensive use of the Old Testament.<sup>457</sup> While allegorical interpretation dominates Barnabas' epistle, Clement's literal interpretation and lack of interest in allegorization or esotericism are evident.<sup>458</sup> His fondness for following Old Testament personages provides him with patterns or examples rather than symbols that could be exploited in the coming of a new Christian reality.<sup>459</sup> As James Walters states, "whereas the common approach to the Old Testament for early Christian writers was to claim the traditions while attacking the Jewish Institutions, Clement used both and attacked neither."<sup>460</sup> The same Temple embodies legitimate ideas transmitted to Christians through their heritage and life as Israel. In light of this, we should approach each Temple notion without the presumption of allegorisation.

#### **4.3.1 1 Clement 23.5**

Chapter 23 is dedicated to advising Clement's addressees not to give up on the promise of God's return. He quotes a saying from an unknown source identified as scripture (ἡ γραφή): "How miserable are those double-minded people who doubt in their soul, saying, 'We have heard these things from the time of our parents, and look! We have grown old, and none of these things has happened to us.' You fools! Compare yourselves to a tree. Take a vine: first it sheds its leaves, then a bud appears, then a leaf, then a flower, and after these an unripe grape, and then an entire bunch fully grown" (1 Clem. 23.3-4; also found in 2 Clem. 11.2-3). Regardless of the source of this quotation, it is consistent with Clement's method. The lifespan of the grape is not an allegory or a shadow from the past. It is like

---

<sup>457</sup> Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 130.

<sup>458</sup> Cf. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 130–31. Hagner makes an important remark on Clement's exegesis by saying: "While typology and allegory flourished, it is remarkable that Clement has recourse to these methods only rarely." An explanation for this should be found in his view of Israel which we will be dealing with.

<sup>459</sup> Cf. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 126–27. This system is unknown to that Jewish synagogue in the Diaspora. Cf. Hans von Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1968), 82.

<sup>460</sup> James Walters, "The Impact of the Romans on Jewish/Christian Relations," in *Judaism and Christianity in the First Century*, eds. Raymond E. Brown and Karl P. Donfried (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 193.

other verifiable cosmic phenomena he mentioned before, a living truth of nature that can be “seen” as a witness to “how in a little time the fruit of the tree comes to ripeness” (1 Clem. 23.4).

Therefore, he concludes with another reference: “he shall come quickly and shall not tarry; the Lord *shall come suddenly to his temple*, and the Holy One for whom you look” (1 Clem 23.5). In this verse, Clement conflates Isa 13:21 (LXX) and Mal 3:1. The composition shows some significant changes:

| 1 Clem. 23:5b                              | Isa 13:21b                           | Mal 3:1                                                             |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| He will quickly come and not tarry         | It quickly comes and shall not tarry |                                                                     |
| Ταχὺ ἥξει καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ                   | ταχὺ ἔρχεται καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ.         |                                                                     |
| The Lord shall suddenly come to his temple |                                      | and the Lord will suddenly come to his temple.                      |
| Ἐξαίφνης ἥξει ὁ κύριος εἰς τὸν ναὸν αὐτοῦ  |                                      | καὶ ἑξαίφνης ἥξει εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἑαυτοῦ κύριος,                       |
| who is the holy one whom you await         |                                      | he whom you seek, and the messenger of the covenant whom you desire |
| καὶ ὁ ἅγιος, ὃν ὑμεῖς                      |                                      | ὃν ὑμεῖς ζητεῖτε καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς διαθήκης, ὃν ὑμεῖς               |

|            |  |        |
|------------|--|--------|
| προσδοκᾶτε |  | θέλετε |
|------------|--|--------|

We observe the following:

- 1- Clement changes the present ἔρχεται to the future ἔξει;
- 2- He changes Malachi's ὁ ἄγγελος to ὁ ἅγιος, and connects the latter with κύριος using a single relative clause ὃν.

Scholars have proposed several hypotheses about the origin of 1 Clement 23.5b. Harnack suggested that it belongs to a sacred book (due to Clement's introduction of the saying τῆς γραφῆς).<sup>461</sup> Other scholars suggested that it is a unit that belongs to a manual of prophetic sayings used by primitive Christians.<sup>462</sup> However, Lona is surely right to say that the relationship between the source and the redactor seems irresolvable.<sup>463</sup> Whether Clement redacted this hypothetical source that combines the two prophecies together or he himself combined them, his intention in the redactional moves in the two points above is obvious.<sup>464</sup> He used this prophetic saying to reflect the situation he dealt with, as the prophecy no longer serves (in the present) as a general idea that has become obsolete for those who gave up on the Parousia, but it is still valid in its futuristic (ἔξει) promise. In the second part, he turns Mal 3:1c into a Christological statement. Clement's substitution of ὁ ἄγγελος with ὁ ἅγιος, combined with κύριος and defined by a single relative clause, makes it a reference to Jesus. Harnack observes it as an "absichtliche Korrektur: Christus ist höher als die Engel,"<sup>465</sup> while Lona comments on defining "Lord" by saying: "Der Artikel vor κύριος weist wahrscheinlich auf eine christologie Deutung hin: der bald kommende Herr ist der erhöhte Christus."<sup>466</sup> Thus, it is safe to say that Clement was historicising a prophecy; he appealed to the authority of Scripture to define an anticipated event in the near future involving Jesus and the Temple.

<sup>461</sup> "Da sie als "die Schrift" zitiert ist, war sie jüdisch und nicht christlich" (Harnack, *Einführung*, 111).

<sup>462</sup> Fischer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 7; Knoch, *Eigenart und Bedeutung*, 129; Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe*, 84.

<sup>463</sup> Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, 293.

<sup>464</sup> Lightfoot suggests that it could be intentional, but he does not go further than that (*S. Clement of Rome*, vol. 2, 82).

<sup>465</sup> Harnack, *Einführung*, 111

<sup>466</sup> Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, 293

The coming of Jesus as the Lord here is confirmed by another important eschatological promise. 1 Clem. 50.3 reads: “All the generations from Adam till today have passed away, but those perfected in love through the gracious gift of God have a place among the pious. And they will be revealed in the visitation of the kingdom of Christ (ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ).” The promised kingdom is Jesus’ and its visitation is the fulfilment of these promises. The term ἐπισκοπῇ is characteristically Lukan where it is also used to identify God’s visitation to his people with Jesus’ ministry (Luke 1:68, 78; 7:16; 15:14; 19:44; Acts 15:14).

After discussing which Lord is meant in the verse, the question becomes: which temple is it? It is difficult to know the answer to this directly since Clement himself does not elaborate on this. Andreas Lindemann suggested that the temple here is the one of the community as it is in 1 Cor 3:16-17. However, he swiftly registers the vulnerability of this reading if we look for any resonance with it anywhere else in the text: “allerdings begegnet die Parallelisierung ναὸς-Kirche im 1 Clement sonst nicht.”<sup>467</sup> This statement is important because it warns us of hastily suggesting an alternative Christian temple simply because it is a Christian text. Two basic observations should be made. First, Clement is quoting a Jewish prophetic text. The association of the Messiah’s coming with the Temple was not unknown to Jewish texts composed in his time (for example, 4 Bar 3.12; Sib. Or. 5.420-433). Second, Clement did not feel the need to interpret this verse and he did not try to baptise it with a Christian meaning that would fulfil the promise of that verse. Taking the two observations into consideration, we could think of the belief in the Jerusalem Temple’s survival as being the author’s hope, like the post-destruction Jewish writings we mentioned earlier. However, the mode of this survival cannot be inferred from this section.

This hope, and the survival of the Temple in it, are eschatological. Agreeing with Knoch, the delay of the Parousia likely caused a crisis of faith in Corinth, which probably led to the question of the validity of Christian claims.<sup>468</sup> Thus, Clement felt the need to follow his argument on this issue with a

---

<sup>467</sup> Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe*, 84–85.

<sup>468</sup> Cf. Knoch, *Eigenart und Bedeutung*, 140.

similar one on resurrection (1 Clem. 24).<sup>469</sup> According to Knoch, the church's role in 1 Clement is to remind its adherents of a culminating salvation history not dissimilar to what we find in Luke-Acts.<sup>470</sup> However, I cannot see any evidence of that.<sup>471</sup> As far as we are concerned, it is the Temple which is expected to be at the centre of the universal salvation when all nations recognise God and his Son (1 Clem. 59.4).

#### 4.3.2 1 Clement 29.1–30.1

The question of identity is another theme that follows the problem of the eschatology in 1 Clement and contains a reference to the Temple. After dedicating chapters 24–28 to defending faith in bodily resurrection, Clement concludes that his addressees should exhibit moral conduct relevant to their identity as the people whom “God elected to be a portion to himself” (1 Clem. 29.1b).<sup>472</sup> But the question is: who are those people? Are they the Christians as a distinct entity from Israel? Explaining this statement, Clement cites Deut 38:8-9 to show that God, amongst all the nations, has chosen Israel as his portion (1 Clem. 29.2). He follows this citation with another one (ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ): “Behold; from the midst of nations, the Lord takes to himself a nation as a human who picks the first fruits of his threshing floor, and *the holy of holies* shall come forth from that nation (καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους ἐκείνου ἅγια ἁγίων)” (1 Clem. 29.3).<sup>473</sup>

The origin of the verse is unknown. For 29.3a, the closest parallel is Deut 4:34. Suggested parallels for 29.3b were 2 Chr 31:4 and Ezek 48:12. However, these suggestions cannot be maintained with any degree of certainty. There is no parallel to “ὥσπερ λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος τὴν ἀπαρχὴν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἄλῳ” in any known source. Thus, I think Hagner’s suggestion that this citation could be from an unknown book is the most plausible one.<sup>474</sup> This could be supported by two observations: Clement’s earlier

<sup>469</sup> Cf. Knoch, *Eigenart und Bedeutung*, 139–40.

<sup>470</sup> Knoch, *Eigenart und Bedeutung*, 139–40.

<sup>471</sup> Therefore, I share Lona’s reluctance to accept Knoch’s assertion (*Eigenart und Bedeutung*, 294–95).

<sup>472</sup> “ὅς ἐκλογῆς μέρος ἡμᾶς ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ.”

<sup>473</sup> The reference to the Holy of Holies, and not merely “most holy” is clear in the Latin edition: “et exient de gente illa sancta sanctorum.”

<sup>474</sup> Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 74.

citation in 29.2 is almost verbatim and his switch from the formula *γέγραπται* to *ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ* suggests a switch from two citations of Scripture. These two points are not conclusive but they are in line with the aforementioned lack of parallels. As in his biblical interpretation elsewhere, Clement understood it as a literal reference to the current historical situation, not a typology. This is further supported by his own conclusion: “since we are the Holy One’s portion, we should do everything that pertains to holiness” (1 Clem. 30.1). However, the problem arises from the different readings of the sentence which all give different implications. The different manuscripts provide different wording here:

|                           |                                              |                             |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| A (Alexandrian):          | ἁγίου οὖν μερίς                              | (a portion of the Holy One) |
| H (Constantinopolitanus): | ἅγια οὖν μέρη                                | (holy portions)             |
| LS (Latin):               | Pars ergo sancta quia sumus <sup>475</sup>   | (a holy portion)            |
| C (Coptic):               | ΕΑΝΔΑΝ ΤΜΕΡΙC CΕ ΝΗΝΕΤ ΟΥΔΑΒΕ <sup>476</sup> | (portion of the holy ones)  |

Scholars have been divided over whether the Latin or the Alexandrian reading is the authentic one.<sup>477</sup> However, the Alexandrian reading is not only in the original language but is a better fit for the literary context. Clement’s point is that Israel is not holy on its own but as God’s portion, following the expressions in the earlier scriptural citations (29.1c, 2, 3a). Unlike the Latin reading, the Alexandrian associates Clement’s community with Israel’s election in the previous verse as it does not break the flow from earlier verses. This could have been problematic enough for later Christians to redact it in as many different ways as the manuscripts we have are. All of the non-Alexandrian readings clearly give space, in varying degrees, for a classic Christian reading (a new holy people), based on 1 Cor 3:16-17. The implications are fundamental for constructing Clement’s understanding of identity and

<sup>475</sup> Text as published in Germain Morin, ed., *Sancti Clementis Romani Ad Corinthios Epistulae. Versio Latina Antiquissima* (Editorem Oxoniae: Parker, 1894).

<sup>476</sup> Text as published in C. Schmidt, *Der Erste Clemensbrief in Altkoptischer Übersetzung* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908), 79.

<sup>477</sup> For A: Lightfoot, Harnack and K: Lake; LS: Knopf, Fischer, Lindemann, Funk and, most recently, Ehrman.

salvation. For example, the Latin reading “a holy portion” does not imply when or how that new holy portion became so. This led Knoch, for example, to set “a new people of God” over against “old Israel.”<sup>478</sup> This does not have any support from the epistle, however. Knoch automatically identified this “new holy people” with the “holy of holies” in the scriptural reference of 29.3,<sup>479</sup> but this cannot be inferred from the previous part of this section (29). We have no reference to any ontological transformation that creates “a new holy people” or a new temple nor any kind of successive replacement. Clement talks clearly about Israel with no interest in explaining how or whether Christianity replaced it. Furthermore, the prophecy Clement refers to does not imply that God’s people are “the holy of holies” but the one *in which the holy of holies comes forth*. Of course, those people are the ones to which Clement belongs, and the citation should have obliged him to explain which temple (holy of holies) that is, and how Christian it should be, if he really meant a new Christian temple community instead of the one of Jerusalem. However, we have no traces of such an idea throughout the epistle. Neither mention of the election nor the Temple suggest a new experience. Indeed, Hagner’s conclusion on this section is that the association of the Israelite prophecies “amounts to nothing less than the election of the Church.”<sup>480</sup> Also, as Robert Grant puts it, “there is only one Israel, culminating in ‘the flock of Christ’.”<sup>481</sup> Yet, this is not a new Israel set against an old one; it is a fulfilled Israel.

---

<sup>478</sup> Knoch, *Eigenart und Bedeutung*, 351.

<sup>479</sup> Knoch, *Eigenart und Bedeutung*, 352: “Ja, er ist gegenüber dem alten Israel das Allerheiligste selbst, was nach Cl. zugleich als Steigerung im heilsgeschichtlichen Sinne verstanden werden soll (20.11).”

<sup>480</sup> Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 122. “It is obvious, however, that even when no explicit indications are giving, the direct application of the OT quotations to the Church establishes the continuity which exists for Clement between Israel and the Church” (123). Note that the validity of this statement hinges on the lack of any alternative definition to the “Christian” use of the Old Testament from Clement which automatically leads Hagner to this conclusion.

<sup>481</sup> Lightfoot, *S. Clement of Rome*, vol. 2, 55. See also Harnack, *Einführung*, 112. Cf. Klevinghaus, *Die Theologie Stellung*, 70. Peter Richardson succinctly observes that “he quotes the OT extensively, but in his use of it he nowhere suggests that Christianity is set over against Israel, or that Christianity is a *tertium genus*” (*Israel in the Apostolic Church*, 24).

Therefore, 29.1–30.1 implies that Clement’s Christian identity should be understood within the concept of the timeless truth of God’s election of Israel. As such, the coming Holy of Holies (ἅγια ἁγίων) belongs to that nation (ἔθνος) with which Clement identifies the Christians. The eschatological context of this statement allows Christians to understand themselves within the Israelite promises. This identity does not bear any exclusion of any other nation or the inheritance of a particular nation (Israel).

Therefore, Clement uses a source in which the Temple comes as a sign of the divine election of the people of God, without the need to add any further interpretation to claim the prophecy for his people as a distinct nation from Israel. This also leads us to see that 29.1–30.1 agrees with what we saw earlier in 1 Clem. 23.5 and we should consequently think of it as a reference to the one Temple of Jerusalem, somehow surviving and continuing in the life of the Jesus community.

#### **4.3.3 1 Clement 40–41**

In his correspondence with the Corinthians, Clement understands the conflict in Corinth to be due to their ecclesiastical structure. This understanding stems from his shared experience. Clement was “involved in the same struggle” (1 Clem. 7.1) in which rivalry and strife (1 Clem. 3:2–6:4) caused unrest. However, Clement offers a solution in which an appeal to the authority of God’s ordained system, as represented by his Temple, could settle the situation and create order (1 Clem. 40–41).

After exhorting his addressees to live as an inclusive unity that sustains the weak and the strong together<sup>482</sup> and which values the variety of spiritual gifts and the financial difference (1 Clem. 36–39), Clement discusses the Temple of Jerusalem and its divinely instated worship as evidence for God’s will for unity.

There are two passages that recapitulate Clement’s argument for the divine order of worship (40–41). Chapter 40 is the culmination of his exhortation (in the earlier chapters) to rise above divisions

---

<sup>482</sup> This reminds us of the same duality in Romans (14:1; 13:19; 15:1-2, 5-7) and reflects the tension between Jewish and gentile forms of Christian communities.

caused by the variety of gifts.<sup>483</sup> Chapter 41 offers a solid argument for following unity and order in worship which appeals to the divine system of worship as manifest in the Temple. From this passage, we can see that Clement exhorts his addressees to have a particular place for worship and for offering their sacrifice. First, he defines his argument for unity as divine knowledge: “θείας γνώσεως” (1 Clem. 40.1). Receiving this divine knowledge obliges us to carry out the Master's will “ὅσα ὁ δεσπότης ἐπιτελεῖν ἐκέλευσε” (1 Clem. 40.1). This ultimate authority manifests in the order God commanded us to follow (as it is in the Temple cult). It is no one else but God who “appointed both where and through whom his wish is accomplished according to his supreme will” (1 Clem. 40.3). Accordingly, Clement explains what place and persons that God appointed (40.4–41.2). However, he starts and concludes this section with two contrasting images in the two chapters:<sup>484</sup>

|                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>40.3 Thus, those who present their offering according to His appointed times are acceptable and blessed. For those who work according to the Master's law commit no sin.<sup>485</sup></p> | <p>41.3 Thus those who work against his will shall receive the penalty of death.<sup>486</sup></p> |
| <p>41.4 See, brethren, the more we become worthy of knowledge, the greater danger we are exposed to.<sup>487</sup></p>                                                                        |                                                                                                    |

<sup>483</sup> This resonates with what Paul said to the same addressees in 1 Cor 14:26-40. Although Clement will refer explicitly to Paul's letter later (1 Clem. 47), it was unnecessary to make this connection here as it is clear enough.

<sup>484</sup> Cf. Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, 440–41. See also Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe*, 125.

<sup>485</sup> οἱ οὖν τοῖς προστεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιῶντες τὰς προσφοράς αὐτῶν εὐπρόσδεκτοί τε καὶ μακάριοι· τοῖς γὰρ νομίμοις τοῦ δεσπότου ἀκολουθοῦντες οὐ διαμαρτάνουσιν.

<sup>486</sup> οἱ οὖν παρὰ τὸ καθήκον τῆς βουλήσεως αὐτοῦ ποιῶντές τι θάνατον τὸ πρόστιμον ἔχουσιν.

<sup>487</sup> ὁρᾶτε, ἀδελφοί· ὅσῳ πλείονος κατηξιώθημεν γνώσεως, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὑποκείμεθα κινδύνῳ.

Between these two parallel statements, Clement unfolds the two elements of divine order: persons and places. As for persons, he enlists them as follows:

|                            |                                                  |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| For the high priest        | special liturgical responsibilities are assigned |
| and for the priests        | a special place is dedicated                     |
| and for the Levites        | a special service is to be laid down.            |
| For the laity (lay humans) | ordinances (commands) are fitted for lay ranks.  |

(1 Clem. 40.5)<sup>488</sup>

The hierarchical order starts from the high priest, who is apparently meant to be appointed by God to preside over liturgical responsibilities. From God, the ranks “προστάγμασιν” (1 Clem. 40.5)<sup>489</sup> are graded until we reach the laity. It is not obvious what responsibilities or ordinances are meant for the latter rank but it is cut off from the sequence of the ranks: the first three offices are connected with the preposition καὶ while the λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος has a separate sentence. It has been noted that this is the first time the term λαϊκὸς appears in Christian literature.<sup>490</sup> It never appeared in the Septuagint. It is found in later Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible, well after Clement.<sup>491</sup> In these references λαϊκὸς is put against ἅγιον in the sense of cultic purification.<sup>492</sup> The Latin edition has a stronger term with a derogatory tone: “plebs” or “commoners” are given orders fit for laypersons (*Plebeius homo laicis praeceptis datus est*). If the Latin edition caught the right sense of the Greek manuscript Clement accessed (which is independent from A and H) or the right meaning of the original author, it appears that he inserted the lay rank deliberately to associate it, in a submissive sense, with the “one

---

<sup>488</sup> τῷ γὰρ ἀρχιερεῖ ἴδιαι λειτουργίαι δεδομένοι εἰσίν, καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τόπος προστέτακται, καὶ Λευίταις ἴδιαι διακονίαι ἐπίκεινται· ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προσταγμασιν δέδεται.

<sup>489</sup> Cf. 1 Clem. 37.3.

<sup>490</sup> Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, 434.

<sup>491</sup> Aq.: 1 Sam 21:5; Sym.: 1 Sam 21:5; Ezek 22:26; Theod.: 1 Sam 21:5; Ezek 48:15.

<sup>492</sup> Cf. Lona (*Der erste Clemensbrief*, 434) infers from this that Clement probably accessed a Greek translation different to the Septuagint and used by the later three translations. This is a possibility that could be supported by Clement’s strong familiarity with Jewish writings in Greek beyond the Septuagint canon, but this is beyond the scope of this research.

or two” (1 Clem. 47.6). If those one or two enthusiasts are laypersons then they should submit themselves to their superiors and accept what has been assigned to them, just as the laypersons in the Temple sequence of ranks above do. This also informs us that Clement needed to confine the whole Corinthian crisis within the model of the Temple in order for his argument to be relevant. This means that legitimacy needs to be understood as being based on the Temple, even if he had to add an extra layer to its hierarchical composition.

The second part (41.1-2) concerns the unity of the place of the sacrifice:

In good conscience, brethren, let each one of us in his own rank become pleasing to God, and not transgress his assigned liturgical canons, but keeping them in all reverence.

Not in every place, brethren, are the daily sacrifices or the free-willing offerings, or the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings offered, but only in Jerusalem;

and not in every spot (place) offers are made, but before the shrine (ναοῦ), at the altar (πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον),

being inspected (for blemishes) by the high priest and the previously mentioned ministers (προειρημένων λειτουργῶν).<sup>493</sup>

This part of his argument limits the legitimate liturgical service to a specific place as it is conducted in the Temple of Jerusalem. The service is also officiated and the offers are inspected by the high priest, assisted by other priests. The authority of the Temple’s τοπός is the core of the evidence: it is not anywhere or by anyone that the offer could be presented legitimately. The reference to the role of the high priests, who inspect the validity of the sacrifice, also implies the apostolic authority granted to the bishops who validate worship. The validity of Clement’s argument hinges on the validity of worship in the Temple of Jerusalem as being God’s will, which was not superseded by the Christian church. Since there is no evidence on supersessionism or any allegorical exegesis (as in Hebrews),

<sup>493</sup> Ἐκαστος ἡμῶν, ἀδελφοί ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι εὐαριστεῖτω τῷ θεῷ ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχων, μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν ὀρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα, ἐν σεμνότητι. 2. οὐπανταχοῦ, ἀδελφοί, προσφέρονται θυσίαι ἐνδελεχισμοῦ ἢ εὐχῶν ἢ περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ πλημμελεία. ἀλλ’ ἢ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ μόνῃ· κακεῖ δὲ οὐκ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ προσφέρεται, ἀλλ’ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ναοῦ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, μωμοσκοπηθὲν τὸ προσφερόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τῶν προειρημένων λειτουργῶν.

this analogy shows that the Temple cult remained as an authoritative example of God's will regardless of its destruction (since Clement most likely wrote after 70 CE).<sup>494</sup> Thus, Christians in Corinth are not called to look at the Temple of Jerusalem as a copy or a symbol of a higher reality, as in Hebrews, but as a reality in its own right which manifests the genuine will of God. As Lona puts it: “Die Wirklichkeit Jerusalems und seines Tempels wächst ins Unermeßliche, wenn sie an keinem real existierenden Parameter mehr gemessen werden kann.”<sup>495</sup>

Looking into other Christian contemporary texts we observe that the image of a temple that resembles apostolic order is found nowhere else with the exception of Ignatius of Antioch who offered the closest case. In his Epistle to the Magnesians, Ignatius says:

And so, just as the Lord did nothing apart from the Father neither on his own nor through the apostles, so too you should do nothing apart from the bishop and the presbyters. Do not try to maintain that it is reasonable for you to do something among yourselves in private; instead, for the common purpose, let there be one prayer, one petition, one mind, one hope in love and in blameless joy, which is Jesus Christ. Nothing is superior to him. You should all run together, as into one temple of God, as upon one altar, upon one Jesus Christ, who came forth from one Father and was with the one and returned to the one.” (7.1-2).

The similarity in the content of the teaching is obvious; the ranking from the Father through the Son, the apostles, and the presbyters also exhorts the addressees to recognise their role according to it. This image is found in a similar problem in Magnesia with a response from Ignatius that agrees in its core with Clement. He confronted the barrier of rendering the bishop all respect despite his youth (Ign. *Magn.* 3). It is the fact that rendering this respect goes beyond this “outwardly youthful appearance” to “the Father of Jesus Christ, to the bishop of all (τῷ πατρὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῷ πάντων ἐπισκόπῳ)” (Ign. *Magn.* 3.1).

---

<sup>494</sup> Cf. R. E. Brown, *Antioch and Rome* (New York: Paulist, 1983), 170; J. Klevinghaus, *Die Theologie Stellung der Apostolischen Väter zur Alttestamentlichen Offenbarung* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1948), 65f.

<sup>495</sup> Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, 440.

In language similar to that of Barnabas 4.10-11, communal unity is emphasised. Ignatius also emphasises the unity of worship in one temple before one altar: πάντες ὡς εἰς ἓνα ναὸν συντρέχετε θεοῦ, ὡς ἐπὶ ἐν θυσιαστήριον. However, the point of legitimacy is not the same. While Clement bases the legitimacy of his teachings of the divine order as revealed in the life of Israel and its worship (the Temple of Jerusalem), Ignatius does not seem to be referring to the Temple of Jerusalem or Israel. His reference to temple imagery is emptied from a historical or religious context of Israel which drives us to wonder whether he is talking about the particular Temple of Jerusalem or temple imagery in general. His lack of interest in the Old Testament<sup>496</sup> and the history of Israel makes the latter choice more plausible. This is further supported by his other temple images in which the rich details collude with Greco-Roman temples, such as Ign. Eph. 9.1 in which we have a mechanical description (τῆς μηχανῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) of the tools building the temple which is similar to the Roman Polyspaston,<sup>497</sup> or in Ign. Eph. 9.2 which has the image of sacred objects like temple bearing (ναοφόροι).<sup>498</sup> Unlike Clement, Ignatius uses temple cult as an image, not as a solid concept of legitimacy. It is only a way of communicating the Christian teachings of the cross or the relationship between the persons of the Trinity which are the source of legitimacy for his claims.

Based on that, we can see that Clement probably defended an earlier tradition of ecclesiastical system known to Ignatius, yet Clement's rhetoric for legitimacy and his understanding of the role of the Temple of Jerusalem within it is entirely different. Based on our investigation of its date, the Temple's destruction did not empty it from its significance for Clement's church, which is not inconsistent with what we already saw in the post-destruction Jewish texts. In light of the

---

<sup>496</sup> He hardly quotes any verse in his letters.

<sup>497</sup> Compare with Marcus Vitruvius, *De Architectura*, 9.2.

<sup>498</sup> Allen Brent, *Ignatius and the Second Sophistic* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 140–44, 160–66; Allen Brent, "Ignatius and Polycarp: The Transformation of New Testament Traditions in the Context of Mystery Cults," in A. Gregory and C. Tuckett (eds.), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 325–49; Allen Brent, "Ignatius' Pagan Background in Second Century Asia Minor," *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 10 (2007): 207–32. W. R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, Hermeneia Series (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 67; Philip A. Harland, "Christ-Bearers and Fellow-Initiates: Local Cultural Life and Christian Identity in Ignatius' Letters," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 11 (2003), 481–99.

eschatological hope he expressed, worship within the Temple remains as a valid pattern of worship until its reception of the coming of Jesus. This makes the Temple and its order as the pillar of the true divine order until the coming of the eschaton.

### ***4.3 Temple language in 1 Clement***

#### ***4.3.1 Martyrdom as access to the Holy Place***

There are several allusions to Temple worship in Clement's cultic language. Some of these allusions have parallels to the heavenly temple worship found in Hebrews. The first section is an exhortation to focus on God's gifts and not to be pulled away with jealousy (3.1–7.4). In this section, Clement enumerates the examples of the men of God who were persecuted by evil people. Examples from ancient times (4.2-13) were followed by the cases of Peter and Paul "from our generation" (1 Clem. 5.1). After enduring persecution, Peter's death led him to his appointed place of glory, "τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης" (1 Clem. 5.4), while Paul's martyrdom led him to "depart from the world" and to enter the Holy Place, "τὸν ἅγιον τόπον" (1 Clem. 5.7). Harnack suggests that Peter's "appointed place" is just a place of honour, and Lightfoot does not add anything further.<sup>499</sup> While this could be the case for the first term (see Acts 1:25; Barn. 19.1; Pol. *Phil.* 9.2), we have no evidence from the epistle that a heavenly temple was proposed. A place of glory could be an eschatological Jerusalem, which is not necessarily a heavenly *alternative*, as in Hebrews. Clement understands well that it is the unparalleled precious blood of Jesus that is the only bringer of salvation (1 Clem. 7.4).

What is that holy place? Is it heaven or is it a heavenly altar on which the two apostles offered their martyrdom as a sacrifice? The second term ('holy place') was used to refer to the Temple of Jerusalem (Acts 21:28; Isa 60:13 which is used by Matt 24:15). The author knew and understood the language of heavenly promises but he never implied it as a reality against shadowy earthly worship. For instance, Paul's letter to the Romans admonishes his addressees to present their bodies as a holy

---

<sup>499</sup> Harnack, *Einführung*, 107; Lightfoot, *S. Clement of Rome*, vol. 2, 1, 29–30. Lona too adds nothing more other than seeing it as a special place that must be in heaven (*Der erste Clementsbrief*, 166).

living sacrifice, which is a rational service: “λογικός λατρεία” (12:1).<sup>500</sup> This is not far from 1 Peter’s “πνευματικᾶς θυσίας” (2:5), which is associated with the image of the individuals as being living stones of the temple.<sup>501</sup> This sacrificial/cultic language seems to be known, then, in Roman Christianity. However, Clement did not employ it towards a complete temple image like 1 Peter.

#### **4.3.2 The Blood of Christ (1 Clement 7.4)**

Clement concludes his admonition to avoid jealousy and evil-doing (1 Clem. 7.3-7) by “looking at the blood of Christ which is most precious to his Father, because pouring it for our salvation brought the grace of repentance to the entire world” (7.4).<sup>502</sup> The liturgical tone in the statement is obvious, as Edmund Fischer’s important analysis of this verse shows.<sup>503</sup> The association of “the blood of Christ” with the verb ἐκχεῖν, “to pour”, is well attested in the New Testament and in most of the ancient liturgies, especially the Roman liturgy.<sup>504</sup> Knoch concurs with Fischer and sees this exhortatory passage as possibly an extraction from ancient Roman liturgy.<sup>505</sup> It is perhaps peculiar of Clement (who knows some Pauline writings) not to associate the pouring of blood with the cross explicitly; the cross is absent from the epistle.<sup>506</sup> Fisher concludes that the “exhortation of 1 Clem. 7.4 is certainly paraenetical in its present context, but the tradition behind it is eucharistic.”<sup>507</sup> This conclusion is consistent with the fact that one of the epistle’s main concerns was conducting the Eucharist service

---

<sup>500</sup> On the cultic language of the verse and its probable usage in baptismal services see Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (London: SCM, 1980), 326–27.

<sup>501</sup> Cf. Brown, *Antioch and Rome*, 136–37; R. Feldmeier, *The First Letter of Peter* (Texas: Baylor University Press, 2008), 136f.

<sup>502</sup> τενίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ γινώμεν, ὡς ἔστιν τίμιον τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθὲν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοίας χάριν ἐπήνεγκεν.

<sup>503</sup> E. W. Fisher, “‘Let Us look upon the Blood-of-Christ’ (1 Clement 7.4),” *Vigiliae Christianae* 34 (1980): 218–36.

<sup>504</sup> Cf. Fisher “‘Let Us look upon the Blood-of-Christ’,” 228, 230. Mark 14:24; Matt 26:28; Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:23-26; in the context of baptism, *Didache* 7.3.

<sup>505</sup> Knoch, *Eigenart und Bedeutung*, 264, 270.

<sup>506</sup> Cf. Fisher, “‘Let Us look upon the Blood-of-Christ’,” 230, 232.

<sup>507</sup> Fisher, “‘Let Us look upon the Blood-of-Christ’,” 234.

properly.<sup>508</sup> Putting it in this liturgical context, there is no gesture to any heavenly cultic alternative as found in Hebrews.

### 4.3.3 *The Patron of our Offerings (1 Clement 36.1)*

The distinction between the two entities is understood from 1 Clem. 40–41. However, a better understanding may be found in 1 Clem. 36.1: “Beloved, this is the road in which we have found our salvation, Jesus Christ, the High Priest of our offerings, the Patron and helper in our weaknesses.” This verse is the conclusion of the section on salvation and good work (34–36). The liturgical tone in the Trisagion of the angels in Chapter 34 has led several scholars to think that the origin of this section is Roman liturgy.<sup>509</sup> A striking parallel of 1 Clem. 36 comes from Heb 1:2-5 and 3:1. A. Carlyle of the Oxford Committee concluded that Clement’s knowledge of Hebrews is beyond doubt (assigned letter A).<sup>510</sup> Hagner’s analysis also supported this confidence in literary dependence.<sup>511</sup> Harnack himself suggests that if we remove 36.1a, we will have a “continuous reproduction of Hebrews.”<sup>512</sup> However, I do not share this confidence since the parallel materials vary in their affinity.<sup>513</sup> While it is probable that Clement indeed relied on Hebrews, it remains difficult to show that with certainty. However, one particular parallel is important for us: 1 Clem. 36.1 and Heb 3:1.

1 Clem. 36.1

Heb 3:1

---

<sup>508</sup> The epistle is loaded with doxologies that suggest a considerable liturgical influence (1 Clem. 1.1; 2.4; 6.1; 36.4; 43.4; 46.4, 8; 49.5; 50.7; 59.2, 3, 64).

<sup>509</sup> Knopf, *Apostolischen Väter*, 106–7; Harnack, *Einführung*, 113; Knoch, *Eigenart und Bedeutung*, 344. See also Fischer, “‘Let Us look upon the Blood-of-Christ’,” 220f.

<sup>510</sup> A. Carlyle, “1 Clement,” in Oxford Committee (ed.), *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, 44–48.

<sup>511</sup> See also Andrew Gregory’s conclusion in Gregory and Tuckett, *The Reception of the New Testament*, 152–53.

<sup>512</sup> Harnack, *Einführung*, 113.

<sup>513</sup> I therefore agree with the cautious position of Ellingworth, “Hebrews and 1 Clement: Literary Dependence or Common Tradition?,” *Biblische Zeitschrift Paderborn* 23 (1979): 269. See A. Gregory “1 Clement and the Writings that Later formed the New Testament,” in Gregory and Tuckett, *The Reception of the New Testament*, 152–54.

This is the path, loved ones, in which we  
have found our salvation—Jesus Christ, the high  
priest of our offerings, the benefactor who helps  
us in our weaknesses

Therefore, holy brethren, who share in a  
heavenly call, consider Jesus, the apostle and high  
priest of our confession

Αὕτη ἡ ὁδός, ἀγαπητοί, ἐν ἣ εὕρομεν  
τὸ σωτήριον ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,

Ὅθεν, ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου  
μέτοχοι, κατανοήσατε

τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῶν προσφορῶν ἡμῶν,

τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας

τὸν προστάτην καὶ

ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν

βοηθὸν τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν

It appears that Clement is loosely referencing Hebrews, but the similarity in form and content, as well as context, is obvious.<sup>514</sup> If Clement is using Hebrews, he makes two major alterations:

1. Jesus is the High Priest of our offerings (τῶν προσφορῶν), not of our confession (τῆς ὁμολογίας).

Jesus' title as "High Priest" is associated with his poured blood, mentioned earlier, which supports understanding the image of the poured blood in 1 Clem. 7.4 in terms of the Temple cult (and the imagery of Hebrews). While Fisher justifiably noticed the absence of the cross in earlier passages, Harnack also noticed here that the "salvation" in v. 36 is not in the Pauline sense (by crucifixion and resurrection).<sup>515</sup> The question remains: what is the role of the church and its "offerings"? Is it the blood of Christ which it offers? Because Hebrews sees no significance for a church service (with offerings) similar to the Temple cult, Jesus is the High Priest of "our confession" only (3:1). There is

---

<sup>514</sup> Note Lindemann makes an important point: Clement is not necessarily quoting *Hebrews* in the form we know today (*Die Clemensbriefe*, 122, 18–20).

<sup>515</sup> Harnack, *Einführung*, 113–14.

no need for more than “our confession” since a heavenly sanctuary exists and is the locus of the only worthy High Priest—Jesus. However, Clement apparently replaces Hebrews’ τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν with τῶν προσφορῶν ἡμῶν.

On the one hand, it appears the church conducts liturgies and services with offerings, yet these offerings are validated by the High Priest, Jesus. “Our offerings” in its plural form and the pronoun ἡμῶν draws a clear distinction between what the church offers in services and the unique sacrifice of Jesus’ blood (7.4). Clement is careful in choosing τῶν προσφορῶν, not θυσία (a frequent word in *Hebrews*)<sup>516</sup> which would have left no room to doubt the notion of blood sacrifice. On the other hand, while Jesus became the High Priest through his unique and once-for-all sacrifice, which is accepted by Clement and Hebrews, he still administers the church services and its offerings in his capacity as a High Priest.<sup>517</sup> Thus, the church is distinct from the Temple service yet it understands itself and validates its ministry through it via Jesus’ priestly ministry. The offerings of the church are a commemoration of Jesus’ sacrifice, not a repetition of them.

## 2. Jesus is the patron (προστάτην), not an apostle.

Clement’s use of *προστάτην* cannot be coincidental. The word is commonly translated as “benefactor”.<sup>518</sup> Since the author approached the source of 1 Clem. 36.1 with an ecclesiological agenda, Jesus cannot be the apostle since he is the source of apostolic legitimacy (1 Clem. 42.1-2). Thus, Clement’s cultic language introduces an ecclesiology built on the Temple’s legitimate cult which gives Jesus and his sacrifice meaning. The church, as an eschatological body, furthers

---

<sup>516</sup> Fifteen times: Heb 5:1; 7:27; 8:3; 9:9, 23, 26; 10:1, 5, 8, 11-12, 26; 11:4; 13:15, 16.

<sup>517</sup> These offerings should be understood strictly as the practice of the Eucharist, not just offering prayers or hymns. Otherwise, his whole argument in 40-41 collapses.

<sup>518</sup> Lightfoot comments: “To a Roman it would convey all the ideas of the Latin ‘patronus’ (*S. Clement of Rome*, vol. 2, 1, 111).

sacrificial life through its liturgy which is presided over by Jesus the High priest. As Brown says about law in general, the church solidifies the Levitical structure, and intends “not to replace it.”<sup>519</sup>

#### **4.4 Conclusion**

We can summarise our findings in the following points:

First, a survey of Clement’s references to the Temple shows us that the Temple played a vital role in the three major themes that lie at the heart of the Corinthian dispute: eschatology (1 Clem. 23), identity (1 Clem. 29–30), and ecclesiology (1 Clem. 40–41).

Second, in these themes it is the Temple of Jerusalem that survives and witnesses the validity of the author’s teaching. From these direct statements, it is not clear how the Temple survives in the hope and life of Clement’s belief despite its destruction. However, our observations on his cultic language (1 Clem. 7.3-7; 36.1) showed that the author understood the experience of the liturgical life of the church in light of the Temple language, yet without superseding the latter or replacing it or providing any language that signifies any transition towards a better or more spiritual alternative. Therefore, this experience is understood to reflect the survival of the Temple perhaps until its final manifestation in “the visitation of the Kingdom of Christ” (1 Clem. 50.3).

Third, we have no evidence of replacing, appropriating or transforming the Temple into a new Christian reality. Despite Clement’s knowledge of other Christian and Hellenistic Jewish allegorical exegesis, he never proposed the different Christian temple models that we find in the variety of these writings. In the text that we can confidently state that Clement knew (1 Corinthians) several models of Christian temples were present, such as the collective Temple image (Christians are one Temple) in 1 Cor 3:16 and 6:19. Hebrews’ heavenly sanctuary (9:23f) could possibly be added to them too. Yet Clement did not share any of them. If Clement used Hebrews, he carefully redacted the materials to

---

<sup>519</sup> R. Brown, *Antioch and Rome*, 170.

avoid implying such an alternative heavenly temple. Avoiding the replacement of the Temple should be underlined in our investigation of Clement's view of the one that was in Jerusalem.

Based on Clement's view of the Temple, we might ask how Clement's Roman Christianity would view Judaism in its contemporary setting? It is hard to answer this question if Roman Christianity itself was not unified.<sup>520</sup> Walters suggested two possibilities for Clement's positive attitude to Jewish practice: "It seems to me that Clement either did not care if Christians defected to the synagogue—a rather unlikely option—or that the distance between the Jewish and Christian communities in Rome was so great at this point that Clement felt no automatic compulsion to guard the back door."<sup>521</sup> However, it is hard to see any concept of supersessionism in Clement's theology which reflects a Christianity that did not necessarily dissociate itself from the synagogue in the first place.

While my research focuses in particular on the question of the Temple, I should refer to a recent publication of Joseph Verheyden on Clement's view of Judaism, compared with that of Barnabas.<sup>522</sup> Verheyden argues that Clement's silence on Israel's fate suggests a rejection that mounts up to the rejection found in the Epistle of Barnabas. Implicit criticism of Israel's past could be inferred in Clement's reference to the moral failure in its history which includes jealousy and strife (6.1-3).<sup>523</sup> Verheyden's case relies on hypothetical statements in which he expects that the reader of the epistle "must feel uncomfortable with this whole presentation as if Israel and its history can be recalled and told in this negative way."<sup>524</sup> However, neither the reader's feeling should be inferred nor is there any

---

<sup>520</sup> We do not have any evidence of a unified church in Rome before the second decade of the first century (Brent, *Political History*, 176). Based on its Jewish roots, early Roman Christian congregations were similar in structure to Jewish synagogues. Rudolf Brändle and E. W. Stegemann, "The Formation of the 'First Christian Congregations' in Rome in the Context of the Jewish Synagogues," in Donfried and Richardson, *Judaism and Christianity in the First Century*, 117f.

<sup>521</sup> James Walters, "1 Clement," in Donfried and Richardson (eds.), *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*, 193.

<sup>522</sup> Joseph Verheyden, "Israel's Fate in the Apostolic Fathers: The Case of 1 Clement and the Epistle of Barnabas," in *Q in Context: II Social Setting and Archaeological Background of the Sayings Source*, Markus Tiwald (Bonn: Bonn University Press, 2015), 237–62.

<sup>523</sup> Verheyden, "Israel's Fate in the Apostolic Fathers," in Tiwald, *Q in Context*, 240–41.

<sup>524</sup> Verheyden, "Israel's Fate in the Apostolic Fathers," in Tiwald, *Q in Context*, 240.

concept of a negative depiction of Israel's history. Jealousy is stretched to include those who killed Peter and Paul (5.2-7) and they were not Israelite. Furthermore, we saw that the concept of Deuteronomistic History is absent in Clement (while it is optimised in Barnabas) which could have been employed if he needed to make such a case. Further still, Verheyden's statement that the readers do not need to be reminded about what happened to Jesus is also hypothetical.<sup>525</sup> His idea that because Christians were referred to three times as the elected people shows the author's negative view of Israel is questionable.<sup>526</sup> We saw that the election (1 Clem. 29–30) did not cause Christians to be referred to as a distinctive group; it happened when God chose Israel from the beginning. This brings us back to the problem of separating 1 Clem. 30.1 from the flow of the argument in chapter 29 by choosing the Latin translation, which Verheyden relied on.<sup>527</sup> While he acknowledges how the blessings bestowed on Abraham and his offspring do not separate Jesus from Israel and how the order of those who received the blessings is non-chronological (1 Clem. 32.2), which is "surprising,"<sup>528</sup> Verheyden reads Clement's reference to Abraham as *our* father in the same way the language of us/them in Barnabas was used. There is no need to do this since Clement himself did not distinguish between two entities of "us and them" like in Barnabas where "our" was not put against "theirs" to assert such a distinction. Referring back to our findings on the Temple, Clement carefully avoided materials that could have helped him articulate the existence of a new people with a new temple against the old one had he desired to do so. But he did not do so which, in itself, is evidence of a contrasting view to that of Barnabas. In a recently published article, James Carleton Paget develops similar arguments against the views of Verheyden on the bigger picture of Judaism in 1 Clement,<sup>529</sup> my findings on the particular topic of the Temple should be, consequently, in support of Paget's case.

---

<sup>525</sup> Verheyden, "Israel's Fate in the Apostolic Fathers," in Tiwald, *Q in Context*, 240.

<sup>526</sup> Cf. Verheyden, "Israel's Fate in the Apostolic Fathers," in Tiwald, *Q in Context*, 241.

<sup>527</sup> Verheyden, "Israel's Fate in the Apostolic Fathers," in Tiwald, *Q in Context*, 243.

<sup>528</sup> Verheyden, "Israel's Fate in the Apostolic Fathers," in Tiwald, *Q in Context*, 243.

<sup>529</sup> Paget, James C. "1 Clement, Judaism, and the Jews." *Early Christianity* 8 (2017): 218–50

## Luke-Acts

### 5.1 Introduction

So far, we have seen a variety of responses to the destruction of the Temple. The Jewish post-destruction writings offer us a multitude of explanations of the problems imposed by that event, and suggest ways to cope with the present and future hope, varying from earthly restoration of the Temple to celestial alternatives. We saw that issues of materiality, eschatology, and political views were reflected on by those writers, providing the elements witnessed to and employed by contemporaneous Christian writers such as 1 Clement and Barnabas in a way that produced two different models of Christian responses to the destruction of the Temple and its value afterwards. In this spectrum of views and within the two different Christian models of Clement and Barnabas, this chapter asks where Luke-Acts stands. Did Luke's double work lean towards a model against the other, or does it witness to both? Did it employ the arguments and views raised by the Jewish post-destruction texts? It is these questions which I will aim to answer within this chapter.

#### 5.1.1 Date and Provenance

Unfortunately, neither the papyri nor the traditional testimonies could help with dating or locating the Gospel of Luke. The earliest manuscript p<sup>4</sup> (and perhaps p<sup>45</sup>)<sup>530</sup> which preserves portions of Luke 1–6 is dated to around the early third century, which makes it too late to affect the dating of the Gospel.<sup>531</sup> Whether any author named Luke is behind the Gospel or not, it cannot have been written before the destruction of the Temple. The *Anti-Marcionite Prologue* and Jerome (*Comm. Matt.* 2) suggest that

---

<sup>530</sup> Other papyri of the same period are p<sup>4</sup>, p<sup>69</sup> and p<sup>75</sup>

<sup>531</sup> Cf. K. Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1976), xiv–xv. K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 96–102. See also Helmut Koester, *Ancient Gospels* (London: SCM, 1990), 332–33.

the Gospel was written in Achaia, in the fourth year of Nero's rule, but there is no reason to take these late assertions as evidence.<sup>532</sup> The only helpful method to fix the date of the Gospel is to study the reception history of Luke.<sup>533</sup>

#### 5.1.1.1 Marcion

The Marcionite debate is the earliest evidence of the existence of *at least* two versions of Luke: the canonical edition and the edition customarily attributed to Marcion called Evangelion. Could this point to Rome as the place where Marcion found the Evangelion and canonical Luke? This requires us to investigate where he probably encountered that text for the first time, and this should be tracked through reliable information.

First, what we know with confidence is that Marcion was from Sinope in Pontus (Tertullian, *Marc.* 1.1; Justin, 1 *Apol.* 25, 58; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.27; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 3.4.25; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 1.42.1). Epiphanius' suggestion that Marcion's father, who was the bishop of the city, excommunicated him after he seduced a virgin (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 1.42.1.4) is a fanciful story used to undermine the integrity of the heretics.<sup>534</sup> At the same time, the suggestion that a historical event could have been allegorised to mean Marcion's doctrinal error addressed against the church (the virgin) which led to his excommunication is speculative.<sup>535</sup> Historically, his move to Rome could be

---

<sup>532</sup> I agree with James R. Edwards about the hesitation of Jerome to locate Luke in Achaia in light of his silence to report this in his major work on Luke (*De viris illustribus*). In fact, Jerome relies on sources in stating that Acts was written by Luke in Rome (*Vir. ill.* 7). J. R. Edwards, *The Gospel according to Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 12.

<sup>533</sup> Cf. F. Bovon, "Studies in Luke-Acts: Retrospect and Prospect," *HTR* 85 (1992): 175–96. A. Bellinzoni, "The Gospel of Luke in the Second Century CE," in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts*, eds. R. Thompson and T. Philips (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998), 59–76. A. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period Before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 27–53. C. K. Rowe, "Literary Unity and Reception History," *JSNT* 29 (2007): 449–57.

<sup>534</sup> See, for example, a list of such heretics in Jerome's *Epist.* 133. See also J. Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 388.

<sup>535</sup> Harnack has no doubt in the excommunication of Marcion by his father, considering the story of seducing the virgin as a legend that meant to explain the reason for this excommunication, which is a heresy. While this could

for any reason, including his business as a ship-owner or someone who works in the business of sailing (Tertullian, *Marc.* 1.2.1; 18.4) which may have made him famous there. In short, we have no solid information about Marcion's life before his arrival in Rome other than his association with Pontus. Therefore, suggestions like Harnack's about Marcion's development of his ideas before his arrival in Rome cannot be assumed.<sup>536</sup>

Second, Marcion was active in Rome under Antonius Pius, and was excommunicated shortly after 144 CE (Tertullian, *Marc.* 1.19). This also concurs with the attested testimony that Marcion appeared after Cerdo's arrival in Rome under the Roman bishop Hyginus<sup>537</sup> (*Haer.* 1.27.1; *Pan.* 1.41.1).<sup>538</sup> This puts Marcion's arrival in Rome after 138 CE. This window of approximately seven years (138–144) is the formative episode of his mission.

Third, Marcion was admitted to a Roman orthodox church whose faith he embraced leading him to make a large donation to affirm his commitment to it (Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.4; *Praesc.* 30). Tertullian was ready to face the Marcionites with a letter written by Marcion himself in which the latter acknowledges the faith of the Catholic Church (*fidei catholicae ecclesiae*, *Marc.* 4.4.3). While Epiphanius does not give us a similar detailed account, he also shows knowledge of Marcion's admission to a church in Rome from which he later deflected, turning instead to the sect of Cerdo (*Pan.* 1.42.1.7). Marcion's conversion, then, took place not before a peaceful period Rome.

Fourth, almost all our sources report that Cerdo was the predecessor *and* instructor of Marcion on the same ideas that would later become known as Marcionism (Tertullian, *Marc.* 1.2; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 1.41-42; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.27.1-2; Cyprian of Carthage, *Ep.* 74.5; Hippolytus, *Haer.* 15; Philastrius, *De Haer.* 45). There is no single historical record suggesting otherwise. Some scholars, following Harnack, suggest that the figure of Cerdo was developed, or even invented, by heresiologists to

---

be true, it remains hypothetical. Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium Vom Fremden Gott* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1924), 23.

<sup>536</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 23-24.

<sup>537</sup> Hyginus died in the first year of Pius' rule in 139 (*Hist. eccl.* 4.15).

<sup>538</sup> Clement of Alexandria suggests that Marcion started earlier in Hadrian's time (*Strom.* 7.17.106) but this stands alone against other authorities which makes it dubious.

underestimate the originality and weight of Marcion or to connect him in line with a succession of heretics.<sup>539</sup> Such an intention could be true for a single source or even two, but it is impossible to think of it as the motive behind the most well-attested piece of information on Marcion (beside his Pontic origin).<sup>540</sup> Having said that, it is equally impossible to affirm the level of influence Cerdo had on Marcion.<sup>541</sup>

Fifth, Tertullian and Epiphanius show that Marcion's rift with the Roman church he first belonged to started from an exegetical disagreement on Lukan texts. This appears in a particular tradition that survives in both works, which is a dispute over the parable of the old and new wine in Luke 5:36-39 (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 1.42.2.1; Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.11.10-11). Before then, we have no evidence of a dispute that involved Marcion and the Third Gospel, or the Evangelion.<sup>542</sup>

From these five basic pieces of information we can deduce that Marcion developed his ideas in Rome either under Cerdo or shortly before joining his community, but not before his arrival in Rome. Regardless of the literary relationship between the Evangelion and Luke, the whole dispute started after the period of his stable reception in the Roman church where he accessed the Third Gospel which was being used as an authoritative text in the congregation. Therefore, we can confidently

---

<sup>539</sup> Cf. Harnack, *Marcion*, 28. Cf. Sebastian Moll, *Arch-heretic Marcion* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 42–43. David W. Deakle, “A Reexamination of the Patristic Evidence for Marcion's Mentor,” in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche wirkung*, eds. Gerhard May, Katharina Greschat and Martin Meiser (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 177–90.

<sup>540</sup> See the table provided by Sebastian Moll which shows the attestation of the major information about Marcion in three sources other than Tertullian. S. Moll, “Three against Tertullian: The Second Tradition about Marcion's Life,” *JTS* 59 (2008): 170.

<sup>541</sup> Harnack himself acknowledges the perplexity around the nature of Cerdo's relationship with Marcion. On the one hand, Marcion remained the founder of Marcionism in the memory of Christianity while Cerdo disappeared. On the other hand, Irenaeus' detailed record reflects, according to Harnack, an access to accurate reports in Rome itself (*Marcion: Das Evangelium von Fremden Gott*, Beilage 2, 32).

<sup>542</sup> What instilled him to debate these texts in such manner is hard to define. One possibility which I am inclined to accept is that Marcion may have received a Pauline Christian education in which the law and grace are clearly distinguished, and this may have been the reason behind his uneasiness with the preference of the old wine in Luke 5:39. This could have led him to be open to Cerdo's teachings at a later stage, but this remains as a possibility suggested by Blackman. Cf. E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and his Influence* (London: SPCK, 1948), 69.

conclude that Marcion's first encounter with the Gospel of Luke was in Rome and that the Gospel was already enjoying a prestigious position in the Roman congregation.

By the time Marcion was defending his theology and offering his canon of the Evangelion and the Apostolikon, Justin Martyr was already using a gospel harmony that included canonical Luke.<sup>543</sup> Justin knitted a Gospel harmony between Matthew and Luke which suggests an authoritative status of the canonical Luke he used. Whether his harmony was in response to Marcion,<sup>544</sup> who certainly did not appreciate Matthew, or not, the dispute over the gospels, or, as Justin calls them, the memoirs of the apostles “ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων! (1 *Apol.* 66.3), at this stage implies the esteem held for Luke in Rome.<sup>545</sup> This suggests a period of time long enough after Luke's composition for it to be included within an esteemed group of gospels that were harmonised and used by Justin. It is difficult to imagine that Marcion composed the Evangelion and that it was expanded and became authoritative enough to be harmonised with other texts within the few years separating the time of his heretical activities (ca. 144–145 CE)<sup>546</sup> and Justin's First Apology (ca. 153–157 CE).<sup>547</sup> Rather, we should suppose that there was an earlier chapter in the composition history of Luke-Acts.

---

<sup>543</sup> I accept the analysis of Koester (*Ancient Gospels*, 360–65), in line with A. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (Leiden: Brill, 1967). Supported further by A. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006). Gregory, “The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke–Acts,” *JSNT* 29 (2007): 459–72. See also, O. Piper, “The Nature of the Gospel According to Justin Martyr,” *Journal of Religion* 41 (1961): 155–68.

<sup>544</sup> Koester suggested this in *Ancient Gospels* (36–37) and this could be a good explanation for the character of Justin's harmony which employed Lukan and Matthean traditions in fulfilment of the Old Testament.

<sup>545</sup> Koester, *Ancient Gospels*, 334–35, 401–2.

<sup>546</sup> Tertullian calculated the beginning of Marcion's heretical activities slightly more than 115.5 years from the fifteenth year of the beginning of Jesus' ministry which Tertullian dates in the fifteenth year of Tiberius' rule (which would be 29 CE). This puts Marcion's ministry between 144 and 145 CE (*Marc.* 1.19), which also agrees with Tertullian's reference to Marcion's activity under Antonius Pious (*Marc.* 1.19). For a discussion of the major dates in Marcion's life and activity see Heikki Räisänen, “Marcion,” in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian*, eds. Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 100–24. Lieu, *Marcion*, 101–4.

<sup>547</sup> The date of Justin's apologies is based on his reference to his work to be 150 years after Jesus' birth under Quirinius rule in Syria (6–7 CE, 1 *Apol.* 46.1). This date agrees with his reference to Felix's recent rule as a prefect of Alexandria between 148–53 CE (1 *Apol.* 29.2–4) and his reference to Lucius whose quaestorship was

In order for this hypothesis to be accepted, it is necessary to find an explanation for an expansion of Luke. Streeter has already plausibly proposed two editions, with the second adding the infancy narratives (Luke 1–2). This would account for Marcion-displeasing<sup>548</sup> elements in the text.

This has two implications for us. First, the usage should push the date of the composition back at least a generation earlier since the notion that both Matthew and Luke were connected with an apostle indicates that they were not composed recently. Second, it also supports locating the composition of the Gospel of Luke in Rome since it is first evidenced there in the writings of Marcion and Justin. This is supported in light of the fact that we have no evidence of its use outside Rome before Irenaeus around 180 CE (*Haer.* 2.27.2), while it was already elevated to an authoritative level *at least* since Marcion's time. According to Clement of Alexandria, Heracleon wrote the first commentary on it while he was a student of Valentinus, whose school was in Rome, and the most elaborate work on Luke in the second century comes from Tertullian who was Justin's student in Rome as well. Meanwhile, the impact of Luke outside of Rome started to appear towards the end of the second century.<sup>549</sup> These observations lead us to suggest that the Gospel of Luke was composed and developed around (probably after) the turn of the first century in Rome. Validating this hypothesis hinges on answering the final question: does the Gospel fit in this date and provenance? This brings us back to 1 Clement as a Roman work that belongs to the same period.

#### **5.1.1.2 1 Clement**

---

in 153 CE. This also agrees with the historical context of the apologists. Therefore, it is safe to give the date between 153–157 CE. See Harnack, *Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* vol. 1. (Leipzig: Hinrich, 1904), 277. Robert Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1988), 52–3. Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, eds., *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 44.

<sup>548</sup> I formed this term as an analogy of “Luke-displeasing” which signifies the materials Luke supposedly found “displeasing” in Matthew, assuming that Luke knew it. See M. Goodacre, *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze* (London: Black, 2004), 157. So, the Marcion-displeasing materials are the ones that reflect ideas Marcion rejects.

<sup>549</sup> For Clement of Alexandria's use of Luke see Carl P. Cosaert, *The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 146–83.

While it is unlikely that Luke-Acts and 1 Clement have a direct literary relationship, the large scale of the affinities between them is remarkable. If we examine the seven maxims of 1 Clem. 13.2, it is worth noting that they reflect knowledge of a sayings source close to the Lukan edition of the sermon on the plain (Luke 6:17–49). Clement shares two of the maxims with Luke only<sup>550</sup> while he has a closer form with the Lukan reading of other two.<sup>551</sup> Undoubtedly the complexity of the wording and the well organised form of the sayings in Clement does not necessarily indicate dependence on Luke, but it may be understood that they share the same milieu. This conclusion is furthered by the fact that the second key section with synoptic parallels (1 Clem. 46.7-8) is also very Lukan.<sup>552</sup> Clement uses key terms that feature prominently in Luke, such as ἐκλεκτῶν and ἐπισκοπῇ (1 Clem. 50.3). Particularly in Acts, we can see a considerable number of terms peculiar to the author that appear in 1 Clement; some appear only in 1 Clement while others appear prominently in 1 Clement and with the same meaning. Richard Pervo’s attempt to date Acts through investigating its possible reception in the Apostolic Fathers includes a helpful analysis of these key terms.<sup>553</sup> While he did not reach a firm

---

<sup>550</sup> 1 Clem. 13.2d (ὡς δίδετε, οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν) // Luke 6:38a. (δίδετε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν); 1 Clem.13:2f (ὡς χρηστεύεσθε, οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν) // Luke 6:35c (ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηρούς). Donald Hagner already observes that the closer form and meaning of 1 Clem. 13:2a (Ἐλεῖτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε) with Luke 6:36 (γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρων ἐστίν) makes sense since both qualities χρηστός and οἰκτιρός (underlined above) were intertwined in the Roman tradition as witnessed to in Justin, 1 Apo. 15.13 and *Dial.* 96.3 (Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 139).

<sup>551</sup> 1 Clem. 2b // Luke 6:37c while both Mark 11:25b and Matt 6:14 are too far from it. 1 Clem. 2 // Matt 7:1//Luke 6:37.

<sup>552</sup> 1 Clem. 46.7-8//Matt 26:24; 18:6//Mark 14:21; 9:42//Luke 22:22; 17:2. A striking parallel could be found between Luke 17:2 and 1 Clem. 46.8 if the latter has the reading of A and H (ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίση τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἓνα) instead of ἢ ἓνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου διαστρέψαι. Of course, it might be suggested that such a reading is a harmonisation with Luke. But both Koester (*Synoptische Überlieferung*, 17 n.1) and Massaux (*Influence*, 27) observed that διαστρέψαι must have been used to fit the meaning. This could also suggest Clement’s replacing of μικρῶν with ἐκλεκτῶν which appears five times in the same section. Yet, this remains only as a possibility (cf. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 154).

<sup>553</sup> Richard Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*, (Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 2006), 201ff. 1 Clement features prominently, if not exclusively, in sharing with Acts these key terms such as a) ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί (fourteen times in Acts and four times in 1 Clement); ἐλεύσεως which appears in the meaning of Jesus’ first coming only in Acts 7:52 and 1 Clem. 17:1 and Pol. *Phil.* 6.3; ζῆλος which Pervo comments on by

conclusion on the matter, he has observed that “if Acts had appeared fifteen to twenty years earlier than 1 Clement, it would have been well ahead of its time in more ways than credibility can reasonably tolerate.”<sup>554</sup> On the level of textual references, both also share a considerable number of common Septuagint texts<sup>555</sup> and in some cases they show the same tendency to merge two prophecies together, agreeing in variations against the Septuagint (1 Clem. 18.1//Acts 13:22 [Ps. 88(89):21; 1Sam 13:14]).<sup>556</sup> One of the clear common verses is a saying of Jesus in 1 Clem. 2.1 (ἡδίων διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες) which appears only in Acts 20:35. In terms of historical information, 1 Clement’s fifth chapter is arranged in a way that seems analogous to Acts. The chapter is divided into two parts concerning the persecution of Peter and Paul, respectively, and both are introduced as two cases of persecution due to envy (ζῆλον). This is curious since this word was used by Luke only twice and for the same cases: the persecution of Peter and Paul, as Hagner rightly observes (Acts 5:17; 13:45 on Peter and Paul, respectively).<sup>557</sup> 1 Clem. 5.1-7 corresponds to Peter’s “not one or two but many (πλείονας)” times of persecution with details that suggest, as Morton Smith says, that this chapter is an exegesis on Peter’s account in Acts.<sup>558</sup> However, Smith also observes that the account of Paul in the same chapter suggests Clement’s use of information outside of Acts.

I would add to this two more meeting points. First, Clement suggests that the same jealousy (ζῆλον) behind the persecution of Peter is also behind the persecution and death of Paul (1 Clem. 5.5-6). The context indicates jealousy as the attitude of the Jewish leaders. But they were not actually the

---

saying, “It is noteworthy that Acts and 1 Clement take a similar approach to jealousy in their models, methods and techniques” (270).

<sup>554</sup> Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 292.

<sup>555</sup> Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 263.

<sup>556</sup> Both have the same alterations of the prophetic texts in a way that seems “conspicuous enough to assert the probability of Clement’s knowledge of Acts” (Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 263). I would not depend on this single text to make such a conclusion but I would agree with Carlyle’s hypothesis that both rely on the same written source (in Oxford Committee (ed.), *New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, 49). For more common terms and parallels see Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 256–63.

<sup>557</sup> Cf. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 257.

<sup>558</sup> M. Smith, “The Report About Peter in I Clement V. 4,” *NTS* 7 (1960): 86–88. See also W. Smaltz, “Did Peter Die in Jerusalem?,” *JBL* 71 (1952): 211–16. See also H. Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom* (Bonn: Marcus und Weber, 1915).

instigators of Paul's execution under Nero according to Acts.<sup>559</sup> This word should therefore be understood as falling within the same tradition that formed Acts (if not Acts itself) which pits Paul against the influential Jewish leaders of Jerusalem all the way through to Rome. Secondly, as we saw in 1 Clem. 47, Clement apparently puts Apollos on a lower level than Paul (who approved of him), which is something that can only be found with the account in Acts, not 1 Corinthians.<sup>560</sup>

In terms of theology, both uniquely share the same expression (or *apologia*) of a Christianity that fulfils the divine promises, not to supersede Judaism,<sup>561</sup> as well as several other fundamental issues such as ecclesiology and eschatology, as we shall see.<sup>562</sup> Given that Hans Conzelmann regretted that J. O'Neill did not elaborate any further on his observation of a possible connection between the two works,<sup>563</sup> we will take up this challenge, after studying the role of the Temple in Luke's double work.

In conclusion, based on the reception history of Luke in the second century, and the literary and theological standing of the work in Roman literature (Justin and 1 Clement), it is safe to conclude that Luke-Acts was probably composed and developed between the last decade of the first century and the first decade of the second century in Rome.

### 5.1.2 Sources

The two-source hypothesis appears to provide the best explanation for determining the sources of Luke's composition. However, it may well be that there are earlier readings of the Gospel found in the Evangelion. This is not to say that Marcion wrote this earlier version. In terms of the *Sondergut* (L)

---

<sup>559</sup> On the death of Paul see Dionysius *Fragments* 3; Ignatius, *Eph.* 12; Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 5; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.25.5; Cf. H. Chadwick, "St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome," *JTS* (1957): 31–52.

<sup>560</sup> Cf. M. Monier, review of *Early Christian Communities between Ideal and Reality*, edited by Mark Grundeken and Joseph Verheyden, *JTS* (2017): 343–45.

<sup>561</sup> Cf. Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 20ff. See above for Clement's view of Israel.

<sup>562</sup> See also Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 201ff. He observes that the cosmology of Acts and 1 Clement make him think that they belong "to the same theological milieu" (255).

<sup>563</sup> J. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts* (London: SPCK, 1970), 7; H. Conzelmann, "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity," in *Studies in Luke Acts*, eds. L. Keck, and J. Martyn (New York: Abingdon, 1966), 298ff.

source, I agree with Francois Bovon's careful position which accepts the existence of a continuous source that could interpret Luke's attitude in switching between blocks from different sources according to his theological programme, especially in the eschatological discourse and the passion narrative.<sup>564</sup> This is important to determine because if we are to define a Temple attitude in Luke-Acts, beginning with the Gospel, we need to ensure that we know where the material comes from, since editorial choices can be determined more accurately by understanding the perspective of the original text. In the following examination, I will focus on the nature of the Temple theme in Mark, Q and L (*Sondergut*) as three distinct sources and consider the editorial shaping in regard to the former, and the perspective in regard to the latter.

---

<sup>564</sup> Bovon identified that the L source is "un texte continu" with "le genre «évangile» et le rapprocherai donc de Marc." Furthermore, L is "D'un niveau littéraire supérieur, il sertait à Luc ce qu'a été Marc à Matthieu." F. Bovon, "Le récit Lucanien de la Passion," in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, ed. C. Focant (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 420. Bovon surveyed the external attestation of special Lukan materials in apocryphal and patristic texts that did not necessarily know the Gospel of Luke and concludes that *at least* a Jewish Christian Gospel (of the Nazarenes) must have known this source ("Le récit," 419–20). On the passion narrative in particular, his position "resemble un peu à celle de V. Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St. Luke*" (410). Decades earlier, Pierson Parker showed that at least three quarters of Hebrews comes from Q+L beside clear theological divergence from Matthew and Mark. Parker concluded that the Gospel accessed a document quite similar, if not identical, to Streeter's Proto-Luke. See P. Parker, "A Proto-Lukan Basis for the Gospel According to the Hebrews," *JBL* 59.4 (1940): 471–78. On the possible Jewish-Christian nature of Proto-Luke see H. Sahlin, *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk: Studien zur protolukanischen Theologie* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells boktryckeri, 1945). Of course, this conclusion requires a detailed assessment but this is beyond the scope of this work. On the Gospel's precanonical sources see the full analysis of A. Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 36ff. Two studies from Kim Paffenroth and, most recently, Helga Krammer, provide what was lacking in earlier research: an examination of the theological coherence behind a limited number of texts, carefully selected on the basis of linguistic and literary connections. Both independently showed that T. W. Manson's "Gospel of the outcast" could indeed be the correct description for the continuous source behind the *Sondergut* units they studied. K. Paffenroth, *The Story of Jesus according to L* (London: Black, 1997), 147; H. Krammer, ed., *Lukas als Ordner des frühchristlichen Diskurses um "Armut und Reichtum" und den "Umgang mit materiellen Gütern"* (Tübingen: Francke, 2015).

### 5.1.3 Scholarship on Luke and the Temple

Jerusalem and the Temple feature prominently throughout the double work of Luke-Acts more than in any other Gospel. Through the author's focus on the city and the Temple, he defines Christianity and its position in salvation history. However, as reviewed in Chapter 1 of the present work, there are diverse scholarly opinions in regard to the Temple attitude within Luke-Acts.

Since Conzelmann's *Die Mitte der Zeit*,<sup>565</sup> scholars have focused on the theology of Luke-Acts in its final shape and the role of the Temple in the salvation history narrative that starts in Jerusalem and concludes in Rome. This has resulted in a multitude of conclusions. The fundamental question is: did Luke abandon allegiance to the Temple on the road towards a universal Gospel proclaimed in the capital of the Empire?<sup>566</sup> Van der Waal, for example, suggested one should not search for a special theology for Luke (in conflict with other New Testament theologies) since it also "replaces Israel who would not listen, by the faithful form of the Gentiles."<sup>567</sup> In the same vein, other scholars have applied sociological methods to highlight an increasing rift between the Christians and the Jews in Luke's language, which should reflect a negative view of the Temple in contrast with superseding Christian households.<sup>568</sup> On the other hand, some later scholars have focused on alternative approaches that lead

---

<sup>565</sup> H. Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1954) ET from Geoffrey Buswell, *The Theology of St. Luke* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1961).

<sup>566</sup> This is the classic view of Conzelmann, *Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*, 75.

<sup>567</sup> C. Van der Waal, "The Temple in the Gospel According to Luke," *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973): 56. He took the argument from terminology to provide an understanding of supersessionism in which the Temple is no longer a ναός but merely an ἱερόν just as any gentile one. The terms appear together 45 times in Luke-Acts: ναός (6) and ἱερόν (39). See P. Head, "The Temple in Luke's Gospel," in *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*, eds. T. Desmond Alexander and S. Gathercole (London: Paternoster, 2004). Cautiously, N. H. Taylor, "The Jerusalem Temple in Luke Acts," *HTS Teologiese Studies* 60 (2004): 459–85. J. H. Elliot, "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions," *HTS* 47 (1991): 88–120. However, the location and usage of the terms do not suggest what van der Waal implied. Conzelmann therefore rejects it: "er (Lukas) unterscheidet nicht zwischen den verschiedenen Vorhöfen, sondern sieht das ἱερόν als einheitlichen Bezirk, zu dem nur die Juden Zugang haben." H. Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1963), 23.

<sup>568</sup> Elliot, "The Temple versus Household," 90. Elliot's work did not take any literary critical method into consideration, relying heavily on cultural anthropology and particularly Bruce Malina's *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1986). Therefore, I do not find it convincing. In response: A. G.

to a more positive view of the Temple in Lukan eschatology.<sup>569</sup> Bradley Chance's dissertation<sup>570</sup> has set a strong case for Luke's view of a literal restoration of the Temple as part of the eschatological hope of Jesus and his movement in criticism of those who have overstretched Conzelmann's *Heilsgeschichte* model in order to de-eschatologise Luke-Acts.<sup>571</sup> Between the first and the second positions, the third position scholars take is to assume the perspective indicates ambiguity. Joseph B. Tyson acknowledges the difficulties faced by scholars in defining Luke's attitude.<sup>572</sup> In the footsteps of Conzelmann and William Robinson, he acknowledges the widely agreed opinion about the centrality of the Temple in the Gospel of Luke.<sup>573</sup> However, the Temple sometimes appears as the place of peace and at other times conflict. This creates ambivalence<sup>574</sup> or, in the words of Nicholas Perrin, "a deeply paradoxical" image.<sup>575</sup>

---

Van Aarde, "The Most High Does Live in Houses, but not Houses Built by Men," *Neotestamentica* 25 (1991): 51–64. This approach was faithfully followed by M. C. McKeever ("Sacred Space and Discursive Field: The Narrative Function of the Temple in Luke-Acts" [PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 1999]), who also projected a social map from industrial Europe on Luke based on R. Wuthnow, *Communities of Discourse* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989). See also Young-San Jung, "From Temple to House-Church in Luke Acts" (PhD diss., University of St. Andrews, 2000).

<sup>569</sup> Cf. F. D. Weinert, "The Meaning of the Temple in the Gospel of Luke" (PhD diss., Fordham University, 1979); F. D. Weinert, "The Meaning of the Temple in Luke-Acts," *Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 11 (1981): 85–89; F. D. Weinert, "Luke, Stephen, and the temple in Luke-Acts," *Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 17 (1987): 88–90. M. Bachmann, *Jerusalem und der Tempel: die geographisch-theologischen Elemente in der lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980).

<sup>570</sup> J. B. Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple and the New Age* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988). See also C. K. Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006); J. W. Jipp, *Divine Visitations and Hospitality to Strangers in Luke-Acts* (Leiden: Brill, 2013). Both Rowe and Jipp paved the way for Lanier's paper: G. Lanier, "Luke's Distinctive Use of the Temple: Portraying the Divine Visitation," *JTS* 65 (2014): 433–62.

<sup>571</sup> Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 141.

<sup>572</sup> J. B. Tyson, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 1986).

<sup>573</sup> Tyson, *The Death of Jesus*, 87–89.

<sup>574</sup> Tyson, *The Death of Jesus*, 107–53.

<sup>575</sup> Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*, 61. The same position is taken by J. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 131.

The diverse opinions reflect diverse methods and approaches that have varied between theological and sociological. In the following, we will undertake a historical and literary analysis of Luke-Acts, considered against its sources and its context. This deployment of the historical-critical method is designed to expose a clearer view of the author's attitude to the Temple. Consequently, as has been done with Barnabas and 1 Clement, we will analyse Luke's attitude using the previously mentioned parameters: critical analysis, regional context and a dating in the apostolic period.

## **5.2 The Infancy Narratives (Luke 1–2)**

### **5.2.1 The Announcement to Zecharias (Luke 1:5-25)**

Luke starts his double work by using a story about the revelation of Gabriel to Zecharias inside the Temple. It tells of the announcement of John the Baptist's birth in the form of a traditional story found in several places in the Old Testament.<sup>576</sup> Taken in its own right, the image of John here differs significantly since he is not a forerunner of another Messiah but of the final eschatological figure preparing his people for the coming Lord. Luke 1:17 bears a clear allusion to Mal 3:1 in which the messenger is preparing the way for the Lord who is coming to his Temple. By positioning this scene before the announcement of Jesus' birth, Luke christologises the coming of the Lord and John becomes Jesus' forerunner.<sup>577</sup>

The coming of the Lord is announced in the Temple. Allen Brent rightly observes that the role of the messenger who comes in the spirit of Elijah in Mal 3:2-4 and 4:5 lacks the image of apocalyptic terror.<sup>578</sup> For Luke, the dawn of the new age does not come with apocalyptic violence in the mission of John the Baptist and it will also disappear from Jesus' mission too. We have already seen both

---

<sup>576</sup> Alongside other stories of the exceptional circumstances of divine providence in the birth of notable figures such as Moses (Exod 2:1-10), Jacob (Gen 25:20-5), and Leah's conception by opening her womb (Gen 29:31). See the births of Isaac (Gen 18:1-14; 21:1-7) and Samuel (1 Sam 1:1-20) in particular. See also Philo (*Cherub* 45-47) and the birth of Mary in the *Protoevangelium of James* 1.

<sup>577</sup> Fitzmyer observes the parallelism between the stories of John and Jesus for the sake of one-upmanship (*Luke*, vol.1, 315)

<sup>578</sup> See A. Brent, *Imperial Cult*, 100f. See also R. Brown, *Birth*, 277–78; B. Kinman, "Luke's Exoneration of John the Baptist," *JTS* 44 (1993): 595–98.

mutations of Mal 3:1-4 (christologising and removing apocalyptic violence) in 1 Clement. Luke has probably edited a pre-existing story, as his key terms and expressions can be found throughout.<sup>579</sup> First, we observe his emphasis on the cultic piety of Zecharias and Elisabeth by adding (to what has already been said about their righteousness and blamelessness) that they fulfil all the ordinances “δικαιώμασιν”. Luke also adds his characteristic term κατὰ τὸ ἔθος<sup>580</sup> to emphasize Zecharias’ commitment to following ancient customs. The angel’s key statement in 1:19 is redacted to include the important verb εὐαγγελίσασθαι in its middle voice, which he will use frequently later.<sup>581</sup> Thus, he defines the beginning of the Gospel in the Temple scene, with good news announced by the lips of Gabriel in the heart of Israel’s Temple, not in the Jordan River outside Jerusalem.<sup>582</sup> The Temple thus functions as the womb of the good news and assures the reader of the continuance of the same Israelite salvation history.<sup>583</sup>

---

<sup>579</sup> Ἐγένετο (1:5, 8, 23); ἱερεὺς τις (1:5); ἔναντι (1:8); ὥφθη (1:11); πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος ἦν τοῦ λαοῦ (1:10); εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς (1:13) etc. Cf. Joachim Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 15ff. See also W. Radl, *Der Ursprung Jesu* (Wien: Herder, 1996), 134ff. On the possible nature of the source see Bovon, “Stark Lukanisch geprägt,” in F. Bovon *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, vol.1 (Zürich: Benziger, 1996), 59; M. Boismard, *L’Évangile de l’enfance (Luc 1 - 2) selon le proto-Luc*, Études bibliques 35 (Paris: Gabalda, 1997).

<sup>580</sup> It appears twelve times in the New Testament, including ten times in Luke-Acts. The expression κατὰ τὸ ἔθος appears only in Luke-Acts (1:9; 2:42; 22:39). Cf. Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*, 29.

<sup>581</sup> It appears only in Luke-Acts (23 times). Jeremias correctly observes that “3 hinzufügungen zur Markus Vorlage (Luke 4:43 diff. Mark 1:38; Luke 9:6 diff. Mark 6:13 und Luke 20:1 diff. Mark 11:27) die vorliebe der dritten Evangelisten für der mediale εὐαγγελίσασθαι” (39). See also Adelbert Denaux, Hellen Mardaga, and R. Corstjens, eds., *The Vocabulary of Luke* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 255–56.

<sup>582</sup> This repositioning of the “evangelion” was probably at the heart of Marcion’s agitation when he encountered Luke in its final form.

<sup>583</sup> Consequently, scholars saw the continuum of Judaism and Christianity in Luke. See Gerhard Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas: Kapitel 1 – 10* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1992), 46; Walter Schmithals, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Zürich: TVZ, 1980), 24. Bovon rules out the possibility of the Essenes being behind the pre-Lukan source due to its positive language regarding the Temple and priesthood (“*Lukas Bd.1*,” 50, 61). Also, Brown, *Birth*, 267–68.

The deliberate inclusion of Augustus' name in the narrative<sup>584</sup> and the angelic announcement to the shepherds, is intended to evoke Augustus in the mind of the reader.<sup>585</sup> These references should also draw our attention to the context his Temple piety is read within.<sup>586</sup> Jesus' divine sonship is by virtue of his birth, not his baptism.<sup>587</sup> For a Roman audience, it may well have brought to mind the traditions surrounding Augustus' birth.<sup>588</sup> According to Suetonius: "When Attia had come in the middle of the night to the solemn service of Apollo, she had her litter set down *in the temple* and fell asleep [...] On a sudden a serpent glided up to her and shortly went away. When she awoke, she purified herself, as if after the embraces of her husband [...] In the tenth month after that Augustus was born *and was therefore regarded as the son of Apollo*" (Aug. 94.4).<sup>589</sup> Based on this story, Jesus becomes an alternative son of the divine, bringing an alternative peace. 1 Clement already makes the connection between the Pax Romana and Christian eschatology.

---

<sup>584</sup> Luke 2:1. The lack of evidence on such a universal census strongly suggests Luke's intention to include Augustus' name for a reason other than historical accuracy.

<sup>585</sup> Luke 2:8-14. The angel announces the Evangelion (εὐαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν) of the birth of the σωτήρ, κύριος (and the υἱὸς θεοῦ in 1:34) who brings εἰρήνη for the οἰκουμένην (2:1). The latter is clearly defined by Luke as the Roman Empire (Acts 11:28). These have striking parallels with the imperial cult. See particularly the Priene inscription as published in W. Dittenberger, *Orientis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae, Supplementum Sylloges inscriptionum graecarum*, vol. 2 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1905), 48–60. Cf. F. Bovon, *Luke*, vol. 1, Hermeneia Series (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002), 83; Josef Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1977), 109–111. Gerhard Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, vol.1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn, 1992), 65f; John Martin Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1953), 35–36. Cf. K. Wengst, *Pax Romana and the Peace of Jesus Christ* (London: SCM, 1987), 103ff.

<sup>586</sup> See the section of historical relevance from p. 254 below.

<sup>587</sup> Brent, *Imperial Cult*, 96–97 shows that not every exegesis on the same scripture leads to such a striking similarity with the imperial cult. Luke's divine sonship differs significantly from Matthew's which is not by the virtue of miraculous birth. See J. Nolland, "No Son-of-God Christology in Matthew 1.18-25," *JSNT* 62 (1996): 3–12.

<sup>588</sup> Several scholars went to suggest Egypt legends (Plutarch, *De Is. et Osir.* 12). For instance, Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, 30–31; Bovon (*Luke* 1, 46) reluctantly. Both rely on H. Gressmann, *Das Weihnachtsevangelium auf Ursprung und Geschichte Untersucht* (Göttingen: Griffith, 1914).

<sup>589</sup> See also Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 45.1.2 "ὅτι ἡ Ἀττία δεινῶς ἰσχυρίζετο ἐκ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος αὐτὸν κεκυηέναι".

Another important aspect is the common expressions between this section of Luke and the final section of 1 Clement. In his study of any possible evidence of Clement's knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels, Hagner correctly avoids suggested allusions to the Synoptic Gospels that are solely based on one or two words from a concordance: "Only in one instance does the occurrence of isolated words or pairs of words seem to be of significance. Because of the number of these that Clement has in common with the Lucan narrative of the nativity it may well be correct to allow that Clement was familiar with and employed that narrative in the composition of this letter."<sup>590</sup> Then he enlists the cases that support his suggestion. The best assessed cases "in similarity and tone" are found between chapters 57-63 and the nativity of Luke: 1 Clem. 59.3 and with Luke 1:52-3 (Mary's Magnificat), 1 Clem. 60.3 with Luke 1:71 (Zechariah's hymn) and 1 Clem. 61.3 with Luke 1:72.<sup>591</sup> Perhaps the rich use of Septuagintal references could be an explanation for this<sup>592</sup> but it is surely not just "fortuitous"<sup>593</sup> to have all these common features and terms. Going beyond common terms into the concepts, we observe that what they share is more than terms. This could be illustrated further in the following table:

|                                                      | Zechariah (Luke)   | Mary (Luke)  | Simeon (Luke) | 1 Clement        |
|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|
| The God of Israel is praised for his final salvation | Luke 1:68b, 71, 77 | Luke 1:54-55 | Luke 2:30     | 1 Clem. 60.3     |
| which launches the dawn of a new age of peace        | Luke 1:78,9        |              | Luke 2:29     | 1 Clem. 60.4; 61 |

<sup>590</sup> Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 169

<sup>591</sup> Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 169-70

<sup>592</sup> Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 20

<sup>593</sup> As Hagner suggests in some cases, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 169.

|                                                                  |           |                                 |              |                              |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------------------------|
| social justice                                                   |           | Luke 1:51                       |              | 1 Clem. 59.3                 |
| and the Messianic reign                                          | Luke 1:69 | Gabriel to Mary<br>Luke 1:34-35 | Luke 2:29-32 | 1 Clem. 20.11;<br>59.3, 60.3 |
| This view is not an<br>innovation: but is rooted<br>in antiquity | Luke 1:70 | Luke 1:55                       |              | 1 Clem. 23.3,<br>30.7, 60.4  |

The elements of this eschatology that appear in the previous table are associated with the coming of the Lord. The term “visitation” (ἐπισκοπή), which first appears in Zechariah’s hymn, is Lukan.<sup>594</sup> The nature of this visitation could be interpreted as bringing judgement or salvation, depending on the addressee. In Luke, however, this visitation is announced as bringing λύτρωσιν (1:68), redemption, mercy ἔλεος (1:72), and peace εἰρήνην (1:79).<sup>595</sup> This agrees with Luke’s interest to turn the prophecy of the coming of the Lord into good news. The term ἐπισκοπή appears later and is the vehicle for christologising Mal 3:1 in the journey of Jesus to the Temple (Luke 7:16). The term ἐπισκοπή also appears in 1 Clement (50.3) in the same sense as in Luke, and against the apocalyptic sense of 1 Pet 2:12. In 1 Clement, it bears the same concept of the visitation that we see in Luke (as we saw, amending the concept of visitation in Mal 3:1-3); that of God through Jesus (christologised) which brings peace, not apocalyptic judgement as in 1 Peter, and which ends in the Temple. This is what makes Knoch reluctant to connect 1 Clem. 50.3 with 1 Pet 2:12.<sup>596</sup>

<sup>594</sup> In relation to divine visitation, the term appears thirteen times in the New Testament, twelve in Luke-Acts, once in 1 Pet 2:12 (it also appears in 1 Tim 3:1 but in relation to a bishop).

<sup>595</sup> It is confirmed by Jesus himself in Luke 19:42.

<sup>596</sup> Knoch, *Eigenart und Bedeutung*, 175–77.

Finally, we can see that the themes of an eschatology that resonates with imperial ideology can be found in 1 Clement and Luke, as shown in the table. The ideas of the Augustan eschatology are shared between the two texts. This further supports the plausibility of seeing the Lukan intention to bring this ideology, which is made explicit in 1 Clement's final doxology. This is important because it highlights the context in which the Temple features prominently.

### 5.2.2 *The Presentation in the Temple (Luke 2:21-38)*

The motif of underscoring Christianity's allegiance to ancient customs of Judaism continues in the Gospel with the story of the presentation of Jesus in the Temple for circumcision.<sup>597</sup> In this section, Luke continues to employ references to ancient tradition to justify the actions in the narrative, for example, κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως (2:22),<sup>598</sup> possibly τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου (2:23, 24, 39),<sup>599</sup> and the traditional κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου (2:27). The meeting of Simeon and the child in the Temple was not coincidental, but it was divinely arranged “καὶ ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν” (2:27). A theme of personal piety appears through vv. 22-24 as well. Jesus' circumcision and the announcement of the details of his ministry in Simeon's canticle provides a link with the end of the Gospel in containing a clear reference to Jesus' passion: “This child is destined for the falling and the rising of many in Israel, and to be a sign that will be opposed, so that the inner thoughts of many will be revealed—and a sword will pierce your own soul too” (2:34-35). This is also implied by the boy's reception by Anna the prophet in the Temple. This scene recapitulates the identity and mission of Jesus in a revelatory moment in the Temple.

---

<sup>597</sup> The pericope is close to 1 Sam 1:22-24 and it appears to be a pre-Lukan Jewish story. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 422.

<sup>598</sup> This appears in the New Testament only in Luke 2:22; 24:44; Acts 15:5; 28:23; John 7:23 (perhaps behind Heb 9:19 τὸν νόμον ὑπὸ Μωϋσέως).

<sup>599</sup> This appears only once outside of Luke (Rom 7:25). Jeremias suggests it is part of the source, not a redaction, since it does not appear anywhere else outside the infancy narrative (*Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*, 90). In both cases it serves Luke's frequent allusions to the ancient customs perfectly.

### 5.2.3 The Boy Jesus in the Temple (Luke 2:41-52)

The theme of piety continues through the third Temple scene. Jesus' family goes "every year" to the Temple for the Passover feast, again "κατὰ τὸ ἔθος" (2:42). Indeed, Fitzmyer observes the emphasis on the piety and respect of ancient customs here, with the Temple as the location for this scene,<sup>600</sup> while W. Radl goes further to suggest that the choice of the Temple as the location could be a Lukan redaction of his source to give the sense of Temple piety (*Tempel-frömmigkeit*) to Jesus' family.<sup>601</sup>

Most exegetes have focused on Jesus' answer from a Christological perspective: the scene clearly outlines Jesus' relationship with the Father.<sup>602</sup> This is certainly true but it is part of the larger concept Luke delivers: Jesus claims authority over the Temple. Finding Jesus in the Temple after three days indicates that he comfortably resides there in his Father's house. He also debates with "the teachers (τῶν διδασκάλων)", which will later be replicated in his activity in the Temple in 19:47–21:38.<sup>603</sup> At this point, Jesus remains in the Temple "everyday teaching" and debating, and likewise his divine sonship is noted (20:1-8). At 2:50, Jesus' answer to Mary's question<sup>604</sup> explains not only his stay in

---

<sup>600</sup> Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 438.

<sup>601</sup> *Ursprung*, 261; Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, vol. 1 (Freiburg: Herder, 1969), 30; Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, 37; D. Rusam, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 86. Cf. Boismard's construction could suggest that as well, in his *L'Évangile de l'enfance*.

<sup>602</sup> Cf. I. Howard Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*, New International Greek Testament Commentary 3 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 129; John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, World Biblical Commentary (Dallas, TX: Word, 1989), 132; Radl, *Ursprung*, 256–57. I agree with Bovon's remark that "die Anekdote hatte die Funktion, die bescheidene menschliche Herkunft Jesu durch seine Beziehung zum himmlischen Vater apologetisch zu entschärfen" (*Lukas* 1, 154).

<sup>603</sup> See below p. 223, 232.

<sup>604</sup> Τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναί με (2:49). The translation is difficult since it is not clear whether τοῖς refers to the Father's affairs or the people. See Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 444; P. J. Temple, "What is to be Understood by *en tois*, Luke 2:49?," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 17 (1922): 248–63.

the Temple as a boy but also explains why the whole narrative of the Gospel leans towards the Temple: when Jesus comes to Jerusalem he is within the Temple from his arrival up until his arrest.<sup>605</sup>

In search for similar stories, scholars have suggested examples from the Greco-Roman world, as well as Philo's account of Moses' childhood and Josephus' own story, even as far as Buddha.<sup>606</sup> These stories focus on the hero's surprising knowledge and rhetorical ability in his childhood. However, taking into consideration the geographical and historical context, Bradley Billings correctly suggests that we should look into Augustus' life.<sup>607</sup> Billings brings our attention to the series of extraordinary occurrences in the childhood of Augustus, as found in Suetonius and his contemporary writer Nikolaos of Damascus who attested to his outstanding oratorical skills in the age of 9.<sup>608</sup> While Billings focuses on the Christological aspect of the story which, as he justifiably suggests, resonates with the Augustan stories that prove his divine sonship,<sup>609</sup> another aspect associated with this matter should be observed. If Luke's story hinges on the Temple and revealing the identity of Son of God at the same time, then the similar story from Augustus' life would be more relevant for its temple piety. Suetonius writes:

After Quintus Catulus had dedicated the Capitol, he had dreams on two nights in succession: first, that Jupiter Optimus Maximus called aside a number of boys of good family, who were playing around his altar, and put in the fold of his toga an image of Roma, which he was carrying in his hand; the next night he dreamt that he saw this same boy in the lap of Jupiter of the Capitol, and that when he had ordered that he be removed, the god warned him to desist, declaring that the boy was being reared to be the saviour of his country. When Catulus next day met Augustus, whom he had never seen before, he

---

<sup>605</sup> Both Bovon (*Luke 1*, 98) and Brown (*Birth*, 455–56, 569) are correct in seeing Mal 3:1 behind the scene which is also behind Jesus' final journey to the Temple.

<sup>606</sup> For example, Alexander (Plutarch, *Alex.* 5), Apollonius (Philostratus, *VitaApoll.* i. 7), Philo, *Vita Mos.* 1, Josephus, *Vita* 2. See the suggestions of Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, 44–45. Radl, *Ursprung*, 257. On its biographical form see Bovon, *Lukas 1*, 154.

<sup>607</sup> Bradley S. Billings, "'At the Age of 12': The Boy Jesus in the Temple (Luke 2:41-52), The Emperor Augustus, and the Social Setting of the Third Gospel," *JTS* 60.1 (2009): 70-89.

<sup>608</sup> Suetonius, *Aug.* 8, 94. Nikolaos of Damascus, *Life of Caesar Augustus* 3.3-5. Complete text available in Mark Toher (ed., tr.), *Nicolaus of Damascus: The life of Augustus and the Autobiography* (Cambridge: CUP, 2016).

<sup>609</sup> See particularly his table in Billings, "At the age of 12," 86-7.

looked at him in great surprise and said that he was very like the boy of whom he had dreamed. (*Aug.* 94.8)<sup>610</sup>

The same two elements of the earlier story of Augustus' birth appear here: the location is a temple (this time Jupiter's) and the unique identity of Augustus with the god is revealed. This time, the boy (Latin *puer*, which is equivalent to Luke's *παῖς*<sup>611</sup>) appears in the temple in the lap of Jupiter, which suggests a special status. The boy is to be educated (*educaretur*) in the temple to become the saviour. In fact, the twelve-year-old Augustus gave the oration at his mother's funeral, according to Suetonius (*Aug.* 8). We note that the Temple in Luke's infancy narrative is the locus of divine revelations, as with the stories collected by Suetonius and Cassius Dio about Augustus' infancy. Suetonius and Dio also record another story in which the prolific Roman writer Cicero dreams of the boy Augustus descending from heaven on a golden chain to the door of Jupiter's Capitoline temple (*Aug.* 94.9; Dio, *Hist.* 45.2.2). It is the place of revealing the divine identity of the central figure of the story.

### **5.3 Preparation for Public Ministry (Luke 3:1–4:13)**

As we have explored, Luke 3:1 is probably the older opening of both canonical Luke and the edition known to the Evangelion used by Marcion.<sup>612</sup> John the Baptist receives “the word of God” in the wilderness, not in the Temple. The way John is introduced does not presume that there was any earlier introduction. However, it seems that Luke intended to ensure a smooth flowing of the revised gospel by including 1:80 at the end of Zechariah's hymn, a link sentence which states that John was waiting in the wilderness for God's appointed time for his “appearance (*ἀναδείξεως*) to Israel.”<sup>613</sup> The reader is thus unsurprised about John's reception of the word that will entitle him to go to tell the good news

---

<sup>610</sup> Translation from LCL 31, 268–71. Another version of the story appears in Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 45.2:3–4.

<sup>611</sup> It also appears as *παῖς* in Cassius Dio's account (*Hist.* 45.2.3).

<sup>612</sup> However, the Evangelion lacks the rest of the section, as well as Jesus' rejection in Nazareth.

<sup>613</sup> This term appears only in Luke-Acts (Luke 10:1; Acts 1:24) and shows the author's redaction interest as something to be shown from God (Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*, 77). Or “Amtseinführung,” according to C. G. Müller, *Mehr als Ein Prophet* (Wien: Herder, 2001), 149–51.

to the people “εὐηγγελίζετο τὸν λαόν” (Luke 3:18). Therefore, Luke has the beginning of the good news in the Temple, and it flows through now to the wilderness. This confirms the Lukan intention to add the infancy narrative with its strong Temple theme as a better beginning than that of the older edition.

#### **5.4 The Temptations (Luke 4:1-12)**

The Temple appears again in the climactic section of Jesus’ preparation for his ministry: the temptations. The temptations section is understood to be part of Q and has been used to argue for a positive presentation of the Temple.<sup>614</sup> In his stratification of Q, John Kloppenborg argued that the temptation section was the final stage of the document’s expansion (Q<sub>3</sub>). Unlike the rest of the document, the temptation reflects a strong dedication to the Jewish Scripture and its Temple.<sup>615</sup> Therefore, he suggests that it should have come from a scribal society that is not far from a community like the one of James’ epistle,<sup>616</sup> but this remains a hypothesis.<sup>617</sup>

Looking into Luke’s account of this tradition, his edition shows no theological embellishments or any extra sayings from Jesus: he always responds in scriptural verses.<sup>618</sup> It is widely agreed that the Matthean order reflects the original one in Q, since in Matthew the first two temptations are closely related and it is natural to see his third as the climax of the story.<sup>619</sup> However, the order of Luke

---

<sup>614</sup> Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, 61; John S. Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1987), 246ff. However, along with Jesus’ baptism, it is difficult to be certain of this.

<sup>615</sup> John S. Kloppenborg, “Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q,” *HTR* 80 (1987): 246–62.

<sup>616</sup> Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 213. Cf. James 2:1-13, 14-26. K. Schelkle also understands the stratification of Q as an expression of the process of the parting of the ways in “Israel und Kirche im Anfang,” *Theologische Quartalschrift Tübingen* (1963): 86–95.

<sup>617</sup> Kyu Han Han also follows Kloppenborg in *Jerusalem and the Early Jesus Movement: The Q Community’s Temple Attitude toward the Temple* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 2002), 55.

<sup>618</sup> For example, Matt. 4:10b. (// Luke 4:8); Matt 4:11b. (// Luke 4:13).

<sup>619</sup> According to Boismard *En Quête*, 187; Bovon, “Le récit de Matthieu est le plus logique” ; Siegfried Schulz, *Q - die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich: TVZ, 1972); Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 160;

reflects the wider theme of the visitation of the Lord, which will have its climax in the arrival of Jesus in the Temple near the end of the Gospel. Luke seems to emphasise Jesus' devotion to the Law in this. Therefore, he probably understood the function of this text in Q and preserved it for this reason. This is why we have to clarify how it was understood in its setting in Q. We saw Luke's intention to do this in the infancy narrative, which ends with the Temple scene. This is confirmed by the Lukan concluding remarks: the devil will depart from Jesus at the Temple temporarily (and return to him in Luke 22:3).<sup>620</sup> If our analysis is correct, it is not surprising that the Evangelion did not include the temptations in its pruned version of the early form of Luke.<sup>621</sup> Jesus' devotion to the Torah and the Temple come in the context of testing (or defining) his divine sonship through Satan's question ('if you are the Son of God ...'). Consequently, Luke associates the legitimacy of Jesus' identity as the Son of God with his devotion to the Temple and Scripture. This is in line with what we have seen thus far in both the infancy narrative and the preparation for the ministry section: divine sonship and piety to the God of Israel manifest in the Temple and Scripture, intertwining with one another.

### **5.5 From Galilee to Jerusalem (Luke 4:14–19:27)**

Luke starts Jesus' journey from his hometown of Nazareth either by re-ordering the materials from Mark by shifting Jesus' ministry in Capernaum to a later point (4:31ff) or by omitting an earlier visit to Capernaum before Nazareth.<sup>622</sup> The pericope of Jesus' rejection in Nazareth (4:14-30) hardly owes its substance to Mark. A larger Lukan source could be inferred from the abundance of non-Lukan

---

Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*; Schneider, "Lukas," vol. 2 98–102; Marshall, *Commentary*; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 507–8; Nolland, *Luke*, 180–81; J. Dupont, *Les Tentations de Jesus au Desert* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1968), 68. Against the majority, W. Manson, *The Gospel of Luke* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1963); Hans Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 218.

<sup>620</sup> Cf. Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964), 117; Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 161.

<sup>621</sup> While I do not accept the classic view of Marcionite posteriority to Luke. At the same time, I cannot exclude the possibility of Marcion's removal of this part if it indeed belongs to Q.

<sup>622</sup> The reference to Jesus' ministry in Capernaum (4:23) suggests some inconsistency in the narrative (cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 526f). It is interesting to observe that Marcion starts from the preaching in Capernaum in 4:31, lacking the textual difficulties in the earlier section.

language, as well as the Semitic style here, in connecting the sentence with twenty ‘ands’ (καὶ).<sup>623</sup> Again, Luke highlights Jesus’ commitment to old customs by inserting the special Lukan expression κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτοῦ. The Isaianic text given to Jesus to read in the synagogue (Isa 61:1-2) reflects the same values of the new world as appear in the infancy hymns (and 1 Clement):

<sup>18</sup> “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,

because he has anointed me

to bring good news to the poor.

He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives

and recovery of sight to the blind,

to let the oppressed go free,

<sup>19</sup> to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favour.” (Luke 4:18-19).

Luke 4:19 lacks Isa 61:2b which says “and the day of vengeance (καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως).” This conforms the message to Lukan eschatology as witnessed to earlier (Luke 9:51, 54; 13:22; 18:31; 19:28): the reign of peace is what Jesus preaches (he replaces Isaiah’s καλέσαι with κηρύξαι) and this is fulfilled in him. This is the eschatological matrix in which we should understand Jesus’ devotion to the Temple: the coming of the Lord to his Temple in Mal 3:1 but without the judgement and apocalyptic violence. In the vein of Mal 3:1-4 (Luke 3:1-6) and Isa 58:6 and 61:1-2, Jesus “sets his face toward Jerusalem” with an uncompromising determination. In light of the prophecies, Jesus was fulfilling God’s visitation to his people and the Temple. Attempts to understand the expression of setting the face to Jerusalem as a judgement against the Temple connect it with Ezekiel’s exhortation for judgement,<sup>624</sup> but this is not the case. McKeever’s conjecture that Jesus’ positive attitude towards

---

<sup>623</sup> Cf. Jeremias’ analysis, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*, 118–28.

<sup>624</sup> McKeever, “Sacred Space and Discursive Field,” 157. He relies on the apparition of this expression in some places in the Septuagint with the meaning of bringing judgement (see Jer 4:10; Ezek 6:2; 13:17; 21:2-4).

the Samaritans is an indication of his negative attitude to the Temple<sup>625</sup> contradicts his own interpretation of the expression “set his face toward Jerusalem”, because the same Samaritans refused to receive Jesus “ὅτι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ” (Luke 9:51-54). If Luke meant by this term judgement against the Temple, he would not have used it as a reason for the Samaritan rejection of Jesus. Thus, both arguments of McKeever cancel each other out. Jesus turns to Jerusalem with a positive focus.

### ***5.5.1 The Blood of Zechariah (Luke 11:49-51)***

The oracle concerning Zechariah reads: “<sup>49</sup> Therefore also the Wisdom of God said, ‘I will send them prophets and apostles, some of whom they will kill and persecute,’ <sup>50</sup> so that this generation may be charged with the blood of all the prophets shed since the foundation of the world, <sup>51</sup> from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, who perished between the altar and the sanctuary. Yes, I tell you, it will be charged against this generation” (Luke 11:49-51).

This saying is part of a longer list of woes against the Jewish religious authorities, particularly the Pharisees and the lawyers. Along with 11:47-54,<sup>626</sup> it forms a unit which belongs to Q’s Deuteronomistic history tradition: the rejection of the prophets (Q 6:23; Q 11:47–51; Q 13:34–35). Kloppenborg and Simon Joseph regard it as an indictment against the Temple.<sup>627</sup> Depicting the Temple as a crime scene for the murder of Zechariah leads eventually to its abandonment (13:35). However, the oracle shows no criticism against the Temple in any way. The prophetic saying holds

---

<sup>625</sup> See the Good Samaritan parable, Luke 10:25-37; the Healing of the Lepers (Luke 17:11-19) shows a Samaritan to be the only grateful person. McKeever suggests that Jesus definitely knew that when he asked the healed Samaritan to go to the Temple to give thanks and the Samaritan would certainly not give thanks at the one in Jerusalem which might, therefore, suggest an anti-Jerusalem-Temple attitude. See McKeever, “Sacred Space and Discursive Field,” 159.

<sup>626</sup> “<sup>47</sup> Woe to you! For you build the tombs of the prophets whom your ancestors killed. <sup>48</sup> So you are witnesses and approve of the deeds of your ancestors; for they killed them, and you build their tombs.”

<sup>627</sup> John S. Kloppenborg, “The Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion on the People Behind the Document,” *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 1 (1993): 9–34; Joseph, *Jesus and the Temple*, 105.

“this generation” responsible for the atrocities committed against God’s messengers throughout history. The crucial verse that mentions the Temple is 51a<sup>628</sup> and it raises several problems. First, its connection with the rest of the passage appears problematic. It is unnecessarily repetitive and breaks the flow from 50 to 51b which has led many to view it as a secondary insertion.<sup>629</sup> The identity of Zechariah is unclear. If the saying aims to cover the entire history since “the formation of the world” to “this generation” of Jesus, then it does not make sense to refer to Zechariah the son of Barachiah as mentioned explicitly in Matthew’s edition (Matt 23:35; see 2 Chr 24:20-22)<sup>630</sup>. Kloppenborg is right in suggesting that if 51a is a Q-redaction then one might expect the *terminus ad quem* to be John the Baptist (Q 16:16).<sup>631</sup> Josephus reported a story of a notable Jewish figure called Zechariah the son of Baris who was subjected to a sham trial by the Zealots and who was slain “in the midst of the Temple (ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἱερῶ)” (B.J. 4.4 [343]). It is this latter Zechariah who completes the time until the destruction of the Temple. One of the overlooked variations between Luke and Matthew is the location of Zechariah’s murder; in Matthew, it is between the altar and the sanctuary (τοῦ ναοῦ), while in Luke it is between the altar and “the House” (τοῦ οἴκου).<sup>632</sup> Either Luke tailored Q to refer to this latter Zechariah rather than to the son of Barachiah, or 51a is a later insertion.<sup>633</sup>

---

<sup>628</sup> ἀπὸ αἵματος Ἀβελ ἕως αἵματος Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἀπολομένου μεταξύ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου.

<sup>629</sup> Dieter Lüthmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 47; Paul Hoffmann, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1972), 168; Frans Neirynck, “Recent Developments in the Study of Q,” in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus* (Leuven: Peeters, 1982), 66; Wolfgang Schenk, *Synopse zur Redenquelle der Evangelien: Q-Synopse* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1981), 79. Kloppenborg thinks it belongs to a pre-Q stratum that precedes 51b (*Formation of Q*, 146f.). See also C. M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity* (Edinburgh T&T Clark, 1996), 169ff.

<sup>630</sup> A few Lukan MSS add the name but this is certainly a later harmonisation.

<sup>631</sup> Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 171.

<sup>632</sup> For a careful analysis see Manson, *Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1949), 104–5.

<sup>633</sup> The triple use of ἀπὸ in the Lukan edition was seen by Schulz as too awkward to be a Lukan production ( *Q - die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*, 338) and was followed by Kloppenborg (*Formation of Q*, 146–47) and the International Q Project’s edition in J. Robinson, P. Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q: A Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 498. Against them, Harry Fledderman convincingly shows that this construction is not far from the Lukan literary style (see Acts 28:23; for a double ἀπὸ Luke 9:5; 16:21), see Fledderman, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 547. Cf.

The significance of 51a is not only about announcing the death of an innocent (that was already clarified in 47-48), but also about referring to the Temple deliberately: the Temple was defiled and profaned by the bloodshed of the victim (whoever that Zechariah was). The saying reminds us of Josephus' attack on the Zealots for defiling the Temple with the blood of their victims. This fact takes the atrocity to a new level in which the house of God was assaulted. Josephus never judged the Temple obsolete nor condemned it along with the rebels who occupied it; he clearly aimed to show the Zealots' unprecedented monstrosity. A reader of both works could easily connect Luke 11:49-51 with the incidences in *Jewish War*, whether through the similar name of the victim (Zechariah) or the same profanity. Whether there is a direct connection between them or not, both Josephus and Luke used the theme of blood to condemn the zealots and consequently, both saw the Temple as a victim rather than a condemned establishment. Nevertheless, several commentators (as early as John Chrysostom) have understood it, along with 13:34-35, as a prophecy of the destruction of the Temple.<sup>634</sup>

### **5.5.2 The First Lamentation (Luke 13:34-35)**

The first lamentation (Luke 13:34-35) is a Q saying with a great level of verbal agreement between Luke and Matthew. It reads:

“Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the city that kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to it! How often have I desired to gather your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you were not willing. See, your house is left to you [ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν]. And I tell you, you

---

H. J. Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method in Luke* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920), 135–36. Jeremias also sees Luke's redaction behind the participle form of τοῦ ἀπολομένου which recurs in the parallels with Q (*Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*, 116, 210). If this is the case, it is plausible to think of Luke's intention to stretch the period of murdering the prophets to deliberately include the destruction of the Temple and Zechariah of Baris consequently becomes a better candidate. For a survey of the different opinions see G. Harb, ed., *Documenta Q: Q11:46b, 52, 47-51* (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 580–94.

<sup>634</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Matt.* 73-74; Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 387–90; Schneider “Lukas,” 273ff.

will not see me until the time comes when you say: *Blessed is the One who comes in the name of the Lord.*”

Several scholars understand this saying as a judgment brought on the Temple based on two major premises: the reference of "οἶκος" and the meaning of the term "ἀφίεται". Several scholars suggest that the house here is Israel if the text in the background of this text is Jeremiah 22:5 (ἐρήμωσιν ἔσται ὁ οἶκος οὗτος), yet they still suggest that Jesus meant forsaking the Temple.<sup>635</sup> A third approach is to understand οἶκος as the Temple. In this case, the judgment of abandonment and replacement becomes more direct, especially for Q scholars who look into it within the construction of Q rather than Luke in its entirety, relying mainly on the translation of the International Q project, which uses the term “forsaken” for both words (ἀφίεται ὑμῖν).<sup>636</sup> The Temple is "forsaken" and, as Fleddermann suggests, replaced by the Kingdom of God.<sup>637</sup> For Robert Miller, the abandonment of the Temple comes in line with the deuteronomic tradition of this prophetic saying, which reflects a negative Christian experience within the Jewish milieu of Jerusalem.<sup>638</sup> The “thoroughly negative view of the Temple” inferred by Kyu Sam Han is based on his acceptance of the idea of the *Shekinah*’s departure from the Temple in Jesus’ announcement, as proposed by T. W. Manson and Hoffman.<sup>639</sup> The word "house" is suggested as an inclusive expression that covers Jerusalem, people and the house collectively. Therefore Jesus’ negative remarks about Jerusalem in v.34 could be extended to the Temple as well and this judgment is an extension to Jesus’ attack on the Pharisees’ hypocrisy in 11:42-51. However,

---

<sup>635</sup> A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922), 352; Nolland, *Luke*, 949; See also Schulz’s statement of what he calls Q’s judgment (Gerichtswort): "Die Stadt als Haus Israels wird von Gott verlassen werden, indem er den Zionstempel als seine Wohnung aufgibt." Siegfried Schulz, *Q - die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich : Theologischer Verlag, 1972), 356.

<sup>636</sup> Milton C. Moreland and James M. Robinson, "The International Q Project Work Sessions 23-27 May, 22-26 August, 17-18 November 1994," *JBL* 114.3 (1995), 475-85

<sup>637</sup> Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 705. On other supersessionist views, see Davies and Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 322, 457; Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*, 576; Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News according to Luke*, 230-2. John S. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 121–23. Simon J. Joseph, *Jesus and the Temple*, 134. B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 110ff; Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 121, 3. Against him, see Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*; J. Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 951.

<sup>638</sup> Robert Miller, "The Rejection of the Prophets in Q," *JBL* 107.2 (1988), 225-40.

<sup>639</sup> Kyu Sam Han, *Jerusalem and the Early Jesus Movement: The Q Community's Attitude Toward the Temple* (London : Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 190. T. W. Manson et al., *The Mission and Message of Jesus* (London, I. Nicholson and Watson, 1937), 419. Paul Hoffmann, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* (Münster : Verlag Aschendorff, 1972), 175.

for Catchpole, the hope of repentance and restoration in v. 13:35b ("until the time") overcomes the negative tone of the previous part of the saying.<sup>640</sup> Therefore, the majority of these interpretation owe the negativity of Luke's attitude to their conception of the house and, more importantly, the translation of "ἀφίεται ὑμῖν" as "forsaken" or abandoned. However, this understanding of the two terms is questionable. As stated before, we cannot accept the *prima facie* concept of considering Jerusalem, Israel and the Temple as a single unity in which a judgment on one of them extends to the other two. We have already seen in 11:49-51 that the Temple was a victim of the Jewish violence and without maintaining the sanctity and holiness of the Temple the crime of slaughtering Zechariah would not have reached that level of gravity, just as it was the case in Josephus' cited stories. Therefore, the relationship between the Temple and the addressees of the saying must be investigated first. As for the meaning of ἀφίεται ὑμῖν, the translation "forsaken" is apparently an interpretive translation that reflects the theological approach of the translator towards the text and, possibly, the influence of Jer 22:5 and the Matthean version (23:38). If the translators chose "forsaken" only as a meaning for ἀφίεται, they apparently dropped ὑμῖν in the translation with no obvious justification. Therefore, the meaning of these terms should be revisited first before any interpretation is concluded.

The scholarly division over the reference of οἶκος is justifiable: there is no clear indication whether it is the house of Israel as it is in Jer 22:5 or the Temple specifically. We should observe that the addressee in verse 34 is Jerusalem, but Jesus in 35a switches to a group (whether the whole people of Israel or those murderers of the previous verse) as it appears from the two second person plural pronouns (ὑμῖν [...] ὑμῶν) and this continues to 35b (ἴδητέ, εἴπητε in plural). Therefore, it would be safe to suggest that Jerusalem represents the same people who brought calamities due to their violent deeds and their failure to recognise God's visitation, which is also found in Luke 19:41-44.<sup>641</sup> Therefore, Eduard Schweizer is correct in stating that Jesus will die at the hands of Jerusalem.<sup>642</sup> At the same time, we find the "house" separated from this, and it is subject to the misdeeds of the addressees. This leads us to believe that we are witnessing a saying that runs in the same spirit of

---

<sup>640</sup> David Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 271

<sup>641</sup> See the second lamentation p. 172 below.

<sup>642</sup> Schweizer, *Good News according to Luke*, 231.

Luke 11:49-51, which is not surprising since both belong to Q. If it is so, then perhaps the house of 13:35a is the same one in 11: 51, which is the Temple. This is likely to be the case since the Temple is not the addressee, as Bovon sensibly suggests.<sup>643</sup> Moving to the second problem, ἀφίεται ὑμῖν means "left to you."<sup>644</sup> Before attempting to understand the nature of this statement, we need to see the difference between Luke and Matthew in transmitting this Q saying:

| Luke 13:35                                                                                                                                    | Matt 23:38-9                                                                                                                                                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>35 ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με <u>ἕως ἡξεί</u> ὅτε εἴπητε· Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.</p> | <p>38 ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν <u>ἔρημος</u>. 39 λέγω <u>γὰρ</u> ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ με ἴδητε <u>ἀπ' ἄρτι</u> ἕως ἄν εἴπητε· Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.</p> |

While the difference (the underlined words) is often overlooked, it is essential in understanding the meaning. The first and most significant difference is the extra word ἔρημος (desolate) in the Matthean version. It cannot be maintained with certainty whether Matthew added it or Luke removed it, although scholars are inclined to suggest the former.<sup>645</sup> The Lukan version that lacks that key term makes the expression ἀφίεται ὑμῖν different in meaning. Taking ὑμῖν into consideration, which is not what translators often do, God does not leave the Temple, but he leaves it *to* the Judeans who chose the path of violence. The lack of ἔρημος loosens the assumed connection with Jer 22:5, which is already talking about the royal house of Israel and does not use ἀφίημι. The destructive tone in God's warning in Jeremiah is unmistakable, he does not simply leave, but he renders the house of Israel ruined. The verb of desolation does not mean simply leaving or departing or handing the responsibility of the establishment to another group but ἔρημος is a destructive act that renders a place to be ruined and left to waste; there is nothing to be left to another group. This is why the term is

<sup>643</sup> Bovon, *Lukas* vol. 3, 455. See also Grundmann, *Das Evangelium*, 289.

<sup>644</sup> NRSV correctly translates it so. However, the majority of English translations seem to harmonise it with Matt 23:38 by adding "desolate" which is not attested in Luke.

<sup>645</sup> See a detailed list of the scholars for each opinion in Stephen R. Johnson, *Q13:34-35 : judgment over Jerusalem*, Documenta Q vol.12 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), [200-13]. See also Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 702-3.

associated with prophetic judgment.<sup>646</sup> Therefore, we observe that in Luke the saying is not part of the eschatological discourse of Luke 21, but it lies in the middle of Jesus' journey. This point, as Weinert and Schweizer succinctly observe, make the reference to the Lord's coming in verse 35b refer to Jesus' entering of Jerusalem.<sup>647</sup> However, we should note that in Jesus' entrance in 19:37-39 it is the disciples who welcomed him with the same words of 13:35b, while the pharisees disapprovingly asked Jesus to stop his disciples. Therefore, the promise of leaving the Temple to the Judean authorities still stands in history, in what seems to explain the destruction in 70 CE. Therefore, looking into its position and its lack of the key term ἔρημος, the saying is not about an eschatological image of desolation and restoration in the Parousia. Therefore, Bultmann is essentially correct when he says that "if ἔρημος is an explanatory addition made by Matthew (in the manner of Jer 22:5) then ἀφίεται is just a bad rendering of a verb meaning 'will be abandoned'."<sup>648</sup> David Garland also asserts that ἔρημος is Matthean based on Matthew's intention to explain the meaning of "is left to you" since that addition connects the saying with the key theme of desolation in the Old Testament.<sup>649</sup> Based on that, Garland makes an important remark on the difference the addition makes: "Without this word [ἔρημος], Mt. 23:38 (Lk. 13:35) implies that your house is 'abandoned to the consequences of your [accumulated] misdeeds,' or 'is left to its own devices.' The addition of the word changes the thought of v. 38 altogether so the destruction of the city and the Temple by the Romans comes into view."<sup>650</sup> The lack of the destructive notion of ἔρημος distances God from being the destroyer and places the responsibility on those who chose violence and destruction. Therefore, it is a mistake to treat Luke 13:35 in the tradition of desolation. It appears to be the same reason behind Brian Han Gregg's decision to drop the saying from the list of apocalyptic judgement sayings that he analysed in Q.<sup>651</sup>

Matthew understood that and therefore he had to edit it in order to give it the necessary apocalyptic meaning in Matthew (23:37-9). He supplied it with an explanation concerning the condition of the

---

<sup>646</sup> See in particular Isa 1:7; 13:9; Ezek 5:14; 6:14; 35:4; and especially the Danielic eschatological visions Dan 9:17, 27, 11:31; 12:11

<sup>647</sup> Weinert, "Luke, the Temple and Jesus' Saying about Jerusalem's Abandoned House (Luke 13:34-35)," *CBQ*, 44.1 (1982), 68-76.

<sup>648</sup> Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 115.

<sup>649</sup> David E. Garland, *The Intention of Matthew 23* (Leiden : Brill, 1979), 200-1.

<sup>650</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>651</sup> B. Gregg, *The Historical Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 33.

Temple by adding ἔρημος. It concludes a collection of woes against the Jewish authorities and inaugurates the eschatological/apocalyptic discourse borrowed from Mark 13. The saying in Matthew is in fact the last saying of Jesus before he departs the Temple for the last time. Thus, Matthew adds "from now on - ἀπ' ἄρτι" because he will not return to the Temple in the remaining chapters. Therefore, its positioning in Matthew (24:1-35) shows Matthew's loyalty to Mark's apocalyptic programme as he puts it in a collection of apocalyptic sayings. Based on that, because Bultmann and Schweizer view it as an eschatological saying, they suggest that Matthew's order is the original one, not Luke's.<sup>652</sup> While I disagree with that, the point is that if the interpreters approach the saying as an apocalyptic judgment against the Temple, they will find the Matthean text and its context more suitable, which proves the case that Luke does not share the same Matthean understanding of the saying. It should not be surprising that the reference to the sacrilege of the Temple in Mark 13:14 is also absent from the Lukan parallel at 21:20-21.

In this case, what is the implication of ἀφίεται ὑμῖν in Luke's setting for his understanding of the Temple? The saying reflects the story of Jesus' mission in its entirety; despite all God's attempts to bring peace to Israel, it fails to respond positively and consequently faces abandonment until it recognises the visitation of the Lord in Jesus. Pointing to Jesus' visitation to Jerusalem is what makes the saying distinctive. This abandonment is not an act of ruining a place in the sense of apocalyptic desolation but is "leaving it" to those who chose the violent path in order to be responsible for its imminent destruction. This is not what we find in Jer 22:5 and therefore the model of leaving the Temple to the Judean authorities is something that requires further investigation in other prophetic models. As it stands in Q and Luke, the sense of ἀφίεται, as Bovon correctly suggests, is leaving only.<sup>653</sup> The saying squares with Ezek 8:6, which records God's complaint for being pushed out of the sanctuary due to the conduct of the rulers of the nation: "Son of man, do you see what they are doing, the great abominations that the house of Israel are committing here, to drive me far from my sanctuary?" Here as well the Temple is not the source of corruption or its worship is under assault but God is driven away due to the lawlessness "ἀνομίας" committed there. In Luke, the violence of 11:49-

<sup>652</sup> Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 114-5; Schweizer, *Good News*, 230-1.

<sup>653</sup> Bovon, *Luke* 2, 329. Weinert, "Luke, the Temple and Jesus' Saying," 68-76.

51 and 13:34 would be the reason for God's departure. But how is the responsibility of the Temple left to those who chose their own way of violence and in what way God could still see the Temple as his house, which is certainly what we find in Luke, not Matthew, in Jesus' visitation to the Temple afterwards? As with previous cases, we can see more satisfactory elaborative parallels by looking into post-destruction texts.

We have seen this already in 2 Baruch where God refuses to be understood as the one who denounced the covenant but who protects the sanctity of the Temple by removing what makes it holy from its sanctuary before the destruction of the Temple and the city, until the time comes when the vessels are restored in the earthly Temple, which "will be renewed in glory and that it will be perfected into eternity" (2 Bar. 8.2; 32.5). Therefore, leaving the Temple was not equivalent to judging or abandoning forever. In fact, the exact image of transfer of responsibility found in Luke's wording could be found in God's decision. As we saw, God left the Temple to the rulers and the Jewish authorities who eventually acknowledge their failure to protect it (2 Bar. 10:18).

The works of Josephus could also be illuminating for finding a parallel to the leaving of the Temple's responsibility to the rulers who chose violence as a path in order to be responsible for the Temple's fate. Josephus tells us that the war was preceded by a series of supernatural phenomena inside the Temple, including one in which chariots were seen flying and the priests heard a voice from inside the Temple saying "we are departing hence" (Josephus, *B.J.* 6.300). It is beyond any dispute that Josephus and the author of 2 Baruch had full allegiance to the Temple, despite their reports about God's departure. While Baruch simply registered the weakness of the Judean authorities to protect the Temple, Josephus was explicit in attributing the destruction to the violent path that the Judeans had acquired. In this portent, Josephus provides a good parallel to Luke, as he did earlier in 11:49-51.

To conclude, the temporary nature of the expected calamity and its reliance on the visitation of Jesus (by pushing the saying back)<sup>654</sup> reminds us of how the restoration of the house of Israel and its Temple is in the mind of Luke. Thus, the difference in the meaning of the saying between having ἄφῆμι alone in Luke and the Matthean addition of ἔρημος is basically the difference in meaning between temporary abandonment and the divine apocalyptic judgement once and for all. The first case is the rejection of God’s protection, offered in the realm of history,<sup>655</sup> while the second means God’s own apocalyptic destructive act in the end. In the words of Gerhard Schneider: “Da sich Jerusalem nicht in den Schutz (der göttlichen Weisheit bzw) des gottesgesandten Jesus begeben wollte, wird Gott es schutzlos lassen. Er wird Jerusalems “Haus” (den Tempel) verlassen.”<sup>656</sup> Verse 35b initiates the intertwining of visitation with the coming of Jesus, which will also appear throughout the coming units. As we will see, a thematic connection in Jesus’ prophecies toward Jerusalem in the second person continues and the Lukan careful redaction of both Mark and Q, for the purpose of avoiding the idea of ultimate end of the Temple or its defilement, will also be seen in the next sections.

### ***5.5.3 The Parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (Luke 18:9-14)***

As noted at the outset, the rising interest in a social scientific approach has influenced the debate over Luke’s Temple attitude significantly from the early 1990s. J. H. Elliot produced the first paper written from a sociological perspective which contrasted the Temple with households.<sup>657</sup> Elliot’s premise is not to distinguish the Temple’s space from the institutional representatives who were in conflict with Jesus. According to Elliot, Luke presents “the Household which is capable of embodying socially, symbolically and ideologically the structures, values and goals of an inclusive gospel of universal salvation”<sup>658</sup> which is in contrast to “the Temple, the bankrupt seat of Jewish power and piety, and to

---

<sup>654</sup> Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1035.

<sup>655</sup> We will see this in the next pericope in reference to the enemies.

<sup>656</sup> Schneider, “*Lukas*,” vol.1 311.

<sup>657</sup> J. H. Elliot, “Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts: A contrast in social institutions,” *HTS* 47 (1991): 88–120.

<sup>658</sup> Elliot, “Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts,” 90.

the city, the area of ‘Caesar’s network’ and locus of social control.”<sup>659</sup> This contrast, for Elliot, is embodied in the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector in Luke 18:9-14. While the Pharisee practised his self-righteousness in the Temple, the tax collector is justified on his way to another locus: his house (οἶκος).<sup>660</sup> This is translated in presenting the household as the place of peace against the Temple as a place of conflict.<sup>661</sup> A. Gueuret also understands the parable as a representation of the following scene in Jericho: the publican represents Zacchaeus (19:1-9) and the Pharisee represents the dismissive religious figures there, while the Temple represents the unwelcoming Jerusalem.<sup>662</sup>

Both readings of the parable are speculative. Verses 9 and 14 are Lukan additions to the pre-Lukan tradition, added in order to provide interpretation: the parable is addressed against self-righteousness (ὁ Φαρισαῖος σταθεὶς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν) and it subverts the superiority and external piety in what seems to correspond with Jesus’ eschatological reversals.<sup>663</sup> The parable does not show any judgement against the Temple. It is true that the tax collector went to “his house” justified before God (δεδικαιωμένος), but he was justified in the Temple. Philip Esler, who himself applied a social scientific method, also concluded that the negative attitude inferred from this method is difficult to reconcile with clear textual evidence as in Acts 5:42.<sup>664</sup> The fact is that this is the only pericope in the Gospels in which a sinner receives justification in a Jewish establishment. The God of Israel gives such unexpected grace

---

<sup>659</sup> Elliot, “Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts,” 90.

<sup>660</sup> Elliot, “Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts,” 91. This analysis is based on H. Mottu, “The Pharisee and the Tax Collector: Sartian notions as applied to the reading of Scripture,” *USQR* 29 (1974):195–213. Elliot followed the work of Bruce Malina on cultural anthropology providing social patterns from pre-industrial societies and the insights of economic anthropologists. Cf. B. Malina, *Christian Origins*.

<sup>661</sup> Elliot, “Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts,” 93.

<sup>662</sup> A. Gueuret, “Le pharisien et le publicain (Lc 18:9-14),” in *Les Paraboles évangéliques: perspectives nouvelles*, ed. J. Delorme (Paris: Editions Du Cerf, 1989), 296–97.

<sup>663</sup> Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, 224; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1954), 111f; G. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke’s Gospel* (London: Black, 2000), 212–13.

<sup>664</sup> Philip Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 6-9. On Elliot’s interpretation see p. 140. On the criticism of excessive application of social pattern coming from contemporary culture on the New Testament world see particularly 174. Cf. A. G. Van Aarde, “The Most High Does Live in Houses, but not Houses Built by Men,” *Neotestamentica* 25 (1991): 51–64.

in a way similar to Jesus' own proclamation of forgiveness of sins in other situations.<sup>665</sup> This parable shows God judging and justifying in the Temple in a way which is not unlike that of Jesus.<sup>666</sup> It shows no distinction between Jesus' community and the community of the Temple. Consequently, the Temple does not contrast the house.

#### 5.5.4 *The Second Lamentation (Luke 19:41-44)*

While Mark registers the cursing of the fig tree as the last act of Jesus before he enters the Temple, Luke omits it and adds the prophetic oracle<sup>667</sup> of 19:41-44 as Jesus' last act before he enters the city. This observation is important as it should reflect the different perspectives of Luke and Mark. The saying encapsulates the goal of Luke's Gospel explicitly: Jesus weeps over Jerusalem's failure to recognise God's visitation and hence its last chance to obtain its peace before it is destroyed by its enemies. The main concepts of the Gospel—the visitation (τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ) and peace (εἰρήνην)—are joined together and christologised by connecting the visitation with Jesus' entrance to the city. As noted earlier, the theme of God's visitation is uniquely Lukan. The term τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ is found throughout the special material L and there are two aspects worthy of note: first, this visitation brings God's peace and deliverance (1:68, 78; 7:16; 19:44);<sup>668</sup> second, Jesus is associated with that visitation in an obvious Christological manner. This appears clearly in the pericope of the Nain miracle (Luke 7:11-17) where the people of Nain glorified God “ὅτι Ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ” (7:16c). The eschatological tone and the verification of God's final visit through Jesus suggests the

<sup>665</sup> cf. Luke 5:20 (//Mark 2:1// Matt 9:2); 7:36-50 par.

<sup>666</sup> Cf. A. Feuillet, “La signification christologique de Luc 18,14 et les references des evangiles au Serviteur souffrant,” *Nova et Vetera Genève* 55 (1980): 188–229.

<sup>667</sup> R. Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963). Bultmann categorized it as an apophthegm (57), but it fits more the form of an apocalyptic proclamation as he later resorts to (123).

<sup>668</sup> It should be noted that the theme of God's visitation appears in the Old Testament with two implications: bringing punishment (Ps 88:39; Sir 2:14), or salvation (Gen 50:24-25; Exod 3:16; 4:31; 13:19; 30:12; Isa 23:17). The Lukan *Sondergut* has only one consistent meaning which is the positive one. See Bovon, *Lukas* vol.1, 104f. G. Petzke, *Das Sondergut des Evangeliums nach Lukas* (Zürich: TVZ, 1990), 173.

christological reading. Bovon thus senses the “*Christologische*” tone: “Was jener tut, ist nichts anderes als die Erfüllung des Willens Gottes, ja ist letztlich Gottes persönliche Tat. Diese Gleichsetzung erhöht einerseits die Person Jesu in die göttliche Sphäre, erniedrigt sie aber andererseits auf die Funktion eines gehorsamen Vermittlers.”<sup>669</sup>

This statement applies perfectly to 19:44 as well, which supports the consistence of the meaning of the visitation as a peculiar theme in Luke’s special source. The uniqueness of the term to the special material, compared to the New Testament, led scholars to conclude that it is part of the tradition, not a Lukan redaction.<sup>670</sup> If this is true, as I think, then we are reading a continuous source with a clear understanding of Jesus’ mission and this understanding is not an option amongst equals on Luke’s table but the most important one that will define the whole Lukan work.<sup>671</sup> This should also explain Luke’s positive regard of the Temple. As far as we are concerned, the christologised visitation of God is a fundamental theme in L and the author rearranges the materials of his other sources towards a narrative that is in agreement. Secondly, this L theme is building up towards not only the visitation of Jesus to Jerusalem but particularly to the Temple which he never leaves, in sheer contrast with Mark, until his arrest.

As we have observed, there are textual observations that suggest the saying of 19:41-44 is old and pre-Lukan, at least in its core.<sup>672</sup> It does not appear in Mark or Matthew. Its thematic connection with

---

<sup>669</sup> Bovon, *Lukas 1*, 365. See also in the same vein Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 600; K. Baltzer, “The meaning of the temple in the Lukan writings,” *HTR* 58 (1965): 263–77.

<sup>670</sup> Cf. Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*, 281–82; Bovon, *Luke 3*, 15-6; Petzke, *Das Sondergut des Evangeliums nach Lukas*, 173.

<sup>671</sup> Petzke almost implied this in his analysis of the theme of visitation and its connectedness with materials driven from other sources such as Q 13:34-5. (*Das Sondergut des Evangeliums nach Lukas*, 173).

<sup>672</sup> Verse 41 is probably a Lukan introductory composition, but later we see a series of peculiar non-Lukan vocabulary and constructions such as ἡξουσιν ἡμέραι (cf. Luke 5:35; Acts 2:20), παρεμβάλλειν (appears once in the Septuagint 2 Kgs 12:28), Luke would not call the Romans “οἱ ἐχθροί σου.” It is also observed by several exegetes that the pericope has a Semitic parataxis (the many references to “and”), as well as the omnipotence of the second person pronoun throughout (Bovon, *Luke 3*, 15-6). On this characteristic style in the *Sondergut* see Petzke, *Das Sondergut des Evangeliums nach Lukas*, passim.

21:20-24 and 23:28-31 suggests that it is part of L.<sup>673</sup> The expression οὐκ ἀφήσουσιν λίθον ἐπὶ λίθον ἐν σοί in v. 44b should lead us to the suggestion that Mark is its source. However, alongside the integrity of the pre-Lukan text, the fact that Luke, who otherwise avoids doublets, feels the necessity to show a doublet here (with 21:6) adds a significant weight to the independence of that saying from Mark.<sup>674</sup>

Some scholars note the rich prophetic parallels in the saying<sup>675</sup> in their arguments against 19:41-44 having any reference to the destruction of the Temple.<sup>676</sup> However, reflection on the destruction using prophetic materials is not uncommon in late first-century Judaism, as we saw.<sup>677</sup> The striking similarity between the details offered by Luke 19:41-44, 21:20-24, and what we know about the siege of Jerusalem,<sup>678</sup> combined with Luke's interest in historicising his prophecies rather than interpreting them in light of the Parousia, would suggest that Luke understood and redacted this piece of tradition towards the calamity of 70 CE. We may therefore agree with Bultmann that it should be read as *vaticinium ex eventu*.<sup>679</sup>

While it is beyond the scope of this research to decide which tradition (Luke 19:41-44 or Mark 13:1-2) is closer to the *Ipsissima Vox* of the historical Jesus, the composition of the Markan account reflects his theological agenda as it appears through the work, which led Bultmann to find “little to encourage us to think that this is the oldest form of the prophecy handed on.”<sup>680</sup> As far as we are concerned, the

---

<sup>673</sup> Bultmann, *History*, 36; Fitzmyer (*Luke*, 84) finds it amongst the few materials he confidently thinks were part of L. See also J. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:52*, World Biblical Commentary v.35c (Dallas: World, 1993), 929–33; Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*, 717–19.

<sup>674</sup> Cf. J. Dupont, “Il n'en sera pas laissé pierre sur pierre (Marc 13:2; Luc 19:44),” *Biblica*, 52 (1971), 301–20.

<sup>675</sup> Cf. Ps 137:9; Neh 3:10; 1 Kgdms 23:8; 2 Kgdms 12:28; Ezek 31:12; Jer 26:18-19.

<sup>676</sup> Cf. T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1971), 320–21. E. E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1991), 226; D. L. Tiede, “Weeping for Jerusalem,” in *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*, ed. D. L. Tiede (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 68–70. Cf. Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 359.

<sup>677</sup> See above p. 51.

<sup>678</sup> Mainly from Josephus' account of *B.J.* 5.67-261; 6:24-28, 93.

<sup>679</sup> Bultmann, *History*, 27. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1254–55; Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*, Nolland, *Luke*.

<sup>680</sup> Bultmann, *History*, 36; V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: McMillan, 1952), 500–501.

difference between the two traditions is significant to our research. By “leaving no stone on another” Luke refers to Jerusalem, while in Mark it refers to the Temple. This leaves Jacques Dupont enquiring whether it was Mark who switched an original saying towards the Temple or vice versa. Again, the difference between Luke and Mark suggests there is a distinction between Jerusalem and the Temple. Dupont collects the main differences:

Il conviendrait à présent de confronter les deux versions du logion en se demandant s'il faut accorder la priorité à celle qui parle de la destruction de Jérusalem ou à celle qui parle du Temple, à celle qui attribue cette destruction à Dieu ou à celle qui la présente comme l'œuvre des ennemis, à celle qui s'exprime à la deuxième personne ou à celle qui emploie la troisième, à celle où la prédiction s'adresse à Jérusalem ou à celle qui la réserve aux disciples.<sup>681</sup>

We can see that eschatology and the object (the Temple or Jerusalem) are intertwined. The apocalyptic standing of the oracle in Mark brought about the destruction of the Temple, while it is the historical understanding of the events that befell Jerusalem that made Luke preserve the oracle as it is, in reference to the city not the Temple.

## **5.6 The Temple Ministry (Luke 19:45–21:38)**

The ‘Jerusalem section’ of Luke should actually be called the ‘Temple section’ because Jesus remains in the Temple throughout, and it is bracketed by two summaries affirming this (Luke 19:47-48; 21:37-38). In this section, Jesus, as Conzelmann correctly states, seems to be claiming the Temple.<sup>682</sup> This brings conflict between him as an authoritative teacher against the Temple authorities. However, Jesus’ teaching attracts all people around who protect him (21:37-38) in what seems to be victory against his opponents (19:47-48).

---

<sup>681</sup> Dupont, “Il n'en sera pas laissé pierre sur pierre,” 320.

<sup>682</sup> Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, 75. See also E. Schweizer, *The Good News according to Luke* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1957), 297ff.

One of the most important divergences between Luke and Mark is the way in which Luke locates Jesus in the Temple. Mark does, however, preserve the saying: “Day after day I was with you in the Temple teaching (καθ’ ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων)” (14:49a). This does not seem to reflect Mark’s account of Jesus’ activities after his arrival to Jerusalem. Joel Marcus has already observed the difficulty in trying to join this saying with the Markan account which has Jesus visiting the Temple around two days, according to Marcus’ estimation (Mark 11:17; 11:27–12:44).<sup>683</sup> With the exception of the brief reference in 12:35a, Mark does not show any interest in locating Jesus’ teaching in the Temple. Indeed, Jesus does not even remain in the city of Jerusalem in Mark. On the other hand, in Luke, Jesus stays in the Temple with no reference to any activity in the city and the Lukan narrative is therefore loyal to Jesus’ response upon his arrest: he was teaching every day in the Temple (22:53a).<sup>684</sup> The differences between Luke and Mark can be shown as follows:

| Mark                                                                               | Luke                                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11:11 Jesus leaves Jerusalem/the Temple to go to Bethany after his triumphal entry | Omitted                                                                                                      |
| 11:19 Jesus goes to Bethany after cleansing the Temple                             | Omitted and later replaced by his first summary that Jesus remained teaching in the Temple every day (19:47) |
| 13:1 the prophecy of the Temple’s                                                  | The reference to Jesus leaving the Temple is                                                                 |

<sup>683</sup> J. Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, Anchor Bible Commentary (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 454.

<sup>684</sup> καθ’ ἡμέραν ὄντος μου μεθ’ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ οὐκ ἐξετείνετε τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ’ ἐμέ· The pericope (22:47-53) raises source-critical difficulties due to the significant variations between Luke and Mark. The arrest could be from his special source since it is also present in John 18.

|                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| destruction is out of the Temple                                | omitted. The saying is included in the eschatological discourse (19:45) and concluded by the second summary that Jesus was teaching in the Temple every day (21:37-38) |
| 14:1 the last activity before the Passover, Jesus is in Bethany | Pushed back to 7:36-50. Luke ensures that the last scene before the passion narrative is in the Temple.                                                                |

This careful redaction reflects the agenda of Luke which diverts from that of his source, Mark. For Luke, Jesus continues to attach himself to the Temple where he remains teaching in what seems to be the fulfilment of his long journey (“set his face to Jerusalem” 3:1-6). It also reminds us of the scene where he was found as a child in the Temple (Luke 2:41-52) where he also debated and had his identity as the son revealed in his Father’s Temple (cf. Luke 20:41-44). His allusions to the “visitation” of the Lord who “comes to his Temple” (Mal 3:1) are finally fulfilled.

### ***5.6.1 Cleansing the Temple (Luke 19:45-46)***

The Gospel of Mark sandwiches the Temple cleansing (11:16-17) with the cursing of the fig tree (11:12-14) and its interpretation (11:20-25). There is a consensus that Mark’s move was meant to use the fig tree incident to be interpretive of the Temple cleansing.<sup>685</sup> The symbolism of the fig tree

---

<sup>685</sup> R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 439; C. S. Mann, *Mark*, Anchor Bible Commentary (London: Doubleday, 1986), 440; W. H. Kebler, *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 99; W. R. Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1980), passim; E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 235; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2007), 523.

cursing shows us one of the most destructive acts in the New Testament<sup>686</sup> and its interpretation is as a symbol of what a person would be without faith and prayer. This is how Mark understands the Temple which, for him, ceased to be a house of prayer and hence becomes like the withered tree.<sup>687</sup> Even worse, the Temple's new unfortunate state is brought about by God's judgement.

This powerful interpretive work of Mark was too strong even for Matthew who detached the cursing from the Temple incident and turned it into a miracle story with its moral lesson (on the efficiency of prayer) attached to it.<sup>688</sup> Luke completely omits it, leaving us with one explanation which is that Luke redacted the scene because he disagreed with deeming the Temple as defiled or judged by God.

The Temple cleansing as a unit is problematic. We notice that Luke (19:45-46) reduces the Markan account significantly: Jesus only expels those who sell, while there is no reference to the buyers, money changers or the sellers of the birds (Mark 11:15b-16). Some scholars have thought that Luke aimed to reduce the violent image of Jesus,<sup>689</sup> but this does not explain how he preserved the initial act (expelling the sellers). It could be sufficient to observe that money changing and selling animals are both important for the pilgrims of the Diaspora who need their services (Exod 30:11-16; *M. Seq.* 1:1, 3).<sup>690</sup> Thus, Weinert could be correct in sensing that Luke aimed to avoid possible reference to aggression against an essential part of the sacrificial system of the Temple.<sup>691</sup>

---

<sup>686</sup> It is important here to refer to Telford's comprehensive research on the meaning and symbolism of cursing the fig tree in the Jewish tradition in *The Barren Temple*, 179–96. See Jer 8:13; 24:1-10; Hos 9:10; Mic 7:1.

<sup>687</sup> France (*The Gospel of Mark*, 441) observes how the cursing of the fig tree is related to prayer, which is the issue Jesus raised while cleansing the Temple.

<sup>688</sup> Matt 21:18-22. Cf. Telford, *The Barren Temple*, 80.

<sup>689</sup> Weinert, *The Meaning of the Temple*; Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*; Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple and the New Age*.

<sup>690</sup> Having said that, some problems were raised amongst Jewish circles on whether these activities should have been practised within the Temple precincts or on the mountain. Cf. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the time of Jesus: An investigation into economic and social conditions during the New Testament period* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 48–49.

<sup>691</sup> In particular Mann, *Mark*, 440–42.

Mark also concludes the pericope of the cleansing by saying: “when the chief priests and the scribes heard it, they kept looking for a way to kill him” (11:18). Mark clearly connects the ill-thoughts of the Judaeen authorities with Jesus’ Temple action. On the other hand, Luke separates Jesus’ action from the priests’ reaction with the summary statement: “Every day he was teaching in the Temple” (19:47a).” He thus makes the priests’ plot of “looking for a way to kill him (47b)” to be a reaction to his daily teaching, and not limited to the single act of Temple cleansing. This is significant not only in terms of interpreting the Temple cleansing to be less offensive (nor as fatal as in Mark), but also to show the Lukan interest in keeping Jesus in the Temple. Indeed, he emphasises that the reason for Jesus’ death was his regular presence and teaching in the Temple. The case in Mark is different, as Jesus leaves the city after this action in the Temple, and goes to Bethany (11:19).

### **5.6.2 The Parable of the Vineyard (Luke 20:9-19)**

Another important unit that comes from Mark is the parable of the vineyard (Luke 20:9-19; Mark 12:1-12; Isa 5:1-7).<sup>692</sup> This parable gives a strong statement against the wicked tenants and intimates destruction over their vineyard. As it stands, it is an exposition based on the song of the unfruitful vineyard in Isa 5:1-7.<sup>693</sup>

The symbolism of the image was subject to different interpretations. Kloppenborg, for example, interprets the whole vineyard as the Temple and consequently senses a developing anti-Temple

---

<sup>692</sup> Cf. Schramm entertained the possibility that Luke used at least another source beside Mark (note it in Gos. Thom. 65), which could explain his brief statements and apparent variants. See T. Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff Bei Lukas* (Cambridge: CUP, 1971), 150–67. J. S. Kloppenborg made a strong case against it in *The Tenants in the Vineyard* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006). See also Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*, 727. The tenability of the concept of Luke’s tendency to abbreviate this parable and the failure to explain the significant similarities between Gos. Thom. 65 and the Lukan account weakens Kloppenborg’s case. Having said that, it is difficult to form an opinion on the nature of the other source that Luke might have used beside Mark. Thus, I will have to avoid this possible source in my study of the parable.

<sup>693</sup> Verse 5b in particular is probably an interpolation to enumerate the prophets sent to Israel (Kloppenborg, *The Tenants in the Vineyard*, 75).

attitude in 11:12-21 which leads on towards 13:1-2 (the little apocalypse) and 14:58 (accusation of destroying the Temple).<sup>694</sup> However, he himself acknowledges the challenge here because the idea of transferring the ownership of the vineyard (the Temple in Mark 11:9b) is difficult to interpret, unless the author meant a transfer from a physical temple to the one that is not made with hands (Mark 14:58).<sup>695</sup> Kloppenborg's association of the whole vineyard with the Temple is problematic, with no external or internal support, and is built on the customary assumption that Jerusalem and the Temple are identical. Overall, it is safer to see the Vineyard as Israel.<sup>696</sup>

One of the overlooked differences between Mark and Luke is the Lukan omission of Mark 12:1b, where the tenant "put a fence around it, dug a pit for the wine press, and built a watch-tower."<sup>697</sup> Some scholars tend to think that this is a Lukan abbreviation,<sup>698</sup> but this fails to explain the fact that the Lukan account is longer anyway. Bovon admits that he simply does not know how to explain it.<sup>699</sup> However, the details of the rich image as it appears in Mark are not uncommon in Jewish literature. The fragments of 4Q500 and 4Q162 reflect the detailed imagery of Mark, and they are rightly connected with Isa 5:1-7.<sup>700</sup> In the Isaianic elements found in Mark, there is a tower (πύργος) built in the middle of the vineyard. In the imagery of the vineyard in Second Temple texts, the tower is understood as the Temple while the winepress attached to it is understood as the channel through which the blood of the sacrifices flows.<sup>701</sup> Even without the vineyard, the tower appears as a reference

---

<sup>694</sup> Kloppenborg, *The Tenants in the Vineyard*, 226–27.

<sup>695</sup> Kloppenborg, *The Tenants in the Vineyard*, 227; The first to suggest this was Ernst Lohmeyer, "Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingartnern," *ZST* 18 (1941): 257.

<sup>696</sup> See Ps 80:9-14; Isa 27:2-5; Hos 10:1; Jer 2:2. Nolland, *Luke*, 950; Schweizer, *The Good News according to Luke*, 304, Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1281; K. Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants: An Inquiry into Parable Interpretation* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 74.

<sup>697</sup> καὶ περιέθηκεν φραγμὸν καὶ ὥρυξεν ὑπολήνιον καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν πύργον

<sup>698</sup> Kloppenborg, *The Tenants in the Vineyard*; 203-5. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1283 (although not certain about it).

<sup>699</sup> Bovon, "Luke 3," 36.

<sup>700</sup> Cf. G. J. Brooke, "4Q500 1 and the Use of Scripture in the Parable of the Vineyard," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 268–94; J. M. Baumgarten, "4Q500 and the Lord's Vineyard," *JJS* 40 (1989): 1–6.

<sup>701</sup> Tg. Isa 5:2: "I propped them up as a precious vine; and I built my sanctuary in the midst of them"; *T. Sukk.* 3:15: "and he built a tower in its midst, this refers to the temple; he dug a winepress in it, this refers to the altar;

to the Temple in 1 Enoch (89:50, 73). Further, the image of the Temple as πύργος appears frequently in Josephus, sometimes in reference to the Oniad temple as well (A.J. 12:388; 13:63, 72; 20:236; B.J. 1:33).<sup>702</sup> Moreover, the Apostolic Fathers also used the term in reference to the Temple (*Herm.* 9.3-13; Barn. 16.5 and later Origen, *Comm. Matt.* 17:7). In light of this, it appears to me that it is difficult to imagine that Luke omitted these details without reason. We are left with one explanation, which is that the judgement is against the Judaeian leadership. The destruction of the city is part of it, but the omission of 12:1b removes the Temple from the judgement scene.

This comes alongside some editorial steps taken by Luke to fit his wider interests. First, Luke addresses the parable to τὸν λαὸν instead of Mark's αὐτοῖς (which refers to the Jewish rulers who questioned Jesus' authority in the previous pericope).<sup>703</sup> Secondly, Luke emphasises the identity of the son sent by the owner as Jesus by saying "my beloved son (τὸν υἱὸν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν)" rather than "a beloved son (υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν)" (Luke 20:13; Mark 12:6).<sup>704</sup> Finally, Luke adds a prophetic saying: "Everyone who falls on that stone will be broken to pieces; and it will crush anyone on whom it falls" (20:18).<sup>705</sup> This saying signifies the selectivity of the destruction against the possible collective implications of the vineyard owner's anger. This also agrees with the fact that the owner decides to destroy the tenants (ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς) in particular (20:16). The reaction of the Judaeian rulers indicates that they understand themselves to be the ones who are selected to be crushed by the cornerstone. This redaction fits the wider interest of Luke in which God's visitation to his people is Christologised in Jesus. Excluding the tower (the Temple) from the judgement, then, indicates Luke's view which does not wish to undermine the Temple's sanctity.

---

and also he dug a winepress in it, this refers to the channel." See Brooke, "4Q500 1 and the Use of Scripture," 271-72.

<sup>702</sup> See also Wardle, "Continuity and Discontinuity," 131.

<sup>703</sup> Matthew clearly understood this and integrated the parable in the wider scene of the debate with the Jewish authorities (21:33-46). See Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew*, vol.2 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2005), 947-8.

<sup>704</sup> Cf. Nolland op. cit., 951.

<sup>705</sup> See also Isa 8:14-5; Dan 2:34, 44-45 (Nolland op. cit., 953).

### 5.6.3 The Eschatological Discourse (Luke 21:5-36)

Focusing on Luke 21:20-24, which deals with the destruction event, it is noted that this section is different to its corresponding verse in Mark (13:14). Therefore, we should ask two questions: what did Luke do with Mark 13:14, which refers to the Temple's sacrilege, and why so.

According to Conzelmann, this appears in the significant change of Mark's apocalyptic words of abomination of desolation (13:14) into the destruction of the city (Luke 21:20-4).<sup>706</sup> Therefore, Conzelmann suggests that the divergence of the Lukan text from his supposed sole source (Mark) is an "interpretation" of the eschatological hope in "a non-eschatological sense [...] by definitely dissociating it from the Christian eschatological hope."<sup>707</sup> This is followed faithfully by Werner Kümmel who considers the Lukan edition as a thorough reworking of Mark,<sup>708</sup> followed by W. Nicol who considered that Luke "freely constructed" it with Mk 13 in mind "in such a way as to show that he is now talking about the fall of Jerusalem,"<sup>709</sup> and later scholars who do not see a source behind the discourse, rely on Conzelmann's view of the Lukan intention to historicise Mark's "Little Apocalypse."<sup>710</sup> While the historical character of the Lukan version can be argued for as Conzelmann and later scholars did, some observations in the text itself, and in particular where the Temple features, must be made. Therefore, I will read this section without presuming Conzelmann's influential view.

---

<sup>706</sup> Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 134-5.

<sup>707</sup> Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 133.

<sup>708</sup> W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975), 134. *idem*, *Promise and Fulfilment* (London: SCM Press, 1957), 102-3.

<sup>709</sup> W. Nicol, "Tradition and Redaction in Luke 21," *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973), 66.

<sup>710</sup> Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishing, 1961), 133-35.

Conzelmann's note was followed by virtually every scholar who rejected the existence of another source beside Mark. See A. Mittelstaedt, *Lukas als Historiker: Zur Datierung des lukanischen Doppelwerks* (Berne: Francke, 2006), 142-3; F. Neirynck, ed., *L'Évangile de Luc: Problèmes Littéraires et Théologiques* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1973), 177-78. Cf. J. C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* (London: SPCK, 1970), 2-3; Craig Koester, "The Origin and Significance of the Flight to Pella Tradition," *CBQ* 51.1 (1989), 90-106. Dale B. Martin, *New Testament History and Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 150-1. Kloppenborg, *The Tenants in the Vineyard*, 204. See also, J. Verheyden, "Proto-Luke, and What Can Possibly Be Made of It," in Paul Foster, and C. M. Tuckett (eds.), *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 617-656.

While the term “Eschatological Discourse” is commonly used to refer to the prophetic materials in Luke 21 only, this should include Luke 13:34-35 (the lament on Jerusalem) and Luke 19:41-44 (the destruction of Jerusalem) because these materials appear together in Matthew (without Luke 19:41-44 since it is a Lukan special material). This Lukan eschatological discourse cuts through Luke’s three main sources (Q, L and Mark):

| <i>Unit</i>                                                    | <i>Source</i> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| First lamentation (Luke 13:34-35 // Matt 23:37-39)             | Q             |
| Second lamentation (Luke 19:41-44)                             | L             |
| Eschatological prophecies (Luke 21:5-36 // Mark 13 // Matt 24) | L + Mark      |

The final eschatological discourse is divided into five sections:

|       |                              |
|-------|------------------------------|
| 5-19  | signs of the end             |
| 20-24 | tribulation before the end   |
| 25-33 | the coming of the Son of Man |
| 34-35 | the need for watchfulness    |
| 37-38 | summary of the scene         |

Looking into the section as a whole (21:5-38), Luke removes every Markan reference of Jesus leaving the Temple (Mark 13:1, 3 and the "abomination of desolation" in verse 14) and adds his final summary, "Every day he was teaching in the Temple" (Luke 21:37), to emphasise Jesus' commitment to the Temple during that period of time.

Luke also adds elements that show a relative delay of the Parousia, such as Ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικεν (21:8b) and οὐκ ἐνθέως τὸ τέλος (21:9b). As Bovon correctly observes, Luke follows Mark interchangeably with L by adding blocks from each source in order.<sup>711</sup> From verse 20, it will be seen that the parallels between Mark and Luke fall dramatically into a few words in clusters while a continuous source dominates the Lukan pericope to verse 28. Luke then returns to Mark in vv. 29-33 (the parable of the fig tree) before losing a Markan connection until the end of the discourse. The Markan clusters are found in 21:20a, 21a, 23, 26b-27. The removal of these clusters does not cause any disruption in the text; in fact, it provides a coherent text that makes more sense. For vv. 20-21, for example, the pronouns αὐτῆς and εἰς αὐτήν should be referring specifically to Jerusalem in v. 20 as the scene does not make sense if it speaks about the whole region of Judaea since it is the besieging of the fortified city of Jerusalem that divides those who are inside and outside. Thus, the removal of this Markan cluster gives us a clearer meaning. Again, the removal of vv. 26b-27 restores the natural continuum between 26a and 28. The list of the expected signs are concluded in 26a, then 28 tells us what to do when they begin to unfold. The Markan insertion makes the coming of the Son of Man one of the signs after which the addressees should start to expect the end. Of course, the coming of the Son of Man is the deliverance itself and so this cluster is certainly misplaced. If we remove these additions, we will have the following coherent text (the Markan clusters are represented by the square brackets):

|                                                                             |                                                                                            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 20 Ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε κυκλουμένην ὑπὸ<br>στρατοπέδων Ἱερουσαλήμ, τότε γινώτε ὅτι | 20 "When you see Jerusalem surrounded by<br>armies, then know that its desolation has come |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

<sup>711</sup> Bovon, *Luke 1*, 6–8. On Luke 21:20-4 see *idem*, *Luke 3*, 114-6.

|                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ἤγγικεν ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς.                                                                                                                              | near.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 21 τότε [...] οἱ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς ἐκχωρεῖτωσαν, καὶ οἱ ἐν ταῖς χώραις μὴ εἰσερχέσθωσαν εἰς αὐτήν,                                                         | 21 Those inside the city must leave it, and those out in the country must not enter it (the city);                                                                                                                                     |
| 22 ὅτι ἡμέραι ἐκδικήσεως αὐταί εἰσιν τοῦ πλησθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα.                                                                                | 22 for these are days of vengeance, as a fulfilment of all that is written.                                                                                                                                                            |
| 23 οὐαὶ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις· [...]                                                                   | 23 Woe to those who are pregnant and to those who are nursing infants in those days!                                                                                                                                                   |
| 24 καὶ πεσοῦνται στόματι μαχαίρης καὶ αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πάντα, καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἔσται πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν, ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἐθνῶν. | 24 They will fall by the edge of the sword and be taken away as captives among all nations; and Jerusalem will be trampled on by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled.                                          |
| 25 Καὶ ἔσονται σημεῖα ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἄστροις, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συνοχὴ ἐθνῶν ἐν ἀπορίᾳ ἤχους θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου,                                 | 25 “There will be signs in the sun, the moon, and the stars, and on the earth distress among nations confused by the roaring of the sea and the waves. 26 People will faint from fear and foreboding of what is coming upon the world, |
| 26 ἀποψυχόντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχομένων τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, [...]                                                                   | [...]                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 28 ἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γίνεσθαι ἀνακύψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν, διότι ἐγγίζει ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν.                                              | 28 Now when these things begin to take place, stand up and raise your heads, because your redemption is drawing near.”                                                                                                                 |

It is difficult to imagine how Luke expanded these fragmentary clusters (which make no sense on their own) in this way and how these expansions make more sense without the Markan insertions unless they pre-existed.<sup>712</sup> Therefore, it is plausible to say that “Vielleicht ist die Rede in Lk 21 ein Kontamination von Markinischen und nicht markinischen Quellen, wie oft behauptet wurde.”<sup>713</sup>

Why would Luke omit the desecration of the Temple, which indeed took place in 70 CE? The rich Septuagintal colours are not enough to think, with Dodd, that the oracle preceded the events.<sup>714</sup> The existence of Lukan terms does not justify an assumption of free composition. In the case of 20:28, we observed how Luke agrees verbatim with the clusters he borrows from Mark and keeps them within the coherent composition of L, as shown above.

An additional enquiry comes from Franz Neirynck. While he admits the coherence of the section without the Markan insertions, he asks why Luke would disturb its homogeneity with these insertions. Neirynck finds this a strong argument against the existence of the source.<sup>715</sup> Actually, it would make more sense to add the Markan clusters to that admittedly homogeneous source rather than the other way around; the Markan insertions (particularly 26b-27) conclude the eschatological oracle with the second visitation of the Son of Man, and without it, the teaching on the deliverance and Parousia would not be fulfilled (hence it is *eschatological*).<sup>716</sup> Luke completed the eschatological shape of the oracle with the Markan insertions. Alongside the theological coherence between this unit and 19:41-

---

<sup>712</sup> This fits with the wider Lukan behaviour as proposed by both Streeter (*The Four Gospels*) and V. Taylor (*Behind the Third Gospel*); the Markan blocks were later added to the uniform Gospel of Proto-Luke formed from L and Q.

<sup>713</sup> W. Robinson, *Der Weg des Herrn* ((Zollikon-Zurich: Evangelische Verlag, 1964), 64.

<sup>714</sup> C. H. Dodd, “The Fall of Jerusalem and the ‘Abomination of Desolation’,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 37 (1947): 47–54. Dodd’s case is weak in light of the fact that the fragmentation of the vocabulary makes it more difficult to believe that it is a pre-70 CE oracle. It is more plausible to see it as a *Vaticinium ex eventu* in which the prophetic vocabulary was used to reflect the event with similar details to those found in Josephus’ historical account (see *B.J.* 6, *passim*). See Jer 41:1 (στρατόπεδον); 52:4-5 (περιεχάρακωσαν, κύκλω); 1 Kgs 23:8; 2 Macc 9:2; Isa 3:25 (μαχαίρα πεσοῦνται); Ezek 4:1-3 (χάρακα, παρεμβολὰς), etc.

<sup>715</sup> Neirynck, *L’Évangile de Luc*, 177–78.

<sup>716</sup> Cf. Bovon (*Luke* 3, 118–19).

44, as we will see, we may confidently join the scholars who think of a single continuous source behind this section *only*.<sup>717</sup>

In his investigation of the existence of Proto-Luke (L+Q), Vincent Taylor struggled with attributing this section to that Gospel despite the fact that it reflects the same Lukan behaviour in inserting Markan blocks into the proto-Lukan material. The reasoning is based on his presumption that proto-Luke should predate 70 CE and must therefore be an isolated piece.<sup>718</sup> However, Taylor's dating of proto-Luke (including L) before 70 CE is already speculative. Regardless of the exact or final shape of L, or even Proto-Luke before the compilation of canonical Luke, Luke 21:20-28 cannot be treated as an isolated piece as it reflects literary and theological similarities with other pieces we dealt with earlier.

Comparing 13:34-35 (Q), 19:41-44, 21:20-28 and 23:28-31 together reveals clear thematic similarities: (1) Jerusalem is the addressee and the subject matter (in the last two); (2) as a city that represents the rulers it is the target of the blame; (3) the four texts also mention the strong notion of the fate of Jerusalem's children (τὰ τέκνα σου/υμῶν); (4) the four texts are intensely rich in Septuagint vocabulary; (5) most importantly, while the four texts refuse to blame or criticise the Temple, 19:41-44 and 21:20-24 do not even refer to it, despite the fact that their parallel traditions in Mark clearly refer negatively to the Temple, not Jerusalem, as the target of the judgement, and this is what interests us more.<sup>719</sup> In light of these observations, I conclude that at least the last three texts

---

<sup>717</sup> Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*; V. Taylor, "A Cry from the Siege: A Suggestion Regarding a Non-Markan Oracle Embedded in Luke xxi 20-36," *JTS* 26 (1925): 136-44; C. H. Dodd, "The Fall of Jerusalem," 47-54; Paul Winter, "The treatment of his sources by the third evangelist in Luke XXI - XXIV," *Studia Theologica - Nordic Journal of Theology* 8 (1954): 138-72; O. P. Boismard, *En Quête*, passim; W. Nicol, "Tradition and Redaction in Luke 21," *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973): 61-71; F. Bovon, "Le récit Lucanien de la Passion," in Focant, *The Synoptic Gospels*, 393-423; Nolland, *Luke*, 999-1004; Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*, 770-4; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1342-4; Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke*, 244; Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 561; Schneider, "Lukas," 423; Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff Bei Lukas*, 178-80.

<sup>718</sup> Later, Taylor's uncertainty appears clearer in his published edition of proto-Luke which includes Luke 21:5-36 as an appendix.

<sup>719</sup> It is not surprising that Boismard puts these texts together in his synopsis. So too does Kurt Aland, Robert Funk and Throckmorton.

belong to the same special tradition. Whether it is a Lukan composition or an entirely pre-Lukan document is another issue.

In terms of redaction criticism, it is also obvious that Luke prioritised L's eschatological discourse over Mark, especially in 21:20-28 // Mark 13:14-27. Here, we should not overlook Luke's omission of Mark's abomination of desolation of the Temple, τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως (Mark 13:14a), and replacement with L's desolation of the city of Jerusalem, ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς [Ἱερουσαλήμ] (Luke 21:20b). Michael Bachmann's thesis is one of the strong voices in the argument against separating the Temple from Jerusalem here.<sup>720</sup> Even though he finds that "auffällig ist es ohne jede Frage", that the Lukan version of the eschatological discourse (Luke 21:20-24) shifts the reference from the destruction of the Temple (as in Mark) to Jerusalem,<sup>721</sup> he makes nothing of it. This should also remind us of the case of Luke 13:34-5, which lacked "ἐρημος" that appeared in the Matthean version.<sup>722</sup> To conclude, Luke probably prioritises his special source, in order to omit the Markan reference of the Temple's desolation which strongly suggests that Luke was eager to maintain the Temple's position as he did in the cases we have discussed earlier.

### **5.7 The Passion and Resurrection (Luke 22:1–24:53)**

In Mark, Jesus was accused of being heard threatening to destroy the Temple "that is made with hands (τὸν χειροποίητον)" and to build another "not made with hands (ἀχειροποίητον)" (14:58). Later, on the cross, Jesus is taunted about this: Οὐὰ ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις (15:29). The accusation of Jesus threatening the Temple has a good historical basis in light of the fact that it is multiply attested (John 2:19-21; Gos. Thom. 71; Acts 6:14).<sup>723</sup> The way the Gospel writers dealt with this shows how problematic this tradition was for early Christians. Matthew tones it down, "I *am able* (Δύναμαι) to destroy the Temple of God (26:61)," John allegorises it by saying that Jesus

---

<sup>720</sup> Bachmann, *Jerusalem und der Tempel*, 134-5.

<sup>721</sup> Bachmann, *Jerusalem und der Tempel*, 135.

<sup>722</sup> See p.166 above.

<sup>723</sup> On the historicity of this accusation see A. Brent, *A Political History of Early Christianity* (London: Black, 2009), 28–31.

meant his body (2:21), while Mark accuses the witnesses of providing false allegations (14:59). Luke omits Mark's accusation and follows his own source, which preserves a different accusation (Luke 23:2). The Judean authorities here make three major accusations against Jesus before Pilate: (i) of perverting (διαστρέφοντα) the nation, (ii) of forbidding them to pay the tribute to Caesar, and (iii) of claiming himself as χριστὸν βασιλέα (Luke 23:1). Bovon rightly notes that the three accusations are important,<sup>724</sup> but only the third was grave enough to capture Pilate's attention, hence his question to Jesus "Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων;" (23:3). Michael Wolter suggests: "Weil Lukas zuverlässig damit rechnen kann, dass die Leser sich noch sehr genau daran erinnern, dass Jesus gerade nicht zur Steuerverweigerung (*tax evasion*) aufgerufen hat (vgl. 20,20-25) und dass er sich gerade nicht als Messias König bezeichnet hat (vgl. 22,67-8), stellt Lukas sie als Lügner dar, die Jesus mit falschen Anschuldigungen beim römischen Statthalter verleumden (slander)."<sup>725</sup> The lack of any allusion to the alleged threat to the Temple, as in Mark, is by no means coincidental. Why did Luke not supply his accusations along with the Markan Temple-threatening one? The first accusation has an obvious religious tone. The verb διαστρέφοντα suggests a religious fraud and the emphatic repetition in v. 5 clearly shows that the problem is Jesus' teaching (διδάσκων) throughout (ὅλης) his journey, and not a specific Temple action.

It is important to observe that that accusation appears in Marcion's Evangelion with an extension: "to destroy the law and the prophets (καὶ καταλύοντα τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας" (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42; *Schol.* 69). Exegetes either ignored it or dismissed it as a Marcionite interpolation or a harmonisation with Matt 5:17.<sup>726</sup> However, there are several difficulties with this. First, it is well attested in western manuscripts that are not dependent on Marcion, particularly in Latin manuscripts: "*et solventem legem [nostram] et prophetas.*"<sup>727</sup> Second, this is the only Marcionite attestation that is longer than Luke's equivalent; Marcion is always shorter and it would be odd to think that he left the

---

<sup>724</sup> Bovon, "Luke 1," 253–54.

<sup>725</sup> M. Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 739.

<sup>726</sup> Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1475; Bovon *Luke 1*, 257. Cf. Dieter Roth, 'Matthean Texts and Tertullian's Accusations in *Adversus Marcionem*' *JTS* 59 (2008) 580-597, and *Idem*, *The Text of Marcion's Gospel*, 337.

<sup>727</sup> MSS: b c e ff2 gat i l q vg4.

entire Evangelion without additions except for this one verse. Third, we have no other evidence of a Marcionite tendency to harmonise Luke with Matthew. It is important to note that Luke mentions similar offences against the Temple in the trials of Stephen and Paul (Acts 6:13; 24:6, respectively). It is certainly difficult to conclude that the Latin/Marcionite extension fits in the history of Luke's composition, but we have two possibilities. Either canonical Luke did not have this and the Latin tradition added it at a later recension, or Luke cut it from his source (used by Marcion) along with the anti-Temple accusations in Mark, since both are equally dangerous on the image of piety which Luke was building up for Jesus rather carefully throughout the Gospel. It is worth noting that without this extension, the accusation appears rather vague and unclear, and the Evangelion's edition makes the verse more understandable.

With regard to Luke's omission of the Markan accusation, it seems that the problem was not the accusation itself, since the apostles themselves received the same accusations and Paul firmly rejected attributing to him any offence against the Temple. Thus, Luke's problem seems to be with the peculiar Markan interpolation "made / not made with hands." This explanatory interpolation was perhaps added by Mark to "let the reader understand" (13:14) a difference between the two temples. Therefore, it reflects Mark's own Temple theology which uses the derogatory expression "made with hands" for the abominated Temple of Jerusalem vis-à-vis the Christian one not made with hands. It is interesting to observe that the term ἀχειροποίητον is peculiar to Mark and does not seem to appear anywhere else earlier.<sup>728</sup> This is what Luke refused to include and to emphasise his rejection of this theology he had to omit the Markan taunting as well. This is striking evidence of the difference between Mark and Luke on the Temple.

### **5.7.1 The Death of Jesus (Luke 23:44-49)**

Concerning the death of Jesus in Luke 23:44-49, Luke is dependent mainly on Mark (15:33-37). However, there are a few significant differences that raise questions about Luke's intentions. Luke follows Mark in mentioning the darkness over the whole earth between the sixth and the ninth hours.

---

<sup>728</sup> Cf. R. E. Brown, *Death of the Messiah* (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 439.

However, Luke gives an extra explanation to the darkness: “the sun eclipsed (τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος)” (23:45). He also replaces Jesus’ loud cry, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” (Mark 15:34), with “Father into your hands I commit my spirit (23:46).” Luke then reorders Jesus’ death and the tearing of the Temple veil by bringing the latter first and adding the reaction of the crowd (23:48).

While the darkness over the earth has its Old Testament parallels (Jer 15:9; Zeph 1:15; Joel 2:2; 3:4; Amos 8:9-10), the added eclipse of the sun seems to have a strong resonance in Roman literature, especially the death of Julius Caesar (Plutarch, *Caesar* 69.4, *Romulus* 27.6; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 15.785, *Fasti* 2.493; Virgil, *Georgics* 1.467; Cicero, *Rep.* 6.22; Josephus, *A.J.* 14.12.3). One remembers here other correspondences with the life of Augustus noted earlier, especially in the infancy narrative.<sup>729</sup>

This should also lead us to understand Luke’s intention to associate this cosmic event with the rending of the Temple’s veil. In the Lukan context, this sign does not necessarily deem the Temple void. The tearing of the Temple is not in reaction to Jesus’ death, as in Mark. There, it is understandable since this Temple is to be replaced with one not made with hands and hence Jesus’ atoning death brings the tearing of the Temple veil. Matthew’s case is also seen in light of Jesus’ explicit statement which puts him at odds with the Temple, τοῦ ἱεροῦ μεῖζόν ἐστιν (12:6). As we said, Luke omits any possible theological offence to the Temple in Mark’s account and this should be considered when we note the relocation of the veil’s rendering in Luke.

The relocation of the event before Jesus’ death has been confusing.<sup>730</sup> The scribe of Codex Bezae relocated it according to the Markan order. However, the relocation makes sense in terms of Luke’s attitude to the Temple. Uniquely in Luke, the Temple has been the place where God expresses his will. As we saw, it is where he reveals (1:5-20), receives (2:22-52), justifies (18:9-14), and now reacts to the suffering of his Son. Therefore, the tearing of the veil explains the cosmic eclipse. If indeed the

<sup>729</sup> Cf. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*” 1042–43.

<sup>730</sup> On the different positions scholars take in the interpretation of the event in Luke see n.7 in D. D. Sylva, “The Temple Curtain and Jesus’ Death in the Gospel of Luke,” *JBL* 105 (1986): 239–50.

eclipse of the sun as a natural omen was meant to send a message to the Romans, perhaps the same readers could see something in the tearing of the veil in the same manner as the omens of divine providence. Josephus also uses the supernatural events around the Temple as omens for its destruction in a language that aims to reach the Roman reader. One of these signs was finding open the heavy eastern gate of the Temple (which needs twenty men to move it) “at the sixth hour” (as well) which was shocking to the guards (*B.J.* 6.293-295). Josephus adds an important remark: like the earlier phenomena, this incident was understood by “the common/unskilled (ἰδιώταις)” as a good omen (κάλλιστον τέρας) in which God opens the gates of blessings, but for the well-educated people (οἱ λόγοι) it was understood as a provocation of enemies. It appears to me that Josephus meant to refer to the Roman sense of this omen, given that the doors of the Janus and Quirinus temple were always open as long as Rome was in a state of war and aggression, and the doors were shut only when the situation was peaceful (Augustus, *Res Gestae* 13; Livy 1.19; Horace 4.15.9). Josephus’ interest in explaining the gate in the language of omens, then, reflects his intention to reach out to the Roman reader. Luke’s relocation of the veil’s tearing in association with the sun’s eclipse *before* Jesus’ death might also reflect the same approach: war and calamities will befall Jerusalem and its Temple.

Therefore, the eclipse was probably meant to give the meaning of a divine reaction to the death of Jesus in the same way it does in Roman literature. We saw that Josephus gives us a case of using the Roman concept of divine omens in the Jewish context and I gave an example from the Temple itself before its destruction. Yet Josephus did not understand it as a condemnation of the Temple after its destruction. Therefore, it boosts the plausibility of my interpretation of Luke’s addition. If this is the case, then the association of the eclipse with tearing the veil before Jesus’ death could make the latter a divine omen like the former with no reason to interpret it as a condemnation of the Temple.

### **5.7.2 The Resurrection and Ascension (Luke 24:1-53)**

Jesus’ responses to the disciples on the road to Emmaus and his encounter with the frightened ones in Jerusalem involve clarifications of how events are deeply rooted in Scripture (Luke 24:27, 44-46). It is not long before the scene returns to Jerusalem where Jesus declares, Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν (24:36b). The

mission to the gentiles has its point of departure from Jerusalem (24:47). In reaction to his instructions, the disciples not only stay in Jerusalem but spend “all their time” in the Temple blessing God, καὶ ἦσαν διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν (24:53).

Jeremias observes that this section is heavily Lukan.<sup>731</sup> Interestingly, the vast majority of what Jeremias labels as “Redaktion” appears as well in the infancy section.<sup>732</sup> The section concludes in the same location as where the Gospel started—the Temple. At the beginning, Zechariah εὐλογῶν τὸν θεόν (1:64), and at the end the disciples εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν (24:53). The stylistic and theological similarity coincide with the striking fact that Marcion’s Evangelion lacks both sections.<sup>733</sup> This is in line with our understanding of the composition history of Luke in which the final author (who also wrote Acts) prefixed and concluded the Gospel with materials of similar style and theology, both of which emphasize piety in allegiance to the ancient faith and its Temple.

## ***5.8 The First Community in Jerusalem and the First Council (Acts 1:12–15:30)***

Acts builds on the final instruction of Jesus, for the disciples to engage in preaching the Gospel, starting from Jerusalem to the end of the earth (Luke 24:47-48). This is what Luke reminds Theophilus about at the beginning of this second work (Acts 1:8).<sup>734</sup> Consequently, Jerusalem and the Temple remain as the central point. As we noted, however, there are diverse scholarly opinions about the Temple attitude expressed in Acts. One of the arguments made for an anti-Temple attitude in Luke

---

<sup>731</sup> Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*, 323: “In vv. 50-53 ließen sich keine Spuren der Tradition erkennen; dieser abschließende Himmelfahrtsbericht wird daher lukanische Komposition seine.”

<sup>732</sup> ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (24:47//1:77); ἐξαπέστειλεν (24:48//1:53 'Ik Vorzugswort'); ἐξ ὕψους (Luke 24:49//1:78 only here in the entire New Testament); the verb composition with δια in διέστη 24:51//1:65 (see Jeremias' analysis, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*, 70); Ἱερουσαλὴμ (24:52//2:25); χαρὰς μεγάλης (24:52//2:10); εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν (24:53//1:64).

<sup>733</sup> As well as the infancy narrative, 24:48-53 is unattested in Maricon.

<sup>734</sup> We saw how 1 Clement indeed reports Paul’s mission to be as far as the end of the Roman Empire (in the west).

is the fact that the Pentecost event happened in “one place,” a location other than the Temple, and that this prepares the way for the household as an alternative.<sup>735</sup> But Luke did not put the household against the Temple. He simply states: “Day by day, as they spent much time in one accord in the Temple (ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ), they broke bread at home (κατ’ οἶκον) and ate their food with glad and generous hearts, praising God and having the goodwill of all the people” (Acts 2:46-47b).

This summary is thoroughly Lukan in style<sup>736</sup> and resembles the summary of Luke 19:47, which starts with the same introduction (καθ’ ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ). The Pentecost event does not alter what was stated in Luke 24:53, indicating the disciples’ continuous presence (day by day) in the Temple. This does not dissolve through the successive conflicts as Luke reminds us: “And every day in the Temple and at home (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ κατ’ οἶκον) they did not cease to teach and proclaim Jesus as the Messiah” (Acts 5:42). However, the balance between the two bodies must be maintained: the presence of the Temple for daily prayers is something that does not conflict with the act of breaking the bread at home.<sup>737</sup>

This balance is unique to Luke throughout the New Testament, though we see it once again in 1 Clement. The Roman community understood the centrality of the Temple, which sustains its identity in harmony with its Eucharistic practices in their households. If indeed 1 Clement is a window into interpreting this ecclesiological formula, we could see that Luke’s point was to preserve the Temple roots to protect the Christians’ and at the same time understand the household liturgy in this light, lest it be understood as a novelty which would endanger the Christian position in the Roman religious system. Thus, Clement concludes his exposition on the church order in light of the Temple (1 Clem. 40-42.4) by emphasising that τοῦτο οὐ καινῶς (1 Clem. 42.5).

<sup>735</sup> Cf. J. H. Elliott, " Temple versus Household, " 102, 107.

<sup>736</sup> καθ’ ἡμέραν [...] ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (see Luke 19:47; 24:53); ἀγαλλίασις a Lukan characteristic (Luke 1:14, 44); see Harnack, *Einführung*, 72, 140, 151; J. Dupont, *Les Beatitudes*, Tome II (Paris: La Bonne Nouvelle, 1969), 320–22; A. Denaux, *The Vocabulary of Luke* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 3. ἀφελότητι only here. προσκαρτερέω once in Mark and five times in Acts (1:14; 2:42, 46; 6:4; 8:13; 10:7).

<sup>737</sup> κλῶντές clearly signifies the act of the institution of the Eucharist as it appears with this meaning in the New Testament. Mark 14:22; Matt 26:6; Luke 22:19, 24:30; 1 Cor 10:16, 11:24.

Luke describes the mood of the Christian community's presence in the Temple as being ὁμοθυμαδόν: something done with one accord. In the NT, with the exception of Rom 15:6, this term appears only in Acts, ten times.<sup>738</sup> The term appears in the Septuagint and implies homogeneity and harmony amongst the members of any group.<sup>739</sup> The mood of harmonious existence is consequently an embodiment of the message of peace which is a fundamental element in the Gospel of Luke. This state of prevalent peace and harmony (across the cities) (Acts 9:31) is synonymous with 1 Clement's εἰρήνη καὶ ὁμονοία.<sup>740</sup> It is not clear why Luke did not directly use ὁμονοία, but perhaps it is due to his tendency to use Septuagintal language as ὁμοθυμαδόν. But it is also important to see that this harmony is actualised in the Temple, which completes the image of Christianity as a legitimate belief. The Temple is the space of peace and harmony amongst the apostles, who symbolise the ideal Christian community. This is also the case in Acts 5:12 where the apostles perform signs and wonders, being together in one accord (ἦσαν ὁμοθυμαδόν) in Solomon's portico. It is therefore safe to conclude that the image of a community being in one accord in the Temple is an image of piety according to the Roman norm and combining the themes of peace, concord and the Temple cannot be coincidental.

This appeal to antiquity appears clearly in the third chapter which takes place entirely in the Temple. After healing the crippled beggar, Peter gives a speech that could be described as an *apologia* for the antiquity of the faith. His speech starts with his emphasis on the role of the God of Israel in performing the miracle (that took place in the Temple). The legitimacy of the faith appears in his statement: ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἐδόξασεν τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν (Acts 3:13). The expression ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν is a Lukan characteristic that appears in the New Testament only in Acts through the speeches of different figures, which rules out the possibility that the expression is derived from Luke's sources (Acts 3:13 and 5:30 [Peter]; 22:14 [Ananias]; 24:14 [Paul]). The expression appears to play an important role in rooting the Christian proclamation in the tradition of Israel and its God, and is thus an attempt to defend its antiquity.

---

<sup>738</sup> Acts 1:14; 2:46; 4:24; 5:12; 7:57; 8:6; 12:20; 15:25; 18:12; 19:29.

<sup>739</sup> See, for example, Exodus 19:8; Num 27:21; Job 2:11, 3:18, 6:2; Jer 5:5; 46:21; Lam 2:8. See also Plato, *Laws* 805a.

<sup>740</sup> See below, p. 250.

The speech also furthers the theme of distinguishing between the Jewish people, who are excused for unbelief against Jesus due to their ignorance, and the Judaeans rulers (Acts 3:17). Luke is the only Gospel that describes the Jerusalem people returning to their homes “beating their breasts” (23:48) after Jesus’ death. The problem is not with the people of God, then, who will join the movement in masses (Acts 2:47; 4:4; 21:20, etc.), but with the unrepentant rulers. Finally, Peter discloses the eschatological hope of the returning Messiah coming back to his people after everything is restored (ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων, Acts 3:21).<sup>741</sup> The eschatology of Luke appears clearly. This restoration, which lacks any references to apocalyptic destruction, would not fit with the abandonment of Judaism or its Temple; it is quite the opposite, especially for a post-destruction reader (cf. 1 Clem. 28-29).<sup>742</sup>

This is the image of a church centralised in Jerusalem that defends its allegiance to the law and the Temple. The second summary in 5:12-16 confirms the divine instruction for the disciples to remain in the Temple despite persecution. The synodical letter sent from the council of Jerusalem to the gentile churches emphasises the image of concord as expressed in the term Ὁμοθυμαδὸν (Acts 15:25).

### **5.9 Stephen (Acts 6:5 – 8:1)**

As we saw in our survey of scholarship since Baur, the speech of Stephen was considered to be a fundamental testimony to the emergence of an anti-temple voice of Christians at an early stage.<sup>743</sup> The distinctiveness of the speech created more debates over its historicity and function in Luke-Acts. We saw James Dunn, in particular, raising the problem of its role within the double work and its contradictory attitude to Luke's positive attitude.<sup>744</sup> However, some scholars did not see this problem. David Francis Weinert's unpublished thesis,<sup>745</sup> which was later presented in three articles,<sup>746</sup> endorsed

---

<sup>741</sup> See also the rebuilding of the dwelling of David (Acts 15:16).

<sup>742</sup> We have already seen in 2 Baruch that the restoration mainly targeted the Temple.

<sup>743</sup> See above, p. 8.

<sup>744</sup> *Unity and Diversity*, 128. In p.270 he says " Suffice it to say that the speech is so distinctive within Acts and chapters 6-8 contain such distinctive features that .the most plausible view is that Luke is here drawing on a source which has preserved quite accurately the views of the Hellenists or even Stephen in particular with regard to the temple." See also, Dunn, *Beginning from Jerusalem*, 244. *Partings*, 86-7.

<sup>745</sup> F. D. Weinert, 1979. *The Meaning of the Temple in the Gospel of Luke*, (PhD dissertation, Fordham: Fordham University).

the positive attitude of Luke-Acts, seeing no challenge to this attitude in Stephen's speech.<sup>747</sup> Weinert acknowledges that the speech, along with Paul's on the Areopagus, could give the sense of a negative view of the Temple. As an advocate of the positive attitude of Luke, he suggests some solutions in his short paper.<sup>748</sup> Perhaps Stephen's criticism "may be extended to the Temple only in the measure that this institution is used to ground an erroneous understanding of what Moses, David and Solomon had done."<sup>749</sup> Or it could be an emphasis on God's transcendence over a limited house, reminding us that Solomon himself acknowledged that in his prayer (1 Kgs 8:27; 2 Chr. 6:18). He goes further to suggest that verse 7:47 "But it was Solomon who built a house for him" should be reread parenthetically to become: "though [it was] Solomon [who] built him [God] a house," in order to continue the previous positive statement about God granting David a dwelling place. Weinert's remarks are shared by several researchers who also refuse a negative depiction of the Temple in the speech.<sup>750</sup> The problem of this approach is that it extracts the Temple section in the speech and treats it apart from the speech as a whole. Therefore, the possibilities of its interpretation are open. What is needed is to address the evidence outside the speech and the speech itself in order to realise the difficulty of the problem. N. H. Taylor is correct about his observation that such approaches fail to explain how the theme of continuous disobedience (idolatry) includes the Temple section and constructs Solomon's building of the Temple as "epitomising Israel's history of defiance of God."<sup>751</sup> These views will be discussed in my following analysis.

---

<sup>746</sup> F. D. Weinert (1981). The meaning of the Temple in Luke-Acts. *Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, 11 (3): 85-89. *idem.*, "Luke, Stephen, and the Temple in Luke-Acts." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 17.3 (1987): 88-90.

<sup>747</sup> Weinert, *The Meaning of the Temple*, 15-22.

<sup>748</sup> Weinert, "Luke, Stephen, and the Temple in Luke-Acts," 89.

<sup>749</sup> Weinert, "Luke, Stephen, and the Temple in Luke-Acts," 89.

<sup>750</sup> James P. Sweeney, "Stephen's Speech (Acts 7:2-53): Is It as 'Anti-Temple' as is Frequently Alleged?," *TRINJ* 23 (2002): 185-210. Eyal Regev, "Temple Concerns and High-Priestly Prosecutions from Peter to James: Between Narrative and History," *NTS* 56 (2010): 64-89. Dennis D. Sylva, "The Meaning and Function of Acts 7:46-50," *JBL* 106.2 (1987): 261-275. John J. Kilgallen, "The Function of Stephen's Speech (Acts 7,2-53)," *Biblica* 70.2 (1989), 173-93.

<sup>751</sup> Nicholas H. Taylor, "Stephen, the Temple, and Early Christian Eschatology," *Revue Biblique* 110.1 (2003): 62-85. See also Barrett, *Acts* 374; Fitzmyer, *Acts* 383. See also F. J. Foakes, "Stephen's Speech in Acts," *JBL* 49.3 (1930), 283-289.

The speech of Stephen in Acts 7 has led many scholars to assume that a negative attitude to the Temple is held by Luke. The peculiarity of the speech has led scholars to suggest that either Stephen offered a rejection of the Jerusalem Temple per se,<sup>752</sup> a rejection of the idea of an immobile house for God,<sup>753</sup> or a theological critique to limiting God's presence to the Temple only.<sup>754</sup>

### 5.9.1 The Speech

The level of criticism against the Temple in 7:48-50 has led scholars to speculate about the possible background of Stephen.<sup>755</sup> There were several proposals to solve this problem. Some scholars have suggested that Stephen belonged to an early Samaritan group that joined Christianity.<sup>756</sup> For instance, Martin H. Scharlemann suggested that using the term *τόπος* in reference to the Temple is a Samaritan

---

<sup>752</sup> J. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998); Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1988), 56ff; M. Simon, "Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 11 (1951): 127–42; H. H. Wendt, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), 1.

<sup>753</sup> F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: the Greek text with introduction and commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 205; Weinert, "Luke, Stephen, and the Temple in Luke-Acts," 88–90; Edvin Larsson, "Temple-Criticism and the Jewish Heritage: Some Reflexions on Acts 6–7," *NTS* 39 (1993): 379–95.

<sup>754</sup> Walter Schmithals, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas* (Zürich: TVZ, 1982); G. Schneider, "Stephanus, die Hellenisten und Samaria," in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*, ed. J. Kremer (Gembloux: Duculot, 1979), 215–40; D. Sylva, "The Meaning and Function of Acts 7:46-50," *JBL* 106 (1987): 261–75.

<sup>755</sup> Cf. Eduard Zeller, ed., *Die Apostelgeschichte, ihre Composition und ihr Charakter* (Tübingen: von Ludwig Friedrich Fues, 1851), 433ff. Zeller suggested an Essene background of Stephen but this is more speculative. On Qumran as a source for Stephen's thought see A. F. J. Klijn, "Stephen's Speech—Acts VII. 2-53," *NTS* 4 (1957): 25–31. Schoeps suggested a Jewish Christian group not far from James' community and perhaps an Ebionite sect. H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1949), 441; Jones, *Recognitions*, 20 n.82; Marcel Simon, "Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 2 (1951): 127–42. On the Ebionites' attitude see *Clem. Recogn.* 1, 38.; Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 164ff; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 56–57; Fitzmyer (*Acts*, 367) rules out Qumran and suggests the Therapeutae as a better representative of this attitude. Cf. Jürgen Roloff, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 125.

<sup>756</sup> Cf. A. Spiro, "Stephen's Samaritan Background," in *The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. Johannes Munck (New York: Doubleday, 1967). For a review of the theory's arguments see E. Richard, "Acts 7: An Investigation of the Samaritan Evidence," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39 (1977): 190–208.

tradition (Acts 6:14).<sup>757</sup> However, Luke uses this term frequently in his double work. On a similar occasion, the Judaeen authority accusers also used it to refer to the Temple in their accusation against Paul (Acts 21:28). Further, Stephen's criticism is not against the place of the Temple (which is the point of dispute between the Jews and the Samaritans) but the very idea of building a Temple at all. Some other scholars also have suggested an Essenic background, but the same problem applies; the Essenes were not against the idea of a Temple, but against those in charge of it.

Marcel Simon supported the view of looking at Stephen as a Jewish-Christian in a way similar to what we find in the *Clementine Recognitions*.<sup>758</sup> However, Hans J. Schoeps narrowed Stephen's identity to Ebionism in particular. According to Schoeps, this could be concluded from comparing the structure and content of the speech with the speech of Peter in the *Clementine Recognitions* (1.27-43), which he calls "the Ebionite Acts".<sup>759</sup> Schoeps went on to suggest that Stephen's martyrdom episode was a cover-up for the martyrdom of James.<sup>760</sup> However, the similarity between the two speeches is not as remarkable as Schoeps and Simon suggest. Further, the speech in the *Recognitions* shows that the Jewish-Christian group behind it did not reject the Temple itself but thought that animal sacrifices should end with the coming of Jesus. In contrast to Stephen's anti-Temple statement, the First Temple was appointed by God for offering the sacrifices legitimately (*Clem. Recogn.* 1.37).

It is important to observe, as Simon J. Joseph and Stanley Jones show, that the Ebionite critique of animal sacrifices is part of a wider Jewish-Christian ascetic interest in vegetarianism.<sup>761</sup> This means that the main target of criticism is animal sacrifices rather than the building that hosts this ritual. In Stephen's speech, the problem is the opposite, at least in terms of Israel's past. Stephen did not criticise the meeting place for animal sacrifices. His problem was with the (man-made) Temple itself.

---

<sup>757</sup> Cf. M. H. Sharlemann, *Stephen: a singular saint* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968), 20, 45–51.

<sup>758</sup> Marcel Simon, "Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 2 (1951): 127–42.

<sup>759</sup> H. J. Schoeps, *Jewish Christianity: Factional Disputes in the Early Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 42–45.

<sup>760</sup> Schoeps, *Jewish Christianity*, 43f. See also Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte*, 441.

<sup>761</sup> Joseph, *Jesus and the Temple*, 182 (particularly n.84).

In 1901, Benjamin W. Bacon developed the concept of Alexandrianism which is based on Jewish Alexandrian texts and early Alexandrian Christian writings which witness some features similar to those found in Stephen's speech. The level of the anti-Judaic theology of Stephen, his view of history which does not follow the Pauline Supersessionism (grace replacing law), and the early traces of typology, made Bacon think of Stephen as an early witness to Alexandrian Christianity.<sup>762</sup> This was also supported later by W. Soltau,<sup>763</sup> and reinforced by Leslie Barnard who aimed to show further theological affinities (particularly in Christology) between Stephen and Barnabas, but they do not mount up to a safe conclusion.<sup>764</sup> In his treatment of the matter, James Carleton-Paget agrees with Barnard's work, stating that the theologies of Stephen and Barnabas are "close enough to speak of a relationship of a common tradition."<sup>765</sup> This possibility has not yet received its deserved attention. A careful comparison between Stephen and an Alexandrian text like the Epistle of Barnabas has not yet been undertaken.

## ***Analysis***

### **Luke's voice:**

Although the event and the speech of Stephen are probably Lukan composition,<sup>766</sup> the report on Stephen's martyrdom must have been based on a pre-Lukan tradition with a distinctively non-Lukan

---

<sup>762</sup> B. Bacon, "Stephen's Speech: Its Argument and Doctrinal Relationship," in *Biblical and Semitic Studies*, eds. E. Curtis et al. (Cambridge, MA: Wilson, 1901), 213ff.

<sup>763</sup> W. Soltau, "Die Herkunft der Reden in der Apostelgeschichte," in *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urschristentums*, ed. E. Preuschen (Leipzig: von W. Drugulin, 1903), 128–54.

<sup>764</sup> L. W. Barnard, "Saint Stephen and Early Alexandrian Christianity," *NTS* 7 (1960): 31–45.

<sup>765</sup> Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 205f.

<sup>766</sup> The scene of the arrest has the classic Lukan structure: the agitation of the authorities followed by the anger of the mob over a misunderstanding of the teachings of a Christian (full of the spirit) (Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 164–65). The parallelism between Jesus and Stephen is remarkable. Cf. Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 168. On the Lukan vocabulary and style see Bacon's convincing analysis in "Stephen's Speech," in Curtis, *Biblical and Semitic Studies*, 233–36.

theology which Luke therefore had to give an explanation for.<sup>767</sup> This is an important point in understanding how Luke explained the theology of Stephen in a way that allowed it to fit into the wider picture of the diverse first Christians.<sup>768</sup> Based on this, it is important to distinguish between Luke's voice and the voice of his source. We should see the Lukan voice in characterising the accusers as false witnesses, μάρτυρας ψευδεῖς (Acts 6:13), which implies the falsification of the accusation itself. The accusations are probably composed by Luke, hence the difficulty in reconstructing the source of his information.<sup>769</sup> His characteristic terms τοῦ τόπου, τοῦ ἁγίου and τὰ ἔθνη show his interest to refuse these particular allegations made repeatedly against Christians: speaking against the ancestral customs (Acts 16:21; 21:28; 24:6, etc.). This dangerous accusation is the same accusation addressed against Jesus in Luke's source (Mark 14:58), but Luke shifted it to be made against Stephen as part of several parallelisms with Jesus' own martyrdom (Luke 23:2). While Luke does not need to explain that the accusations made against Jesus are false, since they were obviously so, he states the falsification explicitly in Stephen's cases in light of the fact that the speech itself could justify these accusations, calling the witnesses μάρτυρας ψευδεῖς (Acts 6:13a). Luke refuses any interpretation of Stephen's speech as "words against this place (ῥήματα κατὰ τοῦ τόπου)" (Acts 6:13b).

## 2. Stephen's voice

Throughout the speeches of Acts, the apostles use language relevant to the background of their hearers. Paul's speech to the Athenians in the Areopagus philosophical language is different to the language of his other responses to his Judaeans accusers and the Roman authorities (Acts 17:16-34; 21:37ff. 23:6; 25:8).<sup>770</sup> We should, then, see Stephen's speech in light of a rhetoric that uses a language and argument accessible to the accusers who are, in Stephen's case, Diaspora Jews mainly

---

<sup>767</sup> I also agree with Pervo's suggestion that "the core comes from the gentile mission source, which apparently related the martyrdom of Stephen not simply to glorify a hero but to explain its subsequent history" (*Dating Acts*, 165).

<sup>768</sup> Cf. Killgallen "Stephen's Speech," 121.

<sup>769</sup> Cf. Conzelmann, *Acts*, 48.

<sup>770</sup> See also the way the accusers of Jesus framed their accusations to be appealing to Pilate (23:2-3).

from Cyrene and Alexandria.<sup>771</sup> This could be inferred from Luke's seeming division between the synagogue of the freedmen, the Cyrene, and the Alexandrian on the one hand (9a), and the Cilicians and Asians on the other (9b).<sup>772</sup> This leads us to enquire whether we should take into consideration the mentioned addressees as being an element in constructing the background of Stephen's rhetoric. But first we have to define Stephen's own attitude from the speech.

The speech is a survey of the sinful history of the Jews (our ancestors). It is divided into a diptych of two contradictory stances: God's action, and the Jewish reaction:

| God's Action                                                                          | <i>our ancestor's</i> Reaction                          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Granting covenant to Abraham and the <i>patriarchs</i> (2-8)                       |                                                         |
|                                                                                       | The <i>patriarchs</i> persecute Joseph (9-16)           |
| 2. Reviving the covenant and giving the law to <i>Moses</i> (central section 17 - 34) |                                                         |
|                                                                                       | Abandoning <i>Moses</i> and turning to idolatry (35-43) |

<sup>771</sup> Therefore, I agree with Pervo's remark that "the exegetical questions are the elucidation of the synagogue or synagogues mentioned in v. 9" (*Dating Acts*, 165).

<sup>772</sup> See Bacon, "Stephen's Speech," in Curtis, *Biblical and Semitic Studies*, 220–21; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 47; Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 165, etc. If Blass is correct in favouring the reading of Λιβύων (Libyans) rather than Λιβερτίων (Freedmen) then this might be a North African synagogue, as Bacon suggests (220), that comprises Libyans, Cyrenes and Alexandrians (which would be enlisted in this verse in a geographical order) but this is not certain. Cf. F. Blass, *Philology of the Gospels* (London: McMillan, 1898), 69. However, the fact remains that an Alexandrian synagogue existed in Jerusalem (*J.Meg.* 3.1.7 and *T.Meg.* 3.6).

|                                                  |                                                                       |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3. Giving <i>the tent of testimony</i> (44 - 46) |                                                                       |
|                                                  | Replacing <i>the tent of testimony</i> with a man-made temple (47-50) |
| Judgement (51-53)                                |                                                                       |

In this way, we can understand issues like (i) the brief notion of Joseph, (ii) the lengthy section of Moses, and (iii) the negativity of Solomon's building of the Temple.

Joseph was needed to show the negative reaction of the patriarchs who received the promise of the covenant yet persecuted their brother. Joseph's life is not the purpose of this inclusion, but his persecution at the hands of the patriarchs is.

The second section on Moses is the central part which aims to show how Israel lost the covenant in the time of its fulfilment. Thus, it begins with this announcement: "But as the time of the promise (ὁ χρόνος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας) that God made to Abraham drew near" (Acts 7:17a). The following part (vv. 18-34) is an explanation of the quality of the man God chose to lead his nation, which concludes with Moses' reception of the promised law. The second part (vv. 35-43) shows Israel's reaction, which is a rejection of Moses as a person and eventually of the covenant itself when Israel turned to idolatry by revelling in the works of their hands: εὐφραίνοντο ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν (Acts 7:41).

The third section also starts from Moses, to whom God gave the divine order of worship in the shape of the tent of testimony. Despite the continuance of allegiance to this legitimate form of worship until David, Solomon replaced it with a temple (v. 47). Stephen reminds us again of Israel's sin of rejoicing in the works of their hands by stating that οὐχ ὁ ὕψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ (v. 48). The scholars who do not see in the term χειροποιήτοις a problem to their positive reading of the text fail to adequately address its meaning and implications. For example, Dennis Sylva's suggestion that the

speech focused on "God's transcendence of earthly places of worship in general"<sup>773</sup> does not see the function of the term in the text. We should note that the term resonates with the earlier statement of Stephen on how the Jews in Sinai sinfully were rejoicing "in the works of their hands" (7:41). The reader cannot escape Stephen's emphasis on the continuous problem of the Jews' idolatrous choice of celebrating man-made cults from the golden calf incident to the Temple of Solomon. Kilgallen suggests that the negativity, if it exists, targets the idea of "housing" God i.e. building a house (οἶκος) and not the divine dwelling since the idea of the tent seemed acceptable in verse 7:44.<sup>774</sup> However, the criticism (after ἀλλὰ) in v. 48 is not against housing God, but houses "made with hands." Further, Kilgallen's argument about the contrast between the tent and the Temple in fact proves the point concerning the need to understand the term of "χειροποίητος" in a way different to the simple interpretation as "physical," since the tent is *technically* a χειροποίητος. This leads us to the next point. Decisive insights on the impact of this term could be drawn from the Jewish texts we studied earlier. In Philo we saw that the term is used to label any gentile objects put in the Temple (*Legat.* 292 see also *QE* 2.85). In the Fourth Sybilline Oracles we also saw the critique against temples "made with hands" (Sib. Or. 4.6-11), yet we showed the author's appreciation of the "great Temple of God" (Sib. Or. 4.115-118) and how its destruction will usher in cosmic eschatological tribulation. The same case was found in God's interpretation of the promise to Baruch in 2 Bar. 4.2-4, in which the Temple will be glorified and renewed in the eschaton (2 Bar. 32.2-5). Therefore, the Jewish texts we surveyed show us that the term should not necessarily be understood in the light of the contrast between what is heavenly and what is physical or earthly, but as something invalid because it was "fashioned" (Philo, *QE* 2.85-6) according to human design with no divine archetype. This explains the difference in Stephen's attitude towards the tent and the Temple. We should not focus on this term only as this will not give us a complete answer to the question of Stephen's views, rather we need to return back to the point of its function in the speech as a whole. So, the analogy between the two sins (worshipping the golden calf and building the Temple of Jerusalem) in their nature (turning to man-made options) and position in the structure of the speech leads to the conclusion that Stephen completely rejected the

---

<sup>773</sup> Sylva, "The Meaning and Function of Acts 7:46-50," 267.

<sup>774</sup> Kilgallen, "The Function of Stephen's Speech (Acts 7:2-53)," 177-8.

Temple. The building of the Temple is a sin that flows from the original one in which the *ἐπαγγελία* was not fulfilled. That is, it becomes the worship of the golden calf.

Thus, the judgement in verses 51-53 sums up Stephen's view. He switches his language from "our ancestors" to "your" ancestors in what appears to be a form of dissociation of his Christian faith (as Israel?) from the Judaism of the Jerusalem authorities. This is entirely different from the rest of Acts. Even the Lukan Paul emphasises his affiliation to "our ancestors". This divisive tone is associated in the final verse (53) with losing the law (in Sinai) in what seems to be the beginning of the end of (true) Israel. It is also remarkable that this dissociation does not take place during Jesus' death, but long before. Stephen makes a connection between the figures of persecuted Joseph and Moses (who was already connected with Jesus in v. 37) and the persecution of "the Righteous One". Thus, we find two fundamental issues raised by Stephen: the categorical rejection of the Temple of Jerusalem and the rejection of Jesus. They are knitted together in this speech.<sup>775</sup> Both stem from Israel's original sin, their turning away from Moses to idolatry, which led the nation to lose the covenant.

The view expressed within the speech, in which the covenant was lost before its delivery, condemns Israel a long time before the coming of Jesus and defies its identity as a people of God. Further, its categorical rejection of the Temple as something analogous to idolatry is unparalleled. This is not simply an un-Lukan speech in the heart of Acts; it is also unparalleled anywhere else in the New Testament.

As far as we are concerned, it is the distinction between Luke's voice and Stephen's that should be noticed. For Stephen, the problem is not only in it being physical (as the tabernacle indeed was) but it being treated as a human alternative to the will of God. This radicalism does not represent Luke's understanding. For Luke, the accusation of Jesus supporting a categorical rejection of the Temple is false and, as we saw, the Temple has always been maintained by the churches with great appreciation. However, it is probably Luke's intention to include the substance of the speech for another purpose.

---

<sup>775</sup> This agrees with what John Kilgallen thinks of the intertwining of Jesus and the Temple in the speech. See J. Kilgallen, "The Function of Stephen's Speech (Acts 7:2-53)," *Biblica*, 70 (1989): 173–93.

The Temple's existence is not the problem but in a realised eschatological situation it transcends the limitations imposed by the Judaeans rulers. The problem is, as Gerhard Schneider puts it, that the Temple is no longer "Haus des Gebetes für alle Völker."<sup>776</sup> Consequently, Jesus' prophetic statement in his cleansing of the Temple (Luke 19:46; Isa 56:7) is key, and for this Paul was arrested for bringing Greeks into the Temple despite his unceasing defence of loyalty to the Temple and the customs (Acts 21). We should remember how such a critique coexisted with admiration of the Temple and the hope of its restoration in the apocalyptic Jewish texts we studied earlier, which makes the insertion of Stephen's speech in Luke-Acts not entirely odd. Further, I agree with Charles Talbert's suggestion that "it would have sounded reasonable to a pagan like Plutarch, who said, 'Further, it is a doctrine of Zeno not to build sanctuaries of the gods (*Moralia* 1034b)."<sup>777</sup>

### 5.9.2 Stephen and the Epistle of Barnabas

As we saw earlier,<sup>778</sup> several scholars (especially in the early twentieth century) sensed the similarity between Stephen and Alexandrianisms of the Epistle of Barnabas. The following alignments can be noted.

First, in their response to the claim to the Mosaic covenant, both Barnabas and Stephen follow the same strategy of unfolding the sinful history of Israel. Stephen and Barnabas stop at the incident of the golden calf as the pivotal moment at which the covenant was lost. That Israel's loss of its covenant did not take place in its rejection of Jesus is unique to both texts. The killing of Jesus becomes a natural correlation to the long history of transgressions which climaxed in the golden calf incident. On this point I certainly agree with both Barnard and Paget's remarks regarding the timing of losing the covenant, which is as early as the golden calf incident.<sup>779</sup>

---

<sup>776</sup> Schneider, "Stephanus," in Kremer, *Les Actes des Apôtres*, 239–40.

<sup>777</sup> Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: a Literary and Theological Commentary* (Georgia: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, Inc., 2005), 63.

<sup>778</sup> See above, p. 201

<sup>779</sup> Barnard, "Saint Stephen and Early Alexandrian Christianity," 39. Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, 201–2.

Secondly, both Stephen and Barnabas underscore the nature of Israel's failure to read and interpret Scripture, which leads to the Judaeen rejection of Jesus. It is important to see how the rejection of Moses (in the worship of the golden calf) in both works meant the rejection of Jesus since the former is the type of the latter. This typology is central for both and is the interpretive tool for what will become the division between the "our/your ancestors - us and them" language. The typology between Jesus and Moses seems to be one of the typological problems which also includes the literal understanding of the religious practices, and consequently, both remind the reader of Israel's failure to be circumcised by heart (Acts 7:51; Barn. 9; Ps 18:44; Deut 30:6). Thus, it is not only a moral failure but also an exegetical failure to keep the law (its right interpretation) upon its reception, which is associated with losing the covenant in the golden calf incident. Acts 7:53 and Barn. 14.3, then, form a direct parallel.<sup>780</sup>

Finally, the previous observations lead to the major common theme between Stephen and Barnabas. Both expressed the same rejection of the Temple on an unrivalled scale, that is, a categorical rejection. We saw that both understand the building and worship in the Temple of Jerusalem as a kind of idolatry, which became an attitude that could be traced back to the golden calf incident. Thus, we see the same strong language which includes the concept of the Temple made with hands, χειροποιήτος. It is interesting to observe that only Stephen and Barnabas share the same variation of ἡ τίς τόπος (Acts 7:49; Barn. 16.2), agreeing against the Septuagint's ἡ ποῖος τόπος (Isa 66:1).<sup>781</sup> Stephen and Barnabas also understand the divisive consequence of their disagreement with their opponents on this matter. Their rejection of the Temple marks the peak of each text at which the language changes to detach the identity of the author from the addressees who then become the *other*. Therefore, it is not only the rejection of the Temple that is common between Stephen and Barnabas but also their reading of history and Scripture. This takes the similarity between them to another level. On this point I disagree

---

<sup>780</sup> Bacon, then, could be right in sensing a contrast between a spiritualising Alexandrianism of the scripture in Stephen's speech against a literalist interpretation amongst the opponents ("Stephen's Speech," in Curtis, *Biblical and Semitic Studies*, 227).

<sup>781</sup> See T. Thornton, "Stephen's Use of Isa. LXVI," *JTS* 25 (1974): 432–34.

with Barnard's supersessionist understanding of the abolition of cult and sacrifice in Barnabas.<sup>782</sup> In fact, I have demonstrated that the major theme of Barnabas is rejection of cult and sacrificial worship in the Temple *per se*.

Based on this, the speech of Stephen does not rest on a theological programme that was invented by Luke. I draw this conclusion, not only because the speech contradicts Luke's overall attitude in its core, as James Dunn observed,<sup>783</sup> but because the historicity of such a programme that concludes in such a radically dismissive attitude does exist outside Luke-Acts; in the Epistle of Barnabas. Further, if this is the case, then we can be more confident in our interpretation of this attitude since another unabridged form of it could be found in Alexandria, which helps us understand further beyond the limitedness of that single speech. However, I agree with Paget that Barnard's confidence in the existence of a direct influence from Stephen on Barnabas is misplaced.<sup>784</sup> Yet a common tradition, if not a common milieu of thought, could be suggested.

## **5.10 The Pauline Ministry (Acts 15:31–28:31)**

### **5.10.1 Paul in Athens (Acts 17:16-32)**

Luke sets Paul in contrast with the Athenians in a debate that defines the God of Israel as the ancient one. Paul's debaters are the ones who appreciate novelty, in what seems to be a parenthetical insertion (verse 21) designed to highlight the contrast. In his radical response, Paul offers a critique of pagan cults by stating that the creator "does not live in shrines made by human hands (οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ), nor is he served by human hands, as though he needed anything, since he himself gives to all mortals life and breath and all things" (Acts 17:24-5; cf. Isa 42:5). Scholars, such as John Townsend, consider this criticism to be framed against the Temple of Jerusalem, just as in Stephen's speech. This could have been the case if we were to extract it from its context, but the context gives the opposite impression: Paul's critique is addressed against the Greek sanctuaries and their idolatry. We have already seen contemporaneous Jewish texts using the same expression (χειροποίητος)

---

<sup>782</sup> Barnard, "Saint Stephen," 41.

<sup>783</sup> See n. 744

<sup>784</sup> Paget, *Barnabas*, 205.

against Graeco-Roman cults.<sup>785</sup> Secondly, the Lukan Paul's dedication to the Temple and Jewish customs rules out the idea of a categorical rejection of Temple worship. Late first-century Rome was exposed to this sort of questioning in Stoic literature (Seneca, *Ep. Mor.* 41:3; 95:47-50; Zeno, *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta* 1 frag. 264; Plutarch, *Mor.* 1034b). Richard Pervo justifiably understands the speech within the wider Graeco-Roman discussions over the role of the temples in regard to divine presence.<sup>786</sup> He observes how the Lukan Paul uses the word κόσμος instead of "earth" to reach out to the language of his debaters, which shows his intention to find a common theological denominator to make his point.<sup>787</sup> We have already seen 1 Clement's engagement with Stoic language to define the divine will in cosmic order. The similar apologetic point between v. 25 and 1 Clem. 52.1 is obvious.<sup>788</sup>

### **5.10.2 Paul from Jerusalem to Rome (Acts 21:17–28:31)**

It is obvious from Luke's narrative of Paul's meeting with James and the apostles in Jerusalem that Luke aimed to reconcile the strong Jewish-Christian church of the city with what was probably known about Paul (an image that is not far from the Marcionite understanding of Paul), a man who calls for destruction of any connection with the law and the customs (the favoured Lukan word τοῖς ἔθουσιν), including the Temple. Paul was asked to correct this image by going through a purification process and commitment to the Temple in public (Acts 21:17-26).

We see Luke's intention to correct the image of Paul through a series of confessions that occur in Paul's appearance before the authorities, confronting the accusations made against him. These include profaning the Temple (Acts 24:6). His defence in front of the governor, Felix, shows precisely in what way Luke wanted to portray Paul: ὁμολογῶ δὲ τοῦτό σοι ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν λέγουσιν αἵρεσιν οὕτως λατρεύω τῷ πατρίῳ θεῷ, πιστεύων πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ τοῖς ἐν τοῖς προφήταις γεγραμμένοις (Acts 24:14). The essence of Christianity is not a new "way" or a "school" (αἵρεσις) but

<sup>785</sup> Here, Conzelmann agrees with this cautious approach (*St. Luke*, 141–42).

<sup>786</sup> Pervo, *Acts*, 433–34.

<sup>787</sup> Pervo, *Acts*, 433; Conzelmann, *St. Luke*, 141.

<sup>788</sup> Cf. Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 435.

is the essence of the ancient tradition.<sup>789</sup> Surveying the use of the term αἵρεσις in Jewish texts contemporary to Acts, Joan Taylor shows that the customary negative notion associated with the term in modern exegetical works should be reconsidered in light of the fact that the term is understood as a point of legitimacy for belonging to Judaism in these texts, which also fits with Paul’s *apologia* that aims to assert the legitimacy of his sect.<sup>790</sup> The Lukan τῷ πατρώῳ θεῷ does not only justify Paul’s faith against the Judaeen authorities but also for the concerned Roman governor, and consequently the Roman reader. A similar statement is made to Festus, who is also reminded of Christianity’s allegiance to the Temple and Caesar: Οὐτε εἰς τὸν νόμον τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὔτε εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν οὔτε εἰς Καίσαρά τι ἥμαρτον (Acts 25:8b). Finally, Paul delivers his final defence in Rome before the Jewish elite there, emphasising that he “had done nothing against our people or the customs of our ancestors (ἢ τοῖς ἔθεσι τοῖς πατρώοις)” (Acts 28:17).<sup>791</sup>

These three affirmations draw the shape of what Christian faith is, according to Luke, and how Paul should be understood. The Lukan Paul proclaims Christianity as a fulfilment of the ancient customs (the Lukan ἔθεσι) and traditions, not an innovation. Pervo rightly observes that Acts does not explain *why* the Jewish Torah should be observed if it cannot make one right with God (Acts 13:38-39; 15:10).<sup>792</sup> Pervo suggests that Luke’s view (tolerating the Jewish-Christian commitment to ritual observations without making them necessary for the gentiles) could be similar to the views of Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 47). While Justin indeed shows tolerance toward the Jewish-Christian commitment to the law, his strong supersessionist attitude is not shared with Luke. Acts’ attitude would be truly a dilemma if it is limited to the bilateral relations between Christianity and Judaism. But, as we saw, Luke was engaging with the wider Roman Imperial ideology to which Luke had to show the antiquity of Christian faith within Judaism, and consequently its respect for the customs.

---

<sup>789</sup> Cf. Conzelmann, *St. Luke*, 199. Haenchen states correctly that Paul carefully defines the new “way” without divorcing it from Judaism. E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 658.

<sup>790</sup> Joan E. Taylor, “The Nazoraeans as a ‘Sect’ in ‘Sectarian’ Judaism?” in *Sects and Sectarianism in Jewish History*, ed. Sacha Stern (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 87–115.

<sup>791</sup> It is largely considered as a Lukan composition (See Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 681).

<sup>792</sup> Cf. Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 544f.

Throughout the double work, Luke puts accusations on the lips of the opponents of the faith for the sake of falsifying them. Therefore, Paul's responses here are meant to be an *apologia* against such accusations. As Taylor suggests, the strategy of Paul is an *ipse dixit* drawn from the lips or the background of the accusers to justify his claims through highlighting commonality with them.<sup>793</sup> The Lukan emphasis on the issue of "the customs" should again lead us to think of the Roman reader. This appears in the explicit accusation made against Paul and Silas in Philippi: "These men are disturbing our city (ἐκταράσσουσιν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν); they are Jews and are proclaiming customs (καταγγέλλουσιν ἔθνη) that are not lawful for us as Romans to adopt or observe" (Acts 16:20b-21).<sup>794</sup> The accusation here suggests that Paul's "proclamation" is a violation against the customs of the Romans. As in the case of Jesus (Luke 23:1-5), the accusation is positioned in the scene in a way that would automatically falsify its content in the eyes of the reader. It seems to be of great importance for Luke to refute the idea of Christian faith as disturbing the peace (ἐκταράσσουσιν) as a new, anti-

---

<sup>793</sup> Cf. J. E. Taylor, "The Nazoraeans," in Stern, *Sects and Sectarianism*, 98.

<sup>794</sup> Paul's activity does not lead to such an accusation; Paul exorcised a slave-girl which led the owners to this hostility (16:11-40). Further, the remark Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες does not offend the Roman customs since Judaism was a legitimate religion. Several scholars acknowledge the difficulty in finding an easy solution. For example, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 502-3; Bruce, *Acts*, 362; J. Roloff, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 246: "Die Anklage versteckt sehr geschickt die privaten Interessen der geschädigten Sklavenbesitzer hinter den durch den Vorfall angeblich tangierten öffentlichen Belangen." Daniel Schwartz makes a clever suggestion by stating that if we read Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες as a concessive insertion like Ῥωμαίους ὑπάρχοντας in v. 37, then the accusers here claim that Paul violates the Jewish customs which means that he also breaches the legal customs of those *Jewish* accusers as Romans citizens. This fits with the fact that Paul approached the Jews of the city, not the gentile Romans. See D. Schwartz, "The Accusation and the Accusers at Philippi (Acts 16:20-21)," *Biblica* 65 (1984): 357-63. Indeed, I find Schwartz's suggestion highly possible in light of the fact that the accusations made against Jesus showed the intention of the accusers who appealed to Pilate by giving Jesus' acts the sense of breaching Roman law. Other suggestions, such as considering the accusation being made against the practice of magic (exorcism), are unconvincing. In this case, the charge is made against the proclamation (καταγγέλλουσιν) of Paul, not the exorcism. This suggestion was made by C. S. de Vos, "Finding a Charge That Fits: The Accusation Against Paul and Silas at Philippi (Acts 16.19-21)," *JSNT* 74 (1999): 51-63. It appears to me that Luke aimed to show how the accusation was entirely baseless and that it was purely motivated by envy rather than any solid observation. As far as we are concerned, Luke's aim was to address the problem of Christianity and Roman customs by deeming the idea of setting the first against the latter as a false insinuation.

Roman cult.<sup>795</sup> Not only does Paul not offend the Roman customs, ἔθος Ῥωμαίων (Acts 25:16), but it is the Roman customs specifically that entitle him to appeal to the emperor (Σεβαστός), which protects him in this difficult situation.

### ***Excursus: Luke-Acts and the Jews***

It is also important to refer to Luke's view of the Jews in the light of our findings regarding the Temple. As it stands, a number of scholars acknowledge the ambivalence of Luke's attitude in which positive and negative attitudes could be inferred from different materials. The major statement of Lloyd Gaston on how Luke could be most the pro-Jewish and anti-Jewish writer in the New Testament at the same time reflects the views of several contributions to the topic.<sup>796</sup> In his important book on scholarship's development on this topic (*Luke, Judaism and the Scholars*), Joseph Tyson reflected on recent major works.<sup>797</sup> Joseph Tyson showed that the context of the scholars influenced their articulation of the Lukan views,<sup>798</sup> which adds to the complexity of the problem. Tyson himself concludes a collection of eight essays that reflect the variety of scholarly opinions with his own understanding that in the middle of the "tension between his [Luke's] condemnation of Jewish rejection and his description of Jewish acceptance" lies Luke's treatment of the Jewish Christians which is "symptomatic of his deep ambivalence."<sup>799</sup>

---

<sup>795</sup> Cf. A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963), 79–80; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 587–88: "Luke so formulates the charge that Paul and Silas can easily repudiate it. The charge, however, raises a question about the legitimacy of Christianity then in the Roman Empire: was it *religio licita*?" On the problem of introducing a new cult see Cicero, *Leg.* 2.8.19; Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 57.18.5; 67.14.2.

<sup>796</sup> Gaston, *No Stone*, 155. G Lohfink, *Sammlung*, 55. G. Wasserberg, *Aus Israels Mitte-Heil* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998), 362. See also, J. Van Goudoever, "The Place of Israel in Luke's Gospel," *Novum Testamentum* 8.2 (1966), 111-123 who justifies the tension between the two attitudes by stating that Luke was prudent in his in his attitude towards the Israel (assuming it is synonymous with "the Jews") because he realised the tragic impact of the war in 70 CE. Yet he was convinced of the rightness of the Messianic movement at the same time (p. 123).

<sup>797</sup> Joseph Tyson, *Luke, Judaism and the Scholars* (South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1999), 134-46.

<sup>798</sup> Tyson, *Luke, Judaism and the Scholars*, 1-2.

<sup>799</sup> Joseph Tyson, *The Problem of Jewish Rejection*, in J. Tyson (ed.), *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988), 137. We will be referring to the other seminal papers in this work afterwards.

Luke's perception of the Jews in his story is one of the most complicated matters in the double work, as Jack Sanders acknowledges.<sup>800</sup> This is reflected in the scholarly divisions on the matter. Within the same work we can see differences in handling the responsibility of trials or attacks on Jesus and later Christian figures in Acts. Sanders suggests a "solution" to this problem; the developing attitude towards the end of Acts and recognising the distinctiveness of different Jewish factions in Luke's treatment.<sup>801</sup> So, he observes a shift from Luke's reluctance to name the Jews collectively in his accusations (Luke 18:32-33), focusing instead on listing the Jewish leadership involved, to the direct accusations that include the Jews collectively in the later chapters of Acts 21:30, 36; 22:22, 30.<sup>802</sup> Yet, "the most of the familiar *dramatis personae* in the scenes are present."<sup>803</sup> Therefore, their responsibility should be underscored, as in the words of Loisy about the leaders: "ce sont les Juifs qui ont tout fait."<sup>804</sup> Therefore, Luke is consistently critical of the Jewish leadership, and particularly the Chief priests, as responsible for the persecution of Jesus and his followers.<sup>805</sup> As for the "Jews" as a collective connotation, Sanders aimed to show the negativity of Luke's attitude towards them, especially in the speeches. For example, Sanders points to Peter's accusation of the "Jews" for killing Jesus (Acts 2:22-23, 36), which is, for him, "quite a good summary of the Lukan passion narrative."<sup>806</sup> However, as we focus on the way the term was employed in the speeches, it is also important to show how it appeared in the reaction of the speeches. Luke especially preserves for us the regret of the crowds and their breast-beating sadness for this (23:27, 48). In the case of Peter's speech the reaction seemed positive; they acknowledged what was said and sought baptism (2:36-7, 47). The same material used by Sanders to prove the negative attitude was used in the opposite way by Marilyn Salmon and Tannehill, which reflects the complexity of the problem.<sup>807</sup>

---

<sup>800</sup> Jack T. Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (London: SCM Press, 1987), 47.

<sup>801</sup> Sanders, *The Jews*, 19-20 and 47-8. See also Richard Bauckham, *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting* (Grand Rapids: Paternoster, 1995 ), 120.

<sup>802</sup> Sanders, *The Jews*, 79-80.

<sup>803</sup> Sanders, *The Jews*, 18.

<sup>804</sup> Alfred Loisy, *Les Évangiles Synoptiques* (Ceffonds : Chez l'Auteur, 1908), 652.

<sup>805</sup> Sanders, *The Jews*, 20.

<sup>806</sup> Sanders, *The Jews*, 234.

<sup>807</sup> Jack Sanders, "The Jewish People in Luke-Acts:" in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People*, 71. Marilyn Salmon, "Insider or Outsider? Luke's Relationship with Judaism," in J. Tyson, *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People*, 81. The introduction of this essay itself registers the vast diversity in reading the same evidence: "Jack Sanders expresses amazement that the representatives of such divergent views could actually have read the same edition of Luke-

Therefore, the distinction between the reaction of the people and the leadership should be maintained, as evidenced in the case of the arrest of Peter and John.<sup>808</sup> While Luke enlists the titles of the leaders who arrested them (rulers, elders, and scribes - Acts 4:5), the speech of Peter was addressed to "the people of Israel" (4:10). The leaders reacted negatively, threatening Peter and John, while "many of those who heard the word believed; and they numbered about five thousand" (Acts 4:4). This success amongst the Jews was the reason for the later success of Christianity to move forward towards the Gentiles, according to Jacob Jervell.<sup>809</sup>

On the other hand, we can see some cases in which the term "the Jews" was used negatively, as in the case of the Jews plotting to kill Saul (Acts 9:23) or other cases of pleasing the mob in the arrest of Christians (13:5, see also 13:50). The problem could be in the definition of the term as it is used in each case, which requires a careful case-by-case study. For instance, "the Jews" who abused Paul (22:30) were actually certain ones from Asia (21:27), which means that conflict with groups and factions labelled as "the Jews" should not be extended to cover the entire Jewry.<sup>810</sup> Yet, we also saw Paul's unceasing defence of affiliation to Judaism as he clearly puts it: "Εγώ εἰμι ἄνθρωπος Ἰουδαῖος" (Acts 21:39; 22:3). In the light of his defence of his allegiance to the ancestral religion, the designation of being a Jew should also be understood as part of his argument to relate himself to the tradition he is accused of abandoning, which means that that tradition and its affiliated group are the source of legitimacy. This could be seen in confrontations such as Paul's trial before Sadducees and Pharisees (Acts 23:6-11). Ernst Haenchen suggests that it is not Christianity and Judaism that are falling away from each other but it is Christianity and the Sadducees (in the case of the debate over

---

Acts" (p.76). See also Lawrence M. Wills, "The Depiction of the Jews in Acts," *JBL* 110.4 (1991), 631-654; Robert Tannehill, "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story," *JBL* 104 (1985), 69-85 who is followed by David Tiede, "'Glory to Thy People Israel': Luke-Acts and the Jews," in Tyson, *Luke-Acts*, 21-34 and, cautiously, Vittorio Fusco, "Luke-Acts and the Future of Israel," *Novum Testamentum* 38.1 (1996), 1-17. Therefore, I disagree with Shelly Matthews' one-sided view through which she judges that Acts depicts the Jews only as the killers of the people of "the Way." See Shelly Matthews, *Perfect Martyr* (Oxford: OUP, 2010), 57.

<sup>808</sup> Cf. G. Lohfink, *Die Sammlung Israels : eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (München : Kösel, 1975), 55; and Tyson, "The Problem of Jewish Rejection in Acts," in Tyson (ed.), *Luke-Acts*, 12.

<sup>809</sup> Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 68-9. Somewhere else he says, "The Jewish people did not reject the gospel *en bloc* - not even an overwhelming majority of Jews oppose the message - rather, from the beginning the mission to Jews was very successful, so that a significant portion of the people was converted." J. Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), 37.

<sup>810</sup> Lawrence Wills, for example, argues that those whom Josephus would attack as "zealots" are the ones Luke calls as Jews. Lawrence M. Wills, "The Depiction of the Jews in Acts," 646.

bodily resurrection, which is an accepted belief amongst Pharisees).<sup>811</sup> We have already referred to Joan Taylor's study of the term "sect" as it appears in Acts,<sup>812</sup> which showed that "in noting that 'they call' the teaching of Jesus a "haireisis," is using the term as part of his *apologia* to Felix, using an *ipse dixit* argument that claims his accuser, Tertullus, has validly credited 'the Way' with a status akin to the status the chief priests afford the legitimate schools: the Pharisees and Sadducees."<sup>813</sup> Therefore, "if the narrative of Acts reflects historical animosities, the Nazoraeans come across as a problem 'sect' not within a divided 'sectarian' Judaism without a definite centre, but within a pluriform Judaism still strongly united by an emphasis on the sanctity and importance of the Temple."<sup>814</sup>

As far as we are concerned, Luke's view on the Jews should not be controlled by his view on the Temple or vice versa. For instance, N. H. Taylor considers that the Temple as divine residence ceases to be at Jesus' death at which the Temple "had been exposed as an empty shell."<sup>815</sup> Taylor argued that Luke's presentation of the Temple is "to be located in the context of Jewish and Christian reconstruction during the period after the Roman-Jewish war of 66-70 CE" in which Luke is deeply concerned about the issue of the continuing validity of Jewish institutions."<sup>816</sup> As we saw, evidence in Acts shows the continuous allegiance to the Temple and respect for Jewish customs despite antipathy and clashes with Jewish leaderships, and it in no way stops by Jesus' death. Interestingly, the same volume that hosted Taylor's paper offers another paper in which G. Carras shows how Luke's portrayal of observant Jews in the double work reflects interest in fulfilling the image of the virtuous

---

<sup>811</sup> Haenchen, *Acts*, 223.

<sup>812</sup> See above n. 790

<sup>813</sup> Taylor, "The Nazoraeans as a 'Sect'," 113.

<sup>814</sup> Taylor, "The Nazoraeans as a 'Sect'," 114. Some other scholars proposed the study of another aspect such as Luke's understanding of the role of the synagogues and the confrontations taking place in their premises which could shed light on the dynamics of relations between the leaders of Jesus movement and "the Jews." David Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 232. He concludes: "There is, however, a further development in Acts where, on four occasions, Luke refers to synagogues of the Jews (13.5; 14.1; 17.1, 10). This qualification suggests that Luke, like Matthew, was familiar with non-Jewish, that is, Christian, synagogues. The description 'Jewish synagogue' has none of the implied antagonism that Matthew's 'their synagogues' has and the four cases in Acts are places of Christian mission." We have already referred to the concept of discursive space as employed in the case of the Temple and the House-hold church by J. H. Elliot and M. C. McKeever (see n.568 above). On households as "Haussynagogen" in Acts see Roger W. Gehring, *Hausgemeinde und Mission: Die Bedeutung antiker Häuser und Hausgemeinschaften von Jesus bis Paulus* (Basel: Brunnen, 2000), 238-274.

<sup>815</sup> N. H. Taylor, "Luke-Acts and the Temple," in Verheyden, *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, 720.

<sup>816</sup> N. H. Taylor, "Luke-Acts and the Temple," 721.

Jewish character as particularly modelled in Josephus *Contra Apionem* (2.164-219).<sup>817</sup> As the paper focuses on specific cases extending from the infancy section to Paul's speeches, Carras observed that the main Lukan characters were meant to fulfil what is a universally recognised virtue, which is respect for ancient values as found in the ancient religion of Judaism.<sup>818</sup> In this case, while Carras does not concern himself with defining Luke's view of the Jews, he concludes how Judaism itself is the centre of legitimacy for the thoughts of Luke and in a way that appeals to these universal values as implemented in Josephus' mentioned work.<sup>819</sup> My study has shown that the virtue of cultic piety (which is a fundamental Roman value) is what Luke was concerned with in his treatment of the Temple and this is solidified by its existence in 1 Clement, which shares the same Roman milieu, as part of his understanding of *Pietas*. Yet, as we saw, 1 Clement also did not concern himself to leave a specific definition of his attitude towards the Jews.<sup>820</sup>

As this is not an exhaustive study of the theme of "the Jews" in Luke-Acts, a thorough study is needed and perhaps a comparative approach with the Apostolic Fathers could bring more light on this theme. For a comprehensive list of scholarship on the matter I refer to M. Rese's paper on this topic,<sup>821</sup> while the most recent work that provides an updated bibliography is David Paul Moessner's published dissertation.<sup>822</sup>

## 5.11 Conclusion

This study has shown Luke's interest in viewing the Temple as a key factor in his allegiance to the ancestral customs, in what could be called temple piety. I aimed to identify the sources to show how

---

<sup>817</sup> G. Carras, "Observant Jews in the Story of Luke and Acts," in Verheyden, *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, 693-708.

<sup>818</sup> G. Carras, "Observant Jews in the Story of Luke and Acts," 700.

<sup>819</sup> G. Carras, "Observant Jews in the Story of Luke and Acts," 699, 707-8.

<sup>820</sup> See the discussion of James C. Paget and Joseph Verheyden on this issue and my view on it above (p. 138-9).

<sup>821</sup> M. Rese, "The Jews in Luke-Acts: Some Second Thoughts," in Verheyden, *Unity of Luke-Acts*, 185-201. Particularly footnotes 5 and 11.

<sup>822</sup> David P. Moessner, *Luke the Historian of Israel's Legacy, Theologian of Israel's 'Christ'* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2016), 289-302.

Luke employed them to achieve this goal. This chapter began by clarifying the date and context of Luke-Acts, and the question of its sources. This led to four fundamental observations:

1- Luke uses his sources carefully, shifting them at times with narration and redaction, in order to clarify his concept that the Lord's visitation to his Temple has been fulfilled.

2- Further, it was noted that the sections that highlighted the Temple piety of Jesus, his family and his followers include characteristically Lukan language about fulfilling ancestral customs and traditions in what seems to show a motivation to defend the Christian allegiance to these themes. This is found particularly in the infancy narrative (Luke 1-2), Jesus' approach to the Temple, the experience of the first community and finally in the repeated defence of allegiance to the Temple and the ancestral customs in Paul's speeches until the end of Acts.

3- Through the study of Temple notions in Luke, I observed an affinity between what is thought of to be characteristically Lukan and 1 Clement regarding their understanding of the eschatology that resonates with the Augustan imperial ideology (especially in the infancy narrative), the concept of Christologised divine visitation (ἐπισκοπή), the state of the community in the Temple (peace and unity) and the apparent need to repeatedly defend the Christian allegiance to the "customs" and "the ancestral customs." This leads to understanding how both showed piety to the Temple, which is suggestive in the light of our understanding that both shared the same regional and historical milieu. The latter point reinforces the plausibility and relevance of my understanding of evidence in Luke-Acts.

4- In re-examining the texts that were thought of as anti-temple judgments, it was observed that the Lukan way of treating the sources reflects an understanding of the Temple as a victim of the choices of the Jewish rulers who refused peace and favoured violence. The plausibility of this understanding is furthered by the available parallels in post-destruction texts. This is of particular importance for understanding the concept of divine departure and leaving the Temple to those who would, consequently, be responsible for what happens to it. We saw this particularly in Luke 11:49-51 and 13:44-45, which lacked the key term (ἔρημος) and also in 23:45. Both Josephus and 2 Baruch

provided us with the closest understanding to Luke's concept of divine departure without losing appreciation of the Temple. The significance of post-destruction texts also extends to understanding the concept of the term "made with hands", which was dropped in Luke's revision of Mark's account of Jesus' trial, and in Paul's speech in the Areopagus. We saw that the term does not mean the difference between human and divine matter but between what is a human concept and divine archetype.

Yet, we saw the peculiar voice of Stephen in Acts 7. Stephen understands the Temple as part of the long idolatrous history of the Jews, starting from their worship of the golden calf. With insights drawn from post-destruction Jewish texts, we observed that the language of Stephen suggests a complete rejection of the Temple and its cult. In the light of the analogy of his rhetoric with the Epistle of Barnabas, which is the only text that offers such similarity, we could conclude that Stephen rejects the Temple *per se*. This constitutes a challenge to the views expressed by Luke throughout the double work.

In the light of this study, John Townsend's suggestion that the speech, and consequently its negative attitude, is a Lukan invention that reflects his attitude due to its peculiarity in Christian tradition is not true.<sup>823</sup> We have already seen, through the epistle of Barnabas, a detailed analogy with Stephen's argument in a way that supports the historicity of the existence of such an attitude i.e. it does not owe its existence to Luke and therefore it does not necessarily represent his thought as Townsend suggested, even if Luke understood it differently. One must also remember that the degree of freedom and diversity amongst Christian groups, which reached a level "of no small dissension" over the law and customs (Acts 15:2-5), was accommodated in the image of harmony and concord. In my opinion, this leaves room for the pre-existence of such a theological programme, as the Epistle of Barnabas evinces.

Therefore, we distinguished two voices: the voice of Luke, and that behind the speech. From his position on the accusations in Acts 6:16-14, we can see how Luke rejects the allegations made against

---

<sup>823</sup> Townsend, "The Jerusalem Temple," 131–33.

Stephen (and Jesus) of denouncing the Temple. Luke probably understood the speech as he did with Paul's in the Areopagus, in which he emphasised God's transcendence and freedom from any cultic limitations such as confining him in the Temple.<sup>824</sup> This is something not only rooted in the Jewish tradition as we saw in the post-destruction texts but also in terms of Greco-Roman piety (as shown in the examples cited earlier). This is what we saw in Paul's repeated affirmations of his respect for the Temple of "our ancestors" rather than Stephen's "your ancestors" throughout his trials, and most importantly in his visit to Jerusalem (Acts 21) until the end in Rome. This does not contradict his speech in the Areopagus, nor Roman piety. Therefore, we should think likewise in the case of Luke's perspective of Stephen, even if Luke was not entirely successful in his editorial work here.<sup>825</sup>

Finally, for Luke, this double work does not only aim to root Christianity in the ancient religion of Judaism but it also aims to clarify to Theophilus how the situation became so as Christian identity had long since become independent by late first and early second century Rome.<sup>826</sup> If Luke aimed to supply Theophilus with an explanation of how Christianity came to its current situation in Rome, as it could be inferred from Acts 28:14 and 28:30-1,<sup>827</sup> then he is meant to explain why it is no longer in communion with the synagogue and how a speech like Stephen's explains the survival of this "Way" without the Temple. Therefore, without the tragic stories of persecution, the jealousy (Acts 5:17) of the Judean rulers and their failure to acknowledge God's transcendental work beyond the destroyed Temple, the story would not lead Theophilus to the reality of the situation around him, which led to

---

<sup>824</sup> Steve Walton, "A tale of Two Perspectives? The Place of the Temple in Acts" in T. Desmond and Simon Gathercole (eds.), *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology* (Waynesboro: Paternoster, 2004), 149.

<sup>825</sup> It is worth mentioning the case of Barn. 2 in which it was observed that the chapter reflects ideas that disagree with the categorical rejection of the cult in the letter. Apparently, as Paget suggested, the chapter reflects tradition saying "something different from what Barnabas makes it say." (*The Epistle of Barnabas*, 107). Barnabas was not entirely successful in maintaining this tradition within his whole argument, which makes the case of Stephen in Acts possible.

<sup>826</sup> I agree with Paget's remark that "a consensus has been arrived at, namely that from a relatively early stage the two communities came to be distinguished from each other." On literature and main pillars of evidence supporting this statement see James C. Paget, "1 Clement, Judaism, and the Jews," *Journal of Early Christianity* 8 (2017): 218-250.

<sup>827</sup> I agree with the observation of Fitzmyer regarding the conclusive tone found in: καὶ οὕτως εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἦλθαμεν (28:14b). See Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 787. οὕτως suggests that Luke was building up to answer a question of how the church became so in Rome. Cf. John Kilgallen, "Luke wrote to Rome – a Suggestion," *Biblica* 88.2 (2007): 251-255. See also O'Neil, *Theology of Acts*, 79. For a comprehensive treatment of that section as a key to interpret the whole double work see Gunter Wasserberg, *Aus Israels Mitte-Heil für die Welt: eine narrativ-exegetische Studie zur Theologie des Lukas* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), 71-114. See also Josef Tyson's arguments in support of Wasserberg's case in J. Tyson, *Luke, Judaism and the Scholars: Critical Approaches to Luke-Acts* (South Carolina: The University of South Carolina Press, 1999), 140-3.

turning to the Gentiles who "will listen" (Acts 28:28). This is when Paul uses the term "'your ancestors" for the first and last time (28:25) even if the promise of the Jewish repentance still stands (Acts 28:27).<sup>828</sup> The role of Stephen's story in the whole narrative, as an introduction to Paul, becomes substantial and therefore we should see it as a fundamental step towards the conclusion of how "we came to Rome" (Acts 28:14).<sup>829</sup> Another aspect suggested by Shelly Matthews is the central role of the death of Stephen in legitimising the movement with his martyrdom.<sup>830</sup> Matthews surveys the role of martyrdom in Greco-Roman rhetoric, showing that the model of the ideal martyr was employed in order to assert legitimacy and integrity to the cause of the hero of these works, considering that Luke probably followed this pattern not only in the case of Stephen but also in the successive abuses Paul endured.<sup>831</sup> This could also be the reason for Luke's intention to report Stephen in his work. With an overall positive Lukan attitude towards the Temple, as Wasserberg suggests, Stephen's section becomes a necessary step in the narrative to explain how the Gospel reached the nations from the heart of Judaism: "Die Stephanusperikope hat die erste große Wende in der Apostelgeschichte eingeleitet. [...] Der Widerstand gegen das Evangelium führt nicht zu seinem Ende, sondern bringt es voran auf seinem Wege hin zu seinem äußersten Ziel: zur Völkerwelt."<sup>832</sup> This is the function of the speech as Luke probably understood it, even if he did not completely succeed to reshape the tradition or the historical voice behind it. Having said that, this only remains as a suggestion to understand this peculiar problem. But this problem should not lead us away from the evidence in an attempt to find a simpler solution.<sup>833</sup>

---

<sup>828</sup> On how the promise is granted for both in this chapter see John Kilgallen, "Acts 28,28 - Why?" *Biblica* 90.2 (2009): 176-187

<sup>829</sup> Cf. Steve Walton, "A Tale of Two Perspectives?," 149.

<sup>830</sup> S. Matthews, *Perfect Martyr*, 57-8.

<sup>831</sup> *Perfect Martyr*, 62-3. It is worth noting that Matthews' argument extends to the debate over Marcionism, detecting an antimarcionite intention in Stephen's intercessory prayers, but this is beyond the scope of this study (*Perfect Martyr*, 100-37).

<sup>832</sup> Wasserberg, *Aus Israels Mitte-Heil für die Welt*, 254.

<sup>833</sup> For example, I disagree with Steve Walton's proposed solution to what he considers as a contradiction between the voice that he considers as the Lukan voice in Stephen's speech and Paul's Areopagus speech which is a negative view of the Temple, and the behaviour of the Christians who worshipped in the Temple in the early stages of Acts. He considered that those Christians were still "learning what it means to live in the light of the coming of the Messiah," and therefore Luke should not be accused of inconsistency ("A Tale of Two Perspectives?," 149). But we saw that the Christian appreciation of the Temple continued through Acts and that the Temple did not lose its significance by the death of Jesus (as he suggests in "A Tale of Two Perspectives?," 136). Even if I agree with him, as I mentioned before, that the narrative is developing towards the status of

This chapter aimed to address the questions of what Luke thought of the Temple and how he implemented that. But why did he introduce it in such a wider rhetoric of legitimacy? The next chapter will study the language found in the third observation above by putting it in a historical context in order to understand the motivation behind it.

---

Luke's present Christianity, faith in God's transcendence and his presence in Jesus' visitation (as we explained earlier) could coexist with appreciation of the Temple. 1 Clement provides us with a similar case from the similar milieu.

## Luke-Acts and 1 Clement: The Temple Attitude in the Context of Rome

In the previous chapter, the Temple attitude of Luke-Acts has been clarified, and it has been noted that it coheres with particularly Roman ideals. Given that the attitude here aligns with another work authored in Rome at around the same time, 1 Clement, in this final chapter the relationship between the two works will be considered in greater depth. We will explore further the rationale for this attitude as something particularly indicative of the apostolic Roman church conscious of *Romanitas*.

So far, our study has led to the observation of three essential characteristics of the respectful Temple attitude that are Lukan. These can assist us in understanding the rationale for this attitude within the context of *Romanitas*. The characteristics of the Temple attitude involve: (i) Temple piety, (ii) the fulfilment of ancestral customs, and (iii) peace and concord. All of these would have struck chords of recognition among Roman readers.

### **6.1 Temple Piety**

We have seen how the declaration of the birth of Jesus, the announcement to the shepherds, and Jesus' presence in the Temple as a boy appear within or between successive Temple scenes. At the same time, they are replete with references to Augustus, his identity and mission as the bringer of the Gospel of Peace. Thus, it is justifiable to ask whether the Temple piety (*Tempelfrömmigkeit*) prevalent in the double work should also be associated with the image of Augustan ideology. Piety (*Pietas*) is one of the four virtues Augustus defended in his revival of ancestral values. *Pietas* is not simply a moral virtue but has a larger set of elements, making it one of the most prominent Roman virtues that

should be acquired by the Roman citizen, including the emperor. According to Cicero's classic definition, *pietas* is the loyalty towards the fatherland, parents and blood-related people (*De Inventione* 2.66).<sup>834</sup> However, *pietas* could be expanded towards unwavering loyalty to the gods and emperors, as we find in Tacitus, for example (*Ann.* 3.53). Whether you are an average Roman citizen, a noble, or the emperor, you are expected to show *pietas* as an expression of righteousness and goodness, and this must be manifested in the respect offered to the temples.

In the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, in which Augustus lists his accomplishments, he concludes with the golden shield which bore an inscription of the four virtues of courage, clemency, justice and *pietas*, presented to him by the Senate in acknowledgement for what he achieved in his rule. Moreover, Augustus identifies *pietas* as devotion to ancient temples, respect to the ancestors and preserving their customs (*Res Gestae* 34).

Indeed, Augustus was keen to show his conservative approach by restoring ancient temples that were destroyed, and founding new ones to commemorate ancient traditions. The temple is where the successful message of the Pax Romana was declared. His greatest accomplishment—peace—was established through the symbolic act of shutting the doors of the temple of Janus Quirinus. Intertwining both concepts, legitimacy through allegiance to the cult of the ancestors and celebrating peace, Augustus' name was included in the hymn of the Salii, an ancient hymn by the so-called “leaping priests”. This particular hymn was sung for the safety and peace of Rome.<sup>835</sup> Interestingly, a copy of the shield (*clupeus virtutis* of Arles) explicitly dated to 26 BCE (when Augustus was appointed consul for the eighth time) adds further that his piety was shown to the gods and country:

---

<sup>834</sup> For a full explanation of *pietas* in the thought of Cicero see G. Emilie, “Cicero and the Roman Pietas,” *The Classical Journal* 39 (1944): 536–42.

<sup>835</sup> P. A. Brunt and J. M. Moore, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus* (Oxford University Press, 1967), 52.

“*pietatis erga Deos patriamque*.”<sup>836</sup> This addition shows how piety is addressed towards the realms of politics and religion.

Augustus’ particular interest in relating himself to Jupiter is indicated in his founding of three temples to the god, and his restoration of the Capitoline on the occasions of his successive victories and the pacification of the Empire (*Res Gestae* 19–20). Consequently, Horace explains the Roman worldview by associating the satisfaction of the gods in the temples with peace in the age of Augustus (*Odes* 3, 6), while Livy describes him as “the founder and restorer of all the temples” (*Hist.* 4.20; see also Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 53.2.4; Suetonius *Aug.* 93). His religious devotion went as far as him becoming the *Augur*, *pontifex* and the *quindecimviri*, and the chief supervisor over foreign cults (*Res Gestae* 7).<sup>837</sup> His evolving divinity is a consequence of his special relationship with Jupiter, who receives the most veneration in Augustus’ restoration of his temples and ancient cultic practices that were long lost (*Res Gestae* 8). One of his most important deeds is showing his piety against the impiety of his enemies. Augustus replaced the ornaments despoiled from the temple of Asia Minor by his “adversary” with new ones (*Res Gestae* 24).

The latter point is important for us because it shows that piety towards a temple is a matter of morality and not only allegiance to a particular cult. If Luke aimed to allude to Augustus and Roman imperial piety in his view of Jesus, it would be consistent if Augustan temple piety, which defines Augustus’ righteousness and divinity, also manifested in the Temple piety of Jesus. The Temple is a defining element in Luke’s Christology, just as Jupiter’s temple was for defining Augustus’ divine sonship. “Ancestral custom” was a theme characteristic of Luke that he was keen on fulfilling throughout his references to the Temple.

---

<sup>836</sup> A digital image of it could be accessed on the catalogue of the “Musée départemental Arles antique,” [http://www.arles-antique.cg13.fr/popup\\_dp/urbanisme/plan/12.htm](http://www.arles-antique.cg13.fr/popup_dp/urbanisme/plan/12.htm). Cf. A. Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text Translation and Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 266–67.

<sup>837</sup> See Brunt and Moor, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 48–49.

## 6.2 Ancestral Customs τὰ ἔθνη τοῖς πατράοις

As we saw earlier, Luke uses the term “customs (τὰ ἔθνη)” uniquely in the New Testament. However, the peculiarity of this usage lies also beyond the New Testament. Despite his loyalty to the Septuagintal vocabulary, the term does not appear in the LXX except in 4 Macc 18:5 where it occurs as part of the letter of Antiochus V. Reference to “the ancestral customs” is scarcely found in Rabbinic literature.<sup>838</sup> In the few references where it is found, it appears that there is a tension in defining what customs really are in comparison with stated practices. It could be read as a regulation that fills a legal void when there is no determined law.<sup>839</sup> The organised definition of the Halakah supersedes the customs in a better and more systematic way. The saying of the Rabbis that “custom supersedes halakha” applies to a custom of the Elders (Tractate Sopherim 14.18), but custom which has no support from the Torah is like a mere injudicious decision (Mishnah Eruvim 10.10).

Writing with the intention to prove the universality and relevance of the Mosaic law for the Greco-Roman world (Mos. 2.9-14), Philo inserts the commandment “Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour’s landmarks which thy forerunners have set up” (Deuteronomy 19:14) to find reason to explain the Jewish respect for the concept of ancestral customs. Philo justifies this by stating that the commandment’s relevance goes beyond the issues of neighbourhood to the importance of safeguarding customs (πρὸς φυλακὴν τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐθῶν): “For customs are unwritten laws (ἔθνη γὰρ ἄγραφοι νόμοι), the decisions approved by men of old, not inscribed on monuments nor on leaves of paper which the moth destroys, but on the souls of those who are partners in the same citizenship” (Spec. 4.149). Therefore, the children should inherit the ancestral customs, ἔθνη πατρία, and carefully protect them as they have been handed down without a written record, ἄγραφος αὐτῶν ἢ παράδοσις (Spec. 4.150). In comparison with preserving written law, Philo strikingly states that those who preserve the unwritten commandments deserve more praise because they do that free-willingly, not under the fear of punishment as is the case with the written law (Spec. 4.150). This shows a

---

<sup>838</sup> Z. W. Falk, *Introduction to Jewish Law of the Second Commonwealth*, part 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 15–18; S. G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 1–11.

<sup>839</sup> Wilson, *Luke and the Law*, 15.

significantly different view from the rabbinic one we saw before. In practice, this definition applies to any nation as a criterion for its piety (for example, *Somn.* 11.56, 78; *Deus* 17; *Virt.* 102, 218-219; *Ebr.* 193; *Her.* 279; *Ios.* 29), and this is why Philo is setting out a universal value that is understandable within the context of the *Romanitas*.<sup>840</sup> This appears intensely in his *Embassy to Gaius* where he defends the piety of the Jewish nation, “For all men guard their own customs, but this is especially true of the Jewish nation” (*Legat.* 210).<sup>841</sup>

It is Josephus who shares Luke’s extensive interest in the term. It appears in his works 166 times.<sup>842</sup> He also promised to provide an entire work on the *Customs and Causes*, which reflects his interest on this matter (*B.J.* 5.237; *A.J.* 4.198, τὴν περὶ ἑθῶν καὶ αἰτιῶν ἀπόδοσιν). Unfortunately, he did not live to deliver his promise. As in the case of Luke, the term in Josephus is used in both the religious and secular senses (on the Roman military customs see *B.J.* 3.115; 4.13, etc.), but it is mostly used in describing the Jewish lifestyle and Jewish religious habits in festivals and religious rituals (*B.J.* 1.26; 2.410; 6.299-300; *A.J.* 11.313; customary sacrifices, ἔθος θυσίας, *B.J.* 1.153).

For Josephus, preserving Sabbath customs means preserving the ancestral laws, τὸν πατριὸν νόμον (*B.J.* 2.392-3), while keeping the Sabbath is appreciation for the ancestral customs, τῶν πατρίων (*B.J.* 4.102). While the Lukan Paul uses it in an apologetic context, Josephus mainly uses it in addressing the Roman authorities to show the Imperial right granted to the Jews to practise their “ancestral customs” (*J.A.* 14.213-216, 245-246; 16.171-176; 19.283-290, 306-311; on piety, see *A.J.* 16.43-47).<sup>843</sup>

---

<sup>840</sup> On the correlation between Philo’s values and the Roman ideals see Hindy Najman, “The Law of Nature and the authority of Mosaic Law,” *The Studia Philonica Annual* 11 (1999): 55–73. See also Richard A. Horsley, “The law of nature in Philo and Cicero,” *HTR* 71 (1978): 35–59; John W. Martens, *One God, One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

<sup>841</sup> See also “τῶν ἀγράφων ἑθῶν” *Legat.* 115, 293, 301.

<sup>842</sup> Wilson, *Luke and the Law*, 6.

<sup>843</sup> Interestingly, the Slavonic addition no.12 describes Jesus as a man who “did not obey the Law and kept not the Sabbath according to our fathers’ customs.”

Therefore, it appears to us that the theme of the maintenance of ancestral customs as a sign of piety does not have a substantial presence in Rabbinic literature, but it features in the Diaspora writings of Josephus and Philo in their *apologia* for Judaism in the Greco-Roman world.

The Romans also are expected to show their piety by revering the ancestral customs. Here also the image of Augustus appears vividly. This particular expression of “the customs of our ancestors” is a key one in Augustus’ *apologia* in defending *pietas* in his *Res Gestae*. Augustus demonstrated his loyalty to the traditions of the ancestors. On being asked to accept the post of supervisor of law and morals, he was reluctant because he feared that this new supreme authority could be inconsistent with “the customs of our ancestors” (*morem maiorum*, *Res Gestae* 6.2). Historically, both Suetonius (*Aug.* 27) and Cassius Dio (*Hist.* 54.10.5) affirm Augustus’ acceptance of this position (around 19 BCE), which shows that Augustus mainly wanted to make an ideological statement in the *Res Gestae*. He says that through the new laws proposed by him he “brought back into use many exemplary practices of our ancestors (*exempla maiorum*) which were disappearing in our time” (*Res Gestae* 8.5). Similarly, Augustus had to change a decision that could have glorified him (taking over Armenia), preferring to follow the “example of our ancestors” (*Res Gestae* 27.2). He pacified the land and the sea so that the doors of the temple of Janus Quirinus were shut three times in his age, while they were shut only twice before him (Livy, *Hist.* 1.19; Horace, *Odes* 4.15.9). Again, he presents his distinguished accomplishment to be in accordance with the will of “our ancestors” (*Res Gestae* 13). Therefore, Augustus boasts in his defence of restoring Roman traditional customs, manifested in the moral choices he made and the religious practices he protected.<sup>844</sup>

This is in line with Cicero’s definition of a legitimate evolution of law in the Republic, that is, the evolution by the wisdom of many successive generations (*Rep.* 2.2). Octavian took up this tactic for legitimacy through the revival of the “ancestral customs,” which was a response to the sense of longing for these lost customs (Cicero, *Leg.* 2.8.19ff.; on the role of the Augury see *de Divinatione* 2.33-70; Livy, *Hist.* 3.20.5).

---

<sup>844</sup> Cf. A. Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 143–44.

It is important to note that Roman piety in respecting the customs of the ancestors is not associated with the imperial cult alone. A surviving Greek inscription suggests that it was forbidden by law to confiscate anything from “public or sacred places in cities or in the territory of a city in every province” and that whoever was in charge of the province must provide replacements for these lost vessels.<sup>845</sup> This inscription shows that piety and respect for the temples is not just an imperial legality but reflects a culture that includes all recognised sanctuaries.<sup>846</sup>

Josephus introduces the Romans as being respectful even of the customs of the Jews (the Temple) by practising their own customs (τῶν ἰδίων ἔθων) afar from it (not crossing the dividing line beyond the court of the gentiles) and therefore it was questionable whether God would entirely be the ally of the Jews in the war (*B.J.* 5.2). Likewise, acknowledgement of the Romans’ respect could be key to understanding Luke’s interest in showing respect to the customs. As we saw earlier, the Josephan Titus was desperately trying to avoid the destruction of the Temple and sought to show the proper Roman respect of its sanctity.

Most important is the edict of Augustus to the Jews in Rome, as reported by Josephus (*A.J.* 16.162-165). The edict entitles the Jews to follow their ancestral customs (τοῖς ἰδίοις θεσμοῖς κατὰ τὸν πατριὸν αὐτῶν), warning against those who would violate their Temple or local synagogues (in Rome), or be sacrilegious, ἱερόσυλος (*A.J.* 16.164). According to Josephus, Augustus introduced this edict as part of his piety (εὐσεβείας), acknowledged by the Jews (*A.J.* 16.165). Here, it is important to observe these main elements: piety for Augustus is reverence for the ancestral customs, the same ancestral customs are visible in the practices of the Temple of Jerusalem. Philo also uses these elements in defence of Augustus’ protection of the ancestral customs (τῶν πατρίων) of the Jews in Rome (*Legat.* 155-158). Interestingly, although there are numerous elements shared between Philo’s reflection on Augustus’ treatment of Jews and Josephus’ report of his edict, it seems that Philo was

---

<sup>845</sup> H. W. Pleket, *Greek Inscriptions in the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden at Leyden* (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 49ff.

<sup>846</sup> Another part of the inscription in Latin shows how the magistrates of Cyrne in Aeolis were required to restore a shrine of Dionysus for a local cult. J. A. Crook, “An Augustan Inscription in the Rijksmuseum at Leyden,” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 8 (1962): 23–29.

not aware of the actual edict itself which, according to Josephus' edition of the edict, was inscribed on a pillar in the temple of Julius Caesar. Philo claimed that Augustus instructed that a daily sacrifice should be offered on his own expense for himself and his family, while the Josephan Augustus calls the God of Israel "the most high (θεοῦ ὑψίστου)" (A.J. 16.163). These elements do not square with Suetonius' report of Augustus' lack of respect towards Judaism and its Temple (Aug. 93). However, Augustus surely followed the line of Julius Caesar in treating Judaism and its customs as a legitimate tradition, and so its ancestral customs are a point of legitimacy.

It is noteworthy to refer to our earlier observation regarding Philo's use of the term ὑψιστος, since he associates it with the Temple in his apologetic texts addressed to the Romans. This could be key to understanding Luke's characteristic use of the term.<sup>847</sup> It is important to note that the reports of Philo and Josephus on the Jews of Rome show how they acknowledged the piety of Augustus in his resolution with them. This is a memory well preserved by Jews of Rome in their struggle under Domitian. Thus, Clement of Rome calls for the church to follow this ancient system "of our forefathers/ancestors" (1 Clem 23.3; 30.7; 60.4; 62.2) as the piety ὅσιος (1 Clem. 40.3), warning his addressees not to think that the Christian system is a novelty: τοῦτο οὐ καινῶς (1 Clem. 42.5). Therefore, we should read Luke's expressions concerning customs as an *apologia*. Luke defended Jesus as a pious Κύριος, and Christians as the community of *pietas* honouring the ancestral customs.

### **6.3 Peace and concord: Εἰρήνη καὶ ὁμονοία**

We observed above<sup>848</sup> that the image of Christians praying in the Temple was introduced by using two concepts peace and being of one accord. For the latter, Luke used a characteristic term, ὁμοθυμαδόν, and in Josephus, the word expresses consensus (J.A. 15.277; C. Ap. 1.241-242). We can see in Cassius Dio's *History* remarks about the Senate members voted "with one accord" for peace with the Carthaginians (Hist. 17.57[83]-8). However, Luke contrasts the state of the Christians in the Temple, εἰρήνη (Acts 9:35) and ὁμοθυμαδόν (Acts 1:14; 2:46, προσκατεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ;

<sup>847</sup> Most importantly in Stephen's speech, 7:48.

<sup>848</sup> See above, pp. 198 - 201.

4:24; 5:12, καὶ ἦσαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅπαντες ἐν τῇ Στοᾷ Σολομῶντος; 15:25, etc.), with the state of the Jewish factions, who are characterised by sedition and insurrection στάσις (Acts 19:40; 23:7, 10). These terms appear almost only in Luke-Acts within the New Testament.<sup>849</sup> The Pharisees and Sadducees are in the state of στάσις against each other when Paul tactically raises the resurrection issue amongst them. The insurrection even goes to the level of violence (Acts 23:7, 10). Luke does not leave the reader unaware of the consequences of this term. On the lips of the town clerk, the Ephesian mob are “in a real danger of being charged with rioting (στάσεως)” (Acts 19:40).<sup>850</sup> When Judean leaders meet Felix to complain against Paul on his Temple action, they accuse him of stirring, στάσεις πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις (Acts 24:5), in an attempt to win Felix over to their side. Paul also denies that particular charge in the Temple (Acts 24:12). Therefore, it is not surprising to see this charge being brought forward in the presence of Roman officials.

It is important to observe that Luke uses this term to express the nature of dispute (στάσεως) of Barnabas and Paul with Jewish-Christians (Acts 15:2), a matter resolved by the council of Jerusalem that restored the state of concord γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδὸν (Acts 15:25). This clear contrast between the two terms, ὁμοθυμαδὸν and στάσις, indicates that ὁμοθυμαδὸν should also be understood in the Roman context of stability and consensus, as expressed in the disciples’ attendance at the Temple.

Similarly, 1 Clement sets out the antonymic relationship between ὁμονοία and στάσις from the first verse onwards (1 Clem. 1.1).<sup>851</sup> Clement of Rome sets out his worldview in relation to the concept of imperial peace. This is clear in his doxology to the Roman Empire in chapters 60–61 and his prayers for the typically imperial formula of peace and concord (εἰρήνη καὶ ὁμονοία) frequently attested in the epistle (1 Clem. 20.10; 20.11; 60.4; 63.2. ὁμοφωνίας: 51.2, etc.), in contrast with the στάσις which Clement frequently warns the Corinthians against (1 Clem. 1.1; 2.6; 3.2; 4.14; 14.2; 43.2; 46.7; 47.6; 49.5; 51.1, 3; 54.2; 55.1; 57.1; 63.1). It is εἰρήνη καὶ ὁμονοία which bring cosmic stability (1 Clem.

<sup>849</sup> It is therefore agreed as a characteristic of Luke. M. E. Boismard, *Le Texte Occidental des Actes des Apôtres* (Paris: Editions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1984); Plummer, *St. Luke*, lx; Denaux, *The Vocabulary of Luke*, 567–68.

<sup>850</sup> On similar examples of this accusation in Roman law see Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 51–52.

<sup>851</sup> Cf. O. Bakke, *Concord and Peace*, WUNT 143 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 80–83.

20) by people following God's will, manifested in the structure of the Temple cult. After giving models that correspond to God's will (including the Roman army structure 1 Clem. 37.2-4), Clement explains God's will in the structure of the sacrificial and hierarchical systems of the Temple as the model to be followed by Christians (1 Clem. 40-41). Consequently, the Temple becomes the embodiment of the hierarchical system that guarantees εἰρήνη καὶ ὁμονοία against the στάσις in the Corinthian ecclesiastical alternative. This is a clear analogy to the Roman system which Clement alludes to in chapter 37.<sup>852</sup>

The contrast between the two terms is highly Roman.<sup>853</sup> Creating concord was a faculty of Caesar, whether it was Julius (Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 44.1-2; 24.2-3) or Augustus who restored the ancestral "peace and harmony" with no local "sedition" to be reported in Rome (*Hist.* 53.8.2). This contrast also becomes the defining theme which stabilises the Greek islands under Rome (Dio Chrys., *Or.* 38-39).<sup>854</sup> The need to adopt the Roman social order could be explained by the nature of Roman religiosity itself. Clifford Ando argues that Greco-Roman religion is by nature a religion of the *polis* by which it assimilates the structure of the social and political structures of its city-state.<sup>855</sup> With the religious laws that control public and private services, this mechanism is understandable as a legitimization process.<sup>856</sup> Another factor for a successful religion is in its ability to introduce its God

---

<sup>852</sup> Cf. Aristides, *Eulogy of Rome* Or.12 88-89. Cf. K. Wengst, *Pax Romana*, 48-49.

<sup>853</sup> Cf. *Diod. Sic.* 3.64.7 in which Dionysius demolishes στάσεων and restores ὁμόνοιαν καὶ πολλήν εἰρήνην. Cf. 12.35.1-3; 29.19.1 et al. See also Dion. Hal. *A.J. Rom.* 2.76.3. For more examples see Bakke, *Concord and Peace*, 86-91.

<sup>854</sup> Cf. Bakke, *Concord and Peace*, 88-89.

<sup>855</sup> C. Ando, "A Religion for the Empire," in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image and Text*, eds. A. Boyle and W. Dominik (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 324-25.

<sup>856</sup> Cicero's important definition (*Leg.* 2.8.19) has anchored the regulations of dealing with foreign cult. Cf. G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (Munich: Beck, 1902), 38ff. Ando, "A Religion for the Empire," in Boyle and Dominik, *Flavian Rome*, 325. In the Christian case particularly, Ando provides a host of patristic references to support the inference that the earliest Christians must have understood the divine will behind the coming of Jesus in a unified empire under Augustus to prepare it for the unifying message of Christianity [C. Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 48 n.148. I find his hypothesis justifiable in the case of Luke-Acts and 1 Clement who showed the tendency to spread in the *oikomene* of Rome, as we saw before.

with open access to the material world, one which is to be publicly worshipped without barriers. This is achieved by adapting an institutional structure acceptable to the city's Senate (in Rome). As Ando puts it: "The institutional structures of such cults need not be heterologous with the social and political structures of the *poleis* in which they are practised,"<sup>857</sup> regardless of its theological ideas about the invisible. The late republican works of Cicero and Varro confirm the distinction between religious order and theology (Cicero, *Nat. d.* 3.5; Varro, *A.J. Div. frag.* 2a, 3), and so an eastern religion could survive if it integrated itself into the city. It is important to observe how the state and religious rites were both founded together, according to Cicero, which became a principle for justifying Augustus' adoption of the most prestigious religious posts (*Nat. d.* 3.5).<sup>858</sup> Therefore, 1 Clement reflects a hierarchical order in which Clement needed to add a layer (Λαϊκός) in his Temple hierarchy to perfectly match the Roman order.<sup>859</sup> This tendency should not be viewed as being far from Luke-Acts which provides the higher authority of the apostles as well.

It is also important to observe that accepting or rejecting a religion is manifested in Rome's view of its Temple worship. Valerius Maximus' account of Cornelius Hispalus' removal of the Jewish altars from public spaces is a case for that (Val. Max. 1.3.3; Livy, *Hist.* 25.1.12).<sup>860</sup> This could also interpret Josephus' sense that there was some survival of the Temple of Jerusalem in its vessels that were left in the Temple of Peace, as we showed above. Therefore, the Lukan devotion to the Temple could be best explained in the circumstances of the Roman community of 1 Clement that survived the Domitian persecution and aimed to provide hospitable religious thought at a stage when the *fiscus Judaicus* was abolished and the vessels of the Temple were provided with special care in the *Templum Pacis*.

---

<sup>857</sup> Ando, "A Religion for the Empire," in Boyle and Dominik, *Flavian Rome*, 329.

<sup>858</sup> Cicero clearly attributes both the foundation of the state and its rites to Romulus and Numa.

<sup>859</sup> See also Wengst, *Pax Romana*, 112ff.

<sup>860</sup> Cf. Ando, "A Religion for the Empire," in Boyle and Dominik, *Flavian Rome*, 332.

Therefore, the third observation leads us to think that the vision of the early Christian movement's commitment to the Temple reflects a hope for a state of concord within the context of imperial ideology.

## **6.4 Historical Relevance**

Given the Roman concerns we have now explored, would the revival of the ideals and Augustan rhetoric for legitimacy explain this ideology of the time of Luke and Clement? This question is important for testing our research since the historical context is an essential factor that could decide the validity and relevance of our findings. Since our investigation has led us to date Luke-Acts and 1 Clement in the reign of Nerva and Trajan, we should assess our findings against what we know about this age.

Two essential observations should be made about the Trajanic era. First, Trajan's accession of power comes after a succession crisis in which Nerva steps in after the assassination of Domitian. This crisis was prompted by Nerva's new approach of adoptive succession. By adopting a strong military figure with great accomplishments in Germanic wars, Nerva ushered in the new adoptive system that would last throughout the second century.

Despite the fact that we have no biography of Trajan, we are fortunate to have three Latin biographers (Suetonius, Tacitus and Pliny the Younger) whose writings could be of great help in understanding the situation in Trajanic Rome.

### **6.4.1 Suetonius**

According to Suetonius, despite the relative stability the Flavian house brought to the Empire, it was seen that Domitian's assassination was the result of his perceived cruelty. Suetonius explains how Vespasian lacked divinity and how he did not have the insight to read the divine omens which are an essential part of legitimising an emperor. This appears in his reluctance to fulfil a divine promise to

perform a miracle to a man born blind and another man who is lame (Suetonius, *Vita* 8; *Vesp.* 7.2-3; see also Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.2). In contrast to Trajan, he lacked some fundamental virtues. Vespasian loved money and was corrupt and covetous (Suetonius, *Dom.* 16.1-3; 18.2). While Suetonius' views of Titus were mixed, Domitian's image had some serious marks that would compromise his legitimacy. Domitian had "an equal number of virtues and vices, but finally he turned the virtues also into vices" (*Dom.* 3.2).<sup>861</sup> Further, he "made many innovations in common customs" (*Dom.* 7.1) sinking into injustice and "savagery" (*Dom.* 11.1) in his increasing cruelty until his death. Most importantly, the omens are reported against Domitian as his anxiety was fed with consecutive divine phenomena (strokes of lightning and dreams) that concluded only with his death (*Dom.* 14-16).

It is beyond the scope of this research to provide a detailed profile of the Flavians but as far as we are concerned, the lack of divine providence, impiety towards ancient customs, and failure to achieve peace reversed entirely any legitimacy in terms of Augustan ideals. Unfortunately, Suetonius left no work on the age of Nerva and Trajan, but his strategy in the biography of emperors of the earlier age is suggestive. This bleak image of violence, injustice and lack of Augustan values should be seen as a preparation for the age of restored values and ideals.

#### 6.4.2 Tacitus

Despite his promise to offer a complete work on Nerva and Trajan, Tacitus died before delivering it. Yet, he opens his *Historiae* with gratitude to the "rare good fortune of an age" of Nerva and Trajan which replaced the era of terror and oppression with freedoms and peace (*Hist.* 1.1-2). It should be noted that the era of terror and oppression stretches from the death of Augustus to the assassination of Domitian, and this shows us that the "happy age" (*Agr.* 3) is understood to refer to the ages of Augustus and Nerva-Trajan, interrupted by the disastrous reigns of the emperors in between. In his biography of Gnaeus Julius Agricola, Tacitus also repeats the point that he would not have managed

---

<sup>861</sup> English Translation of LCL.38.

to write that before the freedom (the virtue of *libertas*) granted in Nerva's age: "Now at last heart is coming back to us: from the first, from the very outset of this happy age, Nerva has united things long incompatible, Empire and liberty; Trajan is increasing daily the happiness of the times; and public confidence has not merely learned to hope and pray, but has received security for the fulfilment of its prayers and even the substance thereof" (*Agr.* 3). The rest of the introduction is about the contrast between the age of Domitian in particular, and Nerva's.

Like Suetonius, the biographies of Tacitus reflect his ideological agenda. A major issue at stake seems to be the new adoptive succession compared to the familial succession. In the case of Emperor Galba's adoption of Piso, Tacitus endeavours to provide the reason why adoptive succession is better. In the speech of Galba to Piso, Tacitus shows that adoptive succession is not a novelty (i.e. impiety), but it is following the precedent of Augustus (*Hist.* 1.15, 18). Further, Rome apparently suffered under the succession within houses and adoption could turn the situation towards a better future in which the emperor is chosen according to his merits (*Hist.* 1.16). Tacitus' argument shines in the final and conclusive statement of Piso: "adoption seemed to provide against any occasion for war even after Galba's death" (*Hist.* 1.29). Piso was killed before seizing power and familial succession dominated the Empire's political thinking. A reader of such discussions between Galba and Piso in the early years of Trajan would understand well how this promotes the new system. As far as we are concerned, we can see how Tacitus prepares the way for the dawn of what he called the "happy age" which fulfils the same Augustan ideals that were lost in the terrorising age of the Flavians, those of piety, peace and providence.

#### **6.4.3 Pliny the Younger**

The notion of a dawn of a new age that resembles the Augustan golden age and revives the importance of its ideals finds its full expression in the work of Pliny the Younger. Pliny was close to Trajan as it appears from their large number of exchanged letters. Pliny's appointment as a consul (in 100 CE) was a shifting moment in his career. In acknowledgement of it he wrote *Panegyricus* as a

*gratiarum actio* to the emperor for this appointment.<sup>862</sup> The first edition was addressed to the Senate, but the second developed edition was written for Trajan to read, which is a large work that needed three days to be read in full.<sup>863</sup> It does not appear to me that *Panegyricus* was meant to be solely an expression of gratitude. The second edition, at least, appears to be a systematic construction of the ideology that should define Trajan's reign. For example, Pliny at some point advises Trajan to accelerate the process of deifying Nerva and to announce him as divine before the adoption of Trajan so that "one day posterity might wonder whether he was already god when his last deed [adopting Trajan] was done" (*Pan.* 10.5). Trajan certainly did not need to know the comprehensive list of his personal information and accomplishments, but at this early stage of his principate, he probably needed to read them in the light of the ideals that would solidify his contested legitimacy. Therefore, this work must have been used as an instruction on what Trajan's adoption and access to power meant ideologically. This was a substantial defence for the adoptive succession system that successfully lasted for nearly a century.

This comprehensive work starts from the essential value of *pietas*: following the ancestors "*maiores*" (*Pan.* 1.1). After that, Pliny showers Trajan with ideals and virtues and, mainly, his *pietas*.<sup>864</sup> According to Pliny, Trajan was not the choice of blind fate but the choice of Jupiter (*Pan.* 1.4-5). Divine providence was proven by omens accessible to everyone (*Pan.* 5). Cassius Dio also refers to omens such as the common omen of dreams that shortly precede the event. According to him, Trajan had a dream of a man in a purple toga crowning him while the Senate is in the background. This preceded Nerva's announcement to adopt him (*Hist. rom.* 68.5). The unprecedented omen is the gathering of the people (for different purposes) and their hailing of him in the Capitoline temple as if

---

<sup>862</sup> Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 3.18. Cf. Julian Bennett, *Trajan* (London: Routledge, 1997), 65. Bennett suggests that this work is inspired by Cicero's *Pro Marcello* which appears to be a plausible suggestion when we compare the two texts and their historical conditions. Other suggestions include Cicero's *de Officiis* and Plato's *Republic*. See S. E. Hoffer, "Divine Comedy? Accession Propaganda in Pliny, Epistles 10.1-2 and the *Panegyric*," *Journal of Roman studies* 96 (2006): 73-87.

<sup>863</sup> Hoffer, "Divine Comedy?", 73-87.

<sup>864</sup> A whole list of these virtues in the work could be found in C. F. Noreña, *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 37.

they were addressing Jupiter (*Pan.* 5.4). The theme of the temple as the platform of legitimate pronouncements continues in Pliny's *apologia* for adoptive succession. Pliny offers the same arguments as Tacitus for adoptive succession against familial succession (*Pan.* 7-8). In a striking statement that puts Trajan above his predecessors, Pliny states that the divine approval of Trajan is embodied in the fact that his sonship came to existence (in terms of its announcement) in Jupiter's temple and not in a marriage bed. Cassius Dio's account also confirms that Trajan's legitimacy stems from Nerva's appeal to the temple for such an announcement when shouting, "May the good be for the Senate, the Roman people and me as I make him Markus Ulpius Nerva Trajan."<sup>865</sup>

This is the adoption "which was to be the basis of no servitude for us, but of security, happiness, and freedom" (*Pan.* 8.1). In a doxology similar to that of 1 Clement in content and position (*Pan.* 94; cf. 1 Clem. 60-61), Pliny repeats this point, praying not only for peace and concord (*pacem, concordiam*) but also to grant Trajan an adopted son who is worthy to be adopted in Jupiter's temple on the Capitol as well (*Pan.* 94.5). In return, Trajan's *pietas* appears in his sincerity to build Nerva temples (*Pan.* 11.1). Like Augustus, and unlike the Flavians, Trajan was reluctant to accept the introduction of any form of glorification to himself (*Pan.* 52).<sup>866</sup> Therefore, this propagandist work appears to construct the virtuous profile Trajan should have. Within that ideology, Trajan as an *Optimus Princeps* stands as the communicator of the divine providence (προνοία). In acknowledgement of that, Pliny formally wrote a letter to seek Trajan's approval to add statues of him in the temple Pliny erected for the deified emperors (*Ep.* 10.8).<sup>867</sup> Pliny calls this an act of piety (*pietatis*) which precisely resonates with the theme of temple piety we have discussed.

---

<sup>865</sup> "ἀγαθὴ τύχη τῆς τε βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ Μάρκον Οὐλπίον Νέρουαν Τραϊανὸν ποιοῦμαι." (Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 68.3.4). In another account, Nerva declared him as a son after offering incense to Jupiter in the Capitole for offering victory to Trajan in Paeonia (LCL 176, 365, n.2).

<sup>866</sup> This is also confirmed in the mail exchange between him and Pliny, *Ep.* 10.8, 9.

<sup>867</sup> Trajan's reluctant yet positive response, *Ep.* 10.9. Cf. K. Scott, "The elder and younger Pliny on emperor worship," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 63 (1932): 156-65.

It is noteworthy that the philosopher Dio Chrysostom, who was exiled under Domitian and restored by Nerva, took advantage of the *libertas*<sup>868</sup> of Trajan's reforms to write his orations *περὶ βασιλείας*, which seem to set out the ideals a ruler like Trajan should acquire (*Orationes* 1–4). This also appears in the biographies of Plutarch, a Trajanic Greek writer as well.<sup>869</sup>

Based on this, we can see that the succession crisis and the new adoptive system was considered to be a new phase in which the ideals and virtues of the Augustan era were mobilised to assert the legitimacy of Trajan. The narrative of the benevolent and virtuous emperor is proclaimed in a spectrum of major works. This shows that it is not a product of a single propagandist working closely with Trajan but reflects a movement of renewal or a revival of Augustan values and ideals in that era. This does not only appear in the quantity and quality of the biographies produced, thanks to Trajan's restoration of the *libertas*, but it also appears in the way his political reforms were received by the later generations as ushering a new "happy age" (*beatissimi saeculi*).<sup>870</sup> As shown in literature and coinage, this is the era of *Pax Augusti* where many of the *Divi Augusti aurei* were restored.<sup>871</sup> That was an obvious act to link the current policies to the great past, as Harold Mattingly puts it.<sup>872</sup> Regarding Pliny's *Panegyricus*, Bennett rightly notes that it "articulated a reality which was readily apparent to his contemporaries."<sup>873</sup> Beyond the revival of imperial ideals, several contemporary historians observed (particularly in *Panegyricus*) what seems to be a major shift towards emphasising

---

<sup>868</sup> This is also not a literary invention but it is attested in coins (see: RIC 123–124).

<sup>869</sup> See in particular P. A. Stadter, "Plutarch and Trajanic ideology," in *Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek intellectuals, and Roman power in the time of Trajan (98-117 AD)*, eds. P. A. Stadter and L. Van der Stockt (Leuven University Press, 2002), 227–42; T. E. Duff, "Plutarch and Trajan," *The Classical Review (New Series)* 55 (2005): 462–65; M. M. Catherine, "Alexander-Imitators in the Age of Trajan: Plutarch's Demetrius and Pyrrhus," *The Classical Journal* 112 (2017): 406–30.

<sup>870</sup> Bennett, *Trajan*, 66.

<sup>871</sup> See also Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 68.15. Alongside the texts mentioned above, see the coins: RIC 11-15, 17, 30 Cf. Bennett, *Trajan*, 74. On the chronological analysis of these coins see D. N. Schowalter, *The Emperor and the Gods: Images from the Time of Trajan*, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1993), 102f. See also Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 68.15.

<sup>872</sup> H. Mattingly, "The restored coins of Trajan," *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society* 6 (1926): 232.

<sup>873</sup> Bennett, *Trajan*, 65.

the penetration of these ideals and virtues into the society in order to ensure divine providence,<sup>874</sup> which resonates with the divine structure of power and order as expressed in 1 Clement in particular. He even uses the same term, τῆς προνοίας τοῦ δεσπότου (1 Clem. 24.5).

## 6.5 Conclusion

This study has shown that Luke's Temple attitude was part of his strategy to provide a Christianity acceptable to Roman culture and values. The Temple was part of Luke's understanding of Jesus' identity as the divine Son of God, the *Kurios*, who was fulfilling the virtue of *pietas* through his allegiance to the Temple of his Father. The first community has also preserved the ancient customs and enjoyed the peace and concordance in its affiliation to the Temple of Jerusalem, despite the sedition brought about by the rulers of the Judaeen nation which eventually brought the historical destruction of the Temple. Therefore, a Roman Christian whose moral conduct includes respect for antiquity, worship in public altars and a hatred of sedition will find in Luke-Acts' allegiance to the Temple a comfortable choice of the religion he should follow. Theophilus, if a Roman of some social standing, would be convinced.

The evidence provided by our study also shows a strong affinity between Luke and 1 Clement whose Temple attitudes and the associated theological issues are almost identical. The external evidence on the locality of the originating context of Luke-Acts and the common view linking it to 1 Clement both point to late first-century Rome. Looking into the possible historical context of these findings, we find that the age of Nerva and Trajan is relevant for the literature of Luke-Acts and 1 Clement. Unlike earlier eras, Trajan's age witnessed a cultural and ideological revolution in which the ideals of the Augustan golden age were mobilised to define the new adoptive system. Secondly, this ideological mobilisation of the virtues penetrated through the society and wider culture as it appears in thriving

---

<sup>874</sup> Cf. Pliny the Younger, *Pan.* 68.7-8; Y. Shochat, "The Change in the Roman Religion at the Time of the Emperor Trajan," *Latomus* 44 (1985): 317-36; J. Beaujeu, *La religion romaine à l'apogée de l'Empire* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1955), 133ff.

biographical literature of that age, thanks to the restoration of the *libertas*. Thirdly, looking into the major biographies and *Panegyricus*, it appears to us that the three major themes we found in Luke-Acts and 1 Clement are also crystallized and underscored in the same way for asserting legitimacy: pietas, ancestral customs, and peace and concord.

## Conclusion

### ***Summary***

This study has aimed to identify and understand the nature and complexity of Luke-Acts' attitude towards the Temple within its post-destruction historical and literary context. Analysing previous studies, three elements that problematised the results of scholars were identified: first, the remaining influence of the ecclesiastical (Eusebian) view of Christian history which marginalized the post-destruction Jewish texts; second, the tendency to harmonize the Christian views, whether inside the same text or in the Christian literature in general, which is also related to the same ecclesiastical view that shows Christianity as a single unified entity; third, there has been a focus on the canonical texts of the Old and New Testaments in interpreting the texts that fall within their hypothetical boundary (like Luke-Acts), devaluing non-canonical texts such as the Apostolic Fathers. These issues led to a variety of results that are partial and unsatisfactory.

Based on that, I offered a different approach that avoids these tendencies. Employing the progress of research in the relationship between the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers, and applying Tertullian's understanding of the designation *apostolicus*, I proposed using the apostolic approach which considers Luke-Acts as a work within the category of the Apostolic Fathers, comparable with them and understood in accordance with the historical background of these works, namely the late first and early second centuries. Other works were selected according to particular criteria to help in understanding the subject found in Luke-Acts. I chose the Epistle of Barnabas and 1 Clement to shed light on the motives and attitudes to the Temple of Jerusalem in Luke-Acts. In order to situate their particular concerns and avoid an assumption of separateness between Jewish and Christian texts of this time, the discussion included both post-destruction Jewish texts.

Studying the post-destruction Jewish texts, it appeared that a variety of responses and views were already shaped. There were elements such as the question of the nature of eschatological restoration,

if any, the relation between earthly and heavenly elements, and whether Temple worship should be redefined in light of what happened in 70 CE. It was noted that these views had a strong resonance in the Apostolic texts and Luke-Acts. Studying the Epistle of Barnabas, the author offers a categorical rejection of the Temple which is substantially different to the classic idea of supersessionism; the Temple was never a house of God, regardless of the coming of Jesus. 1 Clement offers an opposite view in which the Temple and its worship order occupy a central place in his argument for legitimacy.

Having studied a spectrum of texts that offer a wealth of diverse views that surrounded Luke-Acts in its contemporary setting, I analysed the text of Luke-Acts itself to see how the Temple featured within it. It was observed that the materials studied earlier offered insights that clarified problematic issues in Luke's attitude. Importantly, the main voice of Luke-Acts has a significant resemblance of 1 Clement, while the speech of Stephen is close to the ideas of the Epistle of Barnabas. The speech should not be considered the primary paradigm for understanding the Temple attitude of Luke-Acts, but rather it is included in the work as an example of a particular kind of Alexandrian attitude not in fact shared by the writer. The points of similarity observed in Luke-Acts and 1 Clement led us to reflect on the Roman context of the period from Nerva to Trajan, which provided some explanation for these observations.

## ***Conclusion***

Based on this analysis, Luke understands the Temple as a focal point of his work: it is the space of manifesting the divine proclamation of the Good News of God's Son and his people. This view did not fade or suffer supersessionism in the progress of the narrative throughout the double work. Indeed, it remains the major view that runs from the announcement of the gospel in the Temple to the final speech of Paul in Rome. Luke's Temple attitude appears as part of his *apologia* for Christian legitimacy with an eye on *Romanitas*. We noted that the Temple notions come in sections that show a tendency to defend the Christian allegiance to concrete Roman ideals: *pietas*, maintaining ancestral customs, and keeping peace and concord. Therefore, the Temple appeared as the stage for practising these themes by Christians, in contrast to the Judaeian rulers.

A pious Roman citizen (like Theophilus of Luke-Acts) who was introduced to Christian faith or to a biography of its founder would expect to see an account of the works and virtues that overpowered vice, according to “the ancestral customs” (*Agr.* 1.1; see also Plutarch, *Aem.* 1.1). In this case, Jesus as Son of God should have been someone whose piety towards the Temple of his Father showed the latter’s providence in the former’s life, which proves his divine Sonship. This also extends providence to the virtuous life of his followers who were equally respectful to the “ancestral customs”. It would certainly be an act of grave impiety to hold in contempt the Temple of the Father and the customs of the ancestors. To accept a new temple for oneself, immodestly, would prevent the divine *providentia*, and this is why it was rejected by both the pious Augustus and Trajan (Pliny the Younger, *Pan.* 52.1-2; 78.5), in contrast with “the impious” Domitian (Plutarch, *Publ.* 15.5-6). That is why Luke was careful in revising his sources.

The plausibility of the existence of this reading and its motive is supported by its strong presence in 1 Clement which attests to a Roman Christian tendency to fulfil the same ideals and views, in which the Temple is also involved. Further, it has been noted that the same period (Nerva/Trajan) witnessed the revival of these ideals as part of the same rhetoric for legitimacy, in which the idea of the Temple was similarly employed. To summarise, taking into consideration our findings that connect Luke-Acts with 1 Clement in terms of the Roman ideals associated with the Temple notion and in light of our understanding of the era of the composition of Luke-Acts, the matrix of Trajanic Rome should be considered as the best explanation for the approach of Luke-Acts and 1 Clement towards the Temple.

The contribution of this thesis could be summarised as follows:

1- *A New Approach*: This thesis contributes to scholarship through an analysis of Luke-Acts' response to the Temple assessed against a new set of texts that were not engaged with in this topic before. I identify this as an apostolic approach.

2- *Defining Two Major Attitudes*: We saw two cases of contemporaneous and independent attitudes of 1 Clement and Barnabas. In Alexandria, the Epistle of Barnabas offers a response that goes beyond supersessionism to a categorical rejection of the Temple as an idolatrous worship in the same line of idolatry that started with the worship of the golden calf. In Rome, 1 Clement offered an understanding of the Temple that comes as part of his rhetoric for legitimacy according to Roman ideals. Therefore, this study contributes to our understanding of these texts regarding this theme, which could be significant for recently developing studies on Judaism and the Apostolic Fathers.

3- *Historical Plausibility*: Setting Luke in this historical context has provided significant parallels. The overall voice of Luke-Acts shares with 1 Clement allegiance to the Temple and its place in the rhetoric of legitimacy while the categorical rejection of the Temple in Stephen is uniquely shared with the Epistle of Barnabas. The comparisons that penetrate through the arguments behind the attitude deem the reading historically plausible. While the Epistle of Barnabas offers a contemporaneous parallel to the train of thought found in Stephen's speech, which makes this interpretation historically plausible, the case of 1 Clement goes beyond that. 1 Clement offers a similar case that reinforces the historical plausibility of our reading of Luke's overall attitude. Thanks to the large size of both works, we were able to see deeper theological similarity and shared ideas that are found in the Roman ideals that were revived in the Roman works of their Trajanic era. Therefore, this thesis sheds light on the milieu of two texts that belong to it and invites more studies on it as the milieu of the composition of Luke-Acts.

### ***Implications and Recommendation for Future Research***

Due to the limitations of this research, there was a focus on a single theme in Luke-Acts—the Temple. However, a full-scale study into the theology of Luke-Acts in comparison with the Apostolic Fathers (particularly 1 Clement) is expected to be helpful in understanding the double work's background and context.<sup>875</sup> Therefore, furthering this research in the matrix of Trajan's era could shed more light on issues that were found to be ambiguous and unclear. This would also be applicable to other Gospels. We have already observed how the Gospel of John and the Epistle of Barnabas are close in various ways.

Moving towards the larger picture of Christianity's development in this era, the diversity of Christian attitudes towards fundamental Jewish principles such as the Temple could be key in developing a better understanding of the complexity of how Christianity emerged in relation to Judaism. We saw how post-destruction Jewish texts reflected common interests and themes applied by the Apostolic texts we dealt with, as well as Luke-Acts. We have also observed how different regions developed different responses as we saw in the case of the contradictory views of 1 Clement and Barnabas, developed across the Mediterranean independently but contemporaneously. This would result in a

---

<sup>875</sup> Cf. The Composition of Luke-Acts and Marcion: a Proposal, *Biblical Interpretation* 25.4 (2017), (forthcoming).

more complicated, yet more historically reliable, model for a regionally oriented understanding of the parting of the ways.

## Bibliography

- Adams, E. *The Stars Will Fall from Heaven*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Aland, K. *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1976.
- Aland, K., and B. Aland. *The Text of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Allison Jr., Dale C. "The Living Water: John 4:10–14; 6:35c; 7:37–39." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 30 (1986): 143–57.
- Allison Jr., Dale C. and W. D. Davies. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Ando, C. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- . "A Religion for the Empire." Pages 323–44 in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image and Text*. Edited by A. Boyle and W. Dominik. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Bachmann, M. *Jerusalem und der Tempel: die geographisch-theologischen Elemente in des lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980.
- Bacon, B. "Stephen's Speech: Its Argument and Doctrinal Relationship." Pages 213–278 in *Biblical and Semitic Studies*. Edited by E. Curtis C. F. Kent, F. K. Sanders. Cambridge, MA: Wilson, 1901.
- Bakke, O. M. *"Concord and Peace": A Rhetorical Analysis of the First Letter of Clement with an Emphasis on the Language of Unity and Sedition*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Baltzer, K. "The Meaning of the Temple in the Lukan Writings." *HTR* 58 (1965): 263–77.
- Barbarick, C. A. "The Pattern and the Power: The Example of Christ in 1 Peter." PhD diss., The Graduate Faculty of Baylor University, 2011.
- Barclay, J. M. G. *Against Apion: Translation and Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Barnard, L. W. "The Date of the Epistle of Barnabas: A Document of Early Egyptian Christianity." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 44 (1958): 101–7.
- . "The Epistle of Barnabas: A Paschal Homily?" *Vigiliae Christianae* 15 (1961): 8–22.
- . "Saint Stephen and Early Alexandrian Christianity." *NTS* 7 (1960): 31–45.
- . *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1966.

———. *Studies in Church History and Patristics*. Athens: Patriarchikon Idryma Paterikon Meleton, 1978.

Bate, H. N. *The Sibylline Oracles*. London: Macmillan, 1918.

Bauckham, R. "The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes." Pages 63-89 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by J. R. Davila. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

———. "The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why." *St. Th.* 47 (1993): 135–51.

Bauer, W. *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1934. ET: Robert A. Kraft, and Gerhard Krodel, eds., trs. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1971.

Baumgarten, J. M. "4Q500 and the Lord's Vineyard." *JJS* 40 (1989): 1–6.

Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*. Leipzig: Fuess, 1867. ET: Allan Menzies tr. *Paul: The Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Works*. Vol. 1. London: Williams and Norgate, 1873.

———. *The Church History of the First Three Centuries*. Translated by Allan Menzies. London: Williams and Norgate, 1879.

Beall, T. S. *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Beaujeu, J. *La religion romaine à l'apogée de l'Empire*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1955.

Becker, Adam H., and Annette Y. Reed. *The Ways Never Parted*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

BeDuhn, J. *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 2013.

Bellinzoni, A. "The Gospel of Luke in the Second Century CE." Pages 59-76 in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by R. Thompson and T. Philips. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998.

Bennett, J. *Trajan*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Bilde, P. *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works and Their Importance*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988.

Billings, Bradly S. "'At the Age of 12': The Boy Jesus in the Temple (Luke 2:41-52), The Emperor Augustus, and the Social Setting of the Third Gospel," *JTS* 60.1 (2009): 70-89.

- Blackman, E. C. *Marcion and his Influence*. London: SPCK, 1948.
- Blass, Friedrich. *Philology of the Gospels*. London: Macmillan, 1898.
- Boismard, M. *En quête du Proto-Luke*. Paris: Gabalda, 1997.
- . *L'Évangile de l'enfance (Luc 1 - 2) selon le proto-Luc*. Études bibliques 35. Paris: Gabalda, 1997.
- . *Le Texte Occidental des Actes des Apôtres*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1984.
- Borgen, P. *Philo, John, and Paul: New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Bornkamm, G. *Jesus of Nazareth*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1960.
- Bousset, W. *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1903.
- Bovon, F. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 4 vols. Zürich: Benziger, 1996.
- . *Luke: A Commentary*. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2013.
- . *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research (1950–2005)*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- . “Le récit Lucanien de la Passion.” in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Edited by C. Focant. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993.
- . “Studies in Luke-Acts: Retrospect and Prospect.” *HTR* 85 (1992): 175–96.
- . “The Synoptic Gospels and the Noncanonical Acts of the Apostles.” *HTR* 81 (1988): 19–36.
- Bovon, F., Ann Graham Brock, and Christopher R. Matthews, eds. *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Box, G. H. *The Apocalypse of Abraham*. New York: Macmillan, 1918.
- Boyarin, D. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- . “The Christian Invention of Judaism: The Theodosian Empire and the Rabbinic Refusal of Religion.” *Representations* 85 (2004): 21–57.

———. “Semantic Differences; or, Judaism/Christianity.” Pages 65-86 in *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Edited by A. H. Becker and A. Y. Reed. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2007.

Brakke, D. *The Gnostics*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Brändle, R., and E. W. Stegemann. “The Formation of the ‘First Christian Congregations’ in Rome in the Context of the Jewish Synagogues.” Pages 117- 27 *Judaism and Christianity in the First Century*. Edited by K. P. Donfried and P. Richardson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Brandon, S. G. *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*. London: SPCK, 1951.

Brent, A. “Ignatius' Pagan Background in Second Century Asia Minor.” *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum* 10 (2007): 207–32.

———. *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

———. *The Imperial Cult and the Development of Church Order: Concepts and Images of Authority in Paganism and Early Christianity Before the Age of Cyprian*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. *A Political History of Early Christianity*. London: Black, 2009.

Broadhead, Edwin K. *Jewish Ways of Following Jesus: Redrawing the Religious Map of Antiquity*. WUNT 26. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Brooke, G. J. “4Q500 1 and the Use of Scripture in the Parable of the Vineyard.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 268–94.

———. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4Q Florilegium in I*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.

Brown, R. E. *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind*. New York: Paulist, 1999.

———. *Death of the Messiah. From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1994

Brown, R. E., and John P. Meier. *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity*. Paulist Press, 1983.

Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek text with Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Brunt, P. A., and J. M. Moore., eds. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.

- Buitenwerf, R. *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and its Social Setting*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Bultmann, R. *History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. Oxford: Blackwell, 1963.
- . *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. London: SCM, 1993.
- Cadbury, H. J. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.
- Carlebach, A. "Rabbinic References to Fiscus Judaicus." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 66 (1975): 57–61.
- Carras, G. "Observant Jews in the Story of Luke and Acts," in Verheyden, *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, 693–708.
- Catchpole, D. *The Quest for Q*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Caterine, M. M. "Alexander-Imitators in the Age of Trajan: Plutarch's Demetrius and Pyrrhus." *The Classical Journal* 112 (2017): 406–30.
- Chadwick, H. "St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome." *JTS* 8 (1957): 31–52.
- Chance, J. Bradley. *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988.
- Chapman, H. H. "What Josephus Sees: The Temple of Peace and the Jerusalem Temple as Spectacle in Text and Art." *Phoenix* 63 (2009): 107–30.
- Charles, R. H. *The Apocalypse of Baruch*. London: Black, 1896.
- . *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon 1964.
- . *The Assumption of Moses*. London: Black, 1897.
- . *The Book of Enoch the Prophet*. London: SPCK, 1912.
- Charlesworth, J., ed. *Jesus and Temple: Textual and Archaeological Explorations*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2014.
- ., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Chester, A. "The Sibyl and the Temple." Pages 37–69 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by W. Horbury. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Clarke, W., ed., trans. *The First Epistle of Clement*. London: Macmillan, 1937.

Coarelli, Filippo. *Rome and Environs: An Archaeological Guide*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Cole, A. *The New Temple*. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House, 1950.

Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002.

———. “The Place of the Fourth Sibyl in the Development of the Jewish Sibyllina.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25 (1974): 365–80.

———. *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974.

Coloe, Mary L. *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001.

———. “Temple imagery in John.” *Interpretation* 63 (2009): 368–81.

Congar, Yves. *Le Mystère du Temple*. Paris: Cerf, 1958. ET: Reginald Frederick Trevett, trs. *The Mystery of the Temple*. London: Burns & Gates, 1962.

Conybeare, Fred C. *Philo about the Contemplative Life, Or the Fourth Book of the Treatise Concerning Virtues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1895.

Conzelmann, H. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1963.

———. “Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity.” Pages 298-316 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*. Edited by L. Keck and J. Martyn. New York: Abingdon, 1966.

———. *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1954. ET: *The Theology of St. Luke*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1961.

Conzelmann, H., and A. Lindemann. *Interpreting the New Testament: An Introduction to the Principles and Methods of N.T. Exegesis*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988.

Cosaert, Carl P. *The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Cotelier, J. B. *Patrum qui temporibus Apostolicis floruerunt*. Paris, 1699.

- Cox, Ronald R. "The Intersection of Cosmology and Soteriology in Hellenistic Judaism." PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2005.
- Creed, J. M. "L' and the Structure of the Lucan Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis." *ET* 46 (1934–1935): 101–7.
- Crook, J. A. "An Augustan Inscription in the Rijksmuseum at Leyden." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 8 (1962): 23–29.
- Darwall-Smith, R. H. *Emperors and Architecture: A study of Flavian Rome*. Brussels: Latumus Revue d'Études Latines, 1996.
- Dawson, D. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkeley: University of California Press: 1992.
- de Jonge, H. "On the Origins of the Term 'Apostolic Fathers.'" *JTS* 29 (1978): 503–5.
- de Vos, Craig S. "Finding a Charge That Fits: The Accusation Against Paul and Silas At Philippi (Acts 16.19-21)." *JSNT* 74 (1999): 51–63.
- De Wette, W. M. L. *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments*. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1860.
- Deakle, David W. "A Re-examination of the Patristic Evidence for Marcion's Mentor." Pages 177–90 in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung*. Edited by Gerhard May, Katharina Greschat, and Martin Meiser. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.
- Delaunay, F. *Moines et Sibylles dans l'antiquité Judeo-Grecque*. Paris: Librairie Academique, 1874.
- Denaux, A., Hellen Mardaga, and R. Corstjens, eds. *The Vocabulary of Luke: An Alphabetical Presentation and a Survey of Characteristic and Noteworthy Words and Word Groups in Luke's Gospel*. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- d'Herbigny, M. "La date de «L'épître de Barnabé»." *Recherches de science religieuse* 1 (1910): 432–34.
- Dimant, D. *4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple, Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky*. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.
- Dittenberger, W. *Orientis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae, Supplementum Sylloges inscriptionum graecarum*. Vol. 2. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1905.
- Downing, F. G. "Dissolving the Synoptic Problem Through Film?" *JSNT* 84 (2001): 117–18.

Draper, Jonathan A. "Do the Didache and Matthew Reflect an 'Irrevocable Parting of the Ways' with Judaism?" Pages 217-42 in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* Edited by Huub van de Standt. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Duff, T. E. "Plutarch and Trajan." *The Classical Review* 55 (2005): 462–65.

Dunn, James D. G., ed. *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1989.

———. *The Partings of the Ways*. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 2006.

———. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1990.

Dupont, J. *Les Beatitudes*. Tome II: La bonne nouvelle. Paris: Gabalda, 1969.

———. "Il n'en sera pas laissé pierre sur pierre. Marc 13,2; Luc 19,44." *Biblica* 52 (1971): 301–20.

———. *Les Tentations de Jesus au Desert*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1968.

Edwards, James R. *The Gospel according to Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.

Ego, Beate, and Armin Lange. *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

Ehrhardt, Arnold. "Christianity before the Apostles' Creed." *HTR* 55 (1962): 73–119.

Ehrman, B., trans. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Vol. 1. LOEB Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Ellingworth, P. "'Hebrews and 1 Clement: Literary Dependence or Common Tradition?'" *Biblische Zeitschrift Paderborn* 23 (1979): 262-269.

Elliot, J. H. "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts: A contrast in social institutions." *HTS* 47 (1991): 88–120.

Ellis, E. E. *The Gospel of Luke*. Eugene, London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1991.

Emilie, G. "Cicero and the Roman Pietas." *Classical Journal* 39 (1944): 536–42.

Ernst, J. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Regensburg: Pustet, 1977.

Esler, P. F. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Falk, Z. W. *Introduction to Jewish Law of the Second Commonwealth*. Part 1. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Feiner, P. *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas*. Gotha: Perthes, 1891.

- Feldman, Louis H. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Feldmeier, R. *The First Letter of Peter*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.
- Feuillet, A. "La signification christologique de Luc 18,14 et les références des évangiles au serviteur souffrant." *Nova et Vetera Genève* 55 (1980): 188–229.
- Fischer, Joseph A., ed. *Die Apostolischen Väter*. Vol. 1. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1958.
- Fisher, E. W. "'Let Us Look Upon the Blood-of-Christ' (1 Clement 7:4)." *Vigiliae Christianae* 34 (1980): 218–36.
- Fitzmyer, J. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Anchor Bible Commentary. London: Doubleday, 1998.
- . *The Gospel according to Luke*. Vol.1. Anchor Bible 28. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981.
- Fledderman, H. *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.
- Forbes, G. *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*. London: Black, 2000.
- Foakes, F. J. "Stephen's Speech in Acts," *JBL* 49.3 (1930), 283-289.
- Foster, P. "Is It Possible to Dispense with Q?" *Novum Testamentum* 45 (2003): 313–37.
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Friedländer, M. "Les Esséniens." *Revue des Études Juives* 14 (1887): 184–216.
- Füchtel, U. *Die Kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philon von Alexandrien*. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenischen Judentums 2. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- Fuellenbach, J. *Ecclesiastical Office and the Primacy of Rome: An Evaluation of the Recent Theological Discussion of First Clement*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1980.
- Fuglseth, K. S. *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Fusco, V. "Luke-Acts and the Future of Israel," *Novum Testamentum* 38.1 (1996), 1-17.
- Garland, David E. *The Intention of Matthew 23* (Leiden : Brill, 1979), 200-1

- Gärtner, B. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Gaston, L. *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Gathercole, S. *The Composition of the Gospel of Thomas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- . *The Gospel of Thomas: Introduction and Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- . “Thomas Revisited: A Rejoinder to Denzey Lewis, Kloppenborg and Patterson.” *JSNT* 36 (2014): 262–81.
- Geffcken, J. *Die Oracula Sibyllina*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902.
- Gehring, Roger W. *Hausgemeinde und Mission: Die Bedeutung antiker Häuser und Hausgemeinschaften von Jesus bis Paulus*. Basel: Brunnen, 2000.
- Gerhard, M., and M. Katharina, eds. *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001.
- Ginzberg, L. “Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings.” *JBL* 41 (1922): 115–36.
- Goehring, J. E. *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1986.
- Goodacre, M. *The Case against Q*. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2002.
- . *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze*. London: Black, 2004.
- . *Thomas and the Gospels: The Case for Thomas's Familiarity with the Synoptics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Goodenough, E. *By Light, Light. The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1969.
- . *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1962.
- . *Jewish symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. New York, 1968.
- Goodman, M. *Mission and Conversion: Proselytising in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- . “Nerva, the Fiscus Judaicus and Jewish Identity.” *Journal of Roman Studies* 79 (1989): 43.

- Goudoever, J. V. "The Place of Israel in Luke's Gospel," *Novum Testamentum* 8.2 (1966), 111-123
- Grabbe, L. L. "Eschatology in Philo and Josephus." 163-85 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity*. 4 (2000).
- Grainger, John. D. *Nerva and the Roman Succession Crisis of AD 96–99*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Grant, R. "The Apostolic Fathers' First Thousand Years." *Church History* 31 (1962): 421–29.
- . *Eusebius as Church Historian*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1980.
- . *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1988.
- Gray, T. C. *The Temple in the Gospel of Mark: A Study in Its Narrative Role*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Green, J. *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Gregg, B. *The Historical Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Gregory, A. "1 Clement: An Introduction." *The Expository Times* 117 (2006): 226–28.
- . "Disturbing Trajectories." Pages 142-66 in *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*. Edited by Peter Oakes. Exeter: Paternoster, 2002.
- . *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- . "The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke–Acts." *JSNT* 29 (2007): 459–72.
- Gregory, A., and Christopher Tuckett, eds. *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- , eds. *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Gressmann, H. "Jewish Life in Ancient Rome." Pages 170–91 in *Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams*. Edited by the Jewish Institute of Religion. New York: Arno, 1927.
- . *Das Weihnachtsevangelium auf Ursprung und Geschichte untersucht*. Göttingen: Griffith, 1914.
- Grundmann, W. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964.
- Gueuret, A. "Le pharisien et le publicain (Lc 18,9-14)." In *Les Paraboles évangéliques: perspectives Nouvelles*. Edited by J. Delorme. Paris: Cerf, 1989.

- Gunther, J. "The Epistle of Barnabas and the Final Rebuilding of the Temple." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 7 (1976): 143–51.
- Haenchen, E. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Haeuser, P. *Der Barnabasbrief, neu untersucht und neu erklärt*. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1912.
- Hagner, D. A. *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*. Leuven: Brill, 1973.
- Han, K. S. *Jerusalem and the Early Jesus Movement: The Q Community's Attitude Towards the Temple*. New York: Continuum, 1997.
- Harb, G., ed. *Documenta Q: Q11:46b, 52, 47-51*. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.
- Harland, Philip A. "Christ-Bearers and Fellow-Initiates: Local Cultural Life and Christian Identity in Ignatius' Letters." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 11 (2003): 481–99.
- Harrington, D. "The Reception of Walter Bauer's 'Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity' During the Last Decade." *HTR* 73 (1980): 289–98.
- Harrington, J. *The Lukan Passion Narrative: The Markan Material in Luke 22, 54 - 23, 25*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Harris, J. Rendel. "On the Locality of Pseudo-Barnabas." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 9 (1890): 60–70.
- . *The Rest of the Words of Baruch*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1889.
- Hartog, P. *Polycarp and the New Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Hauskins, Paul M. *Jesus as the Fulfilment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.
- Hawkins, J. C. "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel." Pages 29-94 in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by Members of the University of Oxford*. Edited by W. Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.
- Hay, D. M. "Philo's Anthropology, the Spiritual Regimen of the Therapeutae, and a Possible Connection with Corinth." Pages 127-42 in *Philo und das Neue Testament*. WUNT. Edited by K. W. Niebuhr and R. Deines. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Head, P. "The Temple in Luke's Gospel." Pages 101-19 in *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander and S. Gathercole. Exeter: Paternoster, 2004.

- Heemstra, M. *The Fiscus Judaicus and the Parting of the Ways*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Hempel, C. *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Hengel, Martin, and C. K. Barrett. *Conflicts and Challenges in Early Christianity*. London: Continuum, 1999.
- Herzer, J. *4 Baruch. Paraleipomena Jeremiou*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Higgins, A. J. B. "The Priestly Messiah." *NTS* 13 (1967): 211–39.
- Himuro, M. "The Phoenix in The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians." *Renaissance Studies* 12 (1998): 523–44.
- Hoffer, S. E. "Divine Comedy? Accession Propaganda in Pliny, Epistles 10.1–2 and the Panegyric." *Journal of Roman Studies* 96 (2006): 73–87.
- Hoffmann, P. *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1972.
- Hogan, K. M. *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom, Debate and Apocalyptic Solution*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Holmes, M. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Hooijbergh, A. "A Different View of Clemens Romanus." *The Heythrop Journal* 16 (1975): 266–88.
- Horbury, William. *Jewish War Under Trajan and Hadrian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- . *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.
- Horsley, Richard A. "The law of nature in Philo and Cicero." *HTR* 71 (1978): 35–59.
- Hvalvik, R. *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant*. WUNT 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- Jaubert, A. *Clément de Rome: Épitre aux Corinthiens*. Sources Chrétiennes 167. Paris: Cerf, 1971.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1966.
- . *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An investigation into economic and social conditions during the New Testament period*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- . *The Parables of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1954.

- . *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
- Jervell, C. A. *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Jipp, J. W. *Divine Visitations and Hospitality to Strangers in Luke-Acts*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Jones, B. W. “Titus in Judaea A.D. 67.” *Latomus* 1 (1989): 127–34.
- Jones, K. R. *Jewish Reactions to the Destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Jones, Liddell-Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.
- Jones, S. *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity: Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.27-71*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1995.
- Jongkind, D. “The Lilies of the Field' Reconsidered: ‘Codex Sinaiticus’ and the Gospel of Thomas.” *Novum Testamentum* 48 (2006): 209–16.
- Joseph, Simon J. *The Nonviolent Messiah: Jesus, Q, and the Enochic Tradition*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2014.
- . *Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in its Jewish Context*. SNTSMS 165. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Jung, Young-San. “From Temple to House-Church in Luke Acts.” PhD diss., University of St. Andrews, 2000.
- Käsemann, E. *Commentary on Romans*. London: SCM, 1980.
- Kebler, W. H. *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- Keener, C. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 Vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Kerr, A. *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2002.
- Kilgallen, J. “The Function of Stephen's Speech. Acts 7,2-53.” *Biblica* 70 (1989): 173–93.
- Kilpatrick, G. “Scribes, Lawyers and Lucan Origins.” *JTS* 1 (1950): 56–60.
- Kinman, B. “Luke's Exoneration of John the Baptist.” *JTS* 44 (1993): 595–98.
- Kirschner, R. “Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Responses to the Destruction of 70.” *HTR* 78 (1985): 27–46.

- Klauck, H. "Die heilige Stadt. Jerusalem bei Philo und Lukas." *Kairos* 28 (1986):129–51.
- Klawans, J. "Josephus, the Rabbis, and Responses to Catastrophes Ancient and Modern." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 10 (2010): 278–309.
- Klevinghaus, J. *Die Theologische Stellung der Apostolischen Väter zur alttestamentlichen Offenbarung*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1948.
- Klijn, A. *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . "Matthew 11:25 / Luke 10:21." Pages 1-14 in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger*. Edited by E. J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- . "Stephen's Speech—Acts VII. 2-53." *NTS* 4.1 (1957): 25–31.
- Klinghardt, M. *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien*. 2 vols. Tübingen: Francke, 2015.
- . "The Marcionite Gospel and the Synoptic Problem: A New Suggestion." *Novum Testamentum* 50 (2008): 1–27.
- Klinzing, G. *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2000.
- . "On Dispensing with Q?: Goodacre on the Relation of Luke to Matthew." *NTS* 49 (2003): 210–36.
- . "A New Synoptic Problem: Mark Goodacre and Simon Gathercole on Thomas." *JSNT* 36 (2014): 199–239.
- . "Pneumatic Democracy and the Conflict in 1 Clement." Pages 61-82 in *Christian Communities in the Second Century: Between Ideal and Reality*. Edited by M. Grundeken and J. Verheyden. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- . "The Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion on the People Behind the Document," *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 1 (1993): 9–34.

- . “Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q.” *HTR* 80 (1987): 246–62.
- . *The Tenants in the Vineyard: Ideology, Economics and Agrarian Conflict in Jewish Palestine*. WUNT 195. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Knoch, Otto. *Eigenart und Bedeutung der Eschatologie im theologischen Aufriss des ersten Clemensbriefes*. Bonn: Hanstein, 1964.
- Knopf, R. *Der erste Clemensbrief, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901.
- . *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel, die zwei Klemensbriefe*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920.
- . *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1905.
- Knox, J. *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- . “On the Vocabulary of Marcion's Gospel.” *JBL* 1 (1939): 193–201.
- Koester, C. “The Origin and Significance of the Flight to Pella Tradition,” *CBQ* 51.1 (1989), 90-106.
- Koester, H. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. London: Bloomsbury, 1990.
- . “ΤΝΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ. The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity.” *HTR* 58 (1965) 279-318.
- . *History and Literature of Early Christianity*. 2nd ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000.
- . *Introduction to the New Testament*. 2 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982.
- . *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*. Berlin: Akademie, 1957.
- Köstenberger, A., and M. J. Kruger. *The Heresy of Orthodoxy: How Contemporary Culture's Fascination with Diversity Has Reshaped Our Understanding of Early Christianity*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010.
- Kraemer, R. “Monastic Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Egypt: Philo Judaeus on the Therapeutrides.” *Working Together in the Middle Ages: Perspectives on Women's Communities* 14 (1989): 342–70.
- Kraft, R. “The Epistle of Barnabas: Its Quotations and their Sources.” PhD diss., Harvard University, 1961.
- Kramer, H., ed. *Lukas als Ordner des frühchristlichen Diskurses um “Armut und Reichtum” und den “Umgang mit materiellen Gütern.”* Tübingen: Francke, 2015.

- Kuhn, K. H., ed., trans. "A Coptic Jeremiah Apocryphon." *Le Muséon* 83 (1970): 95–135.
- Kümmel, W. *Introduction to the New Testament*. New York: Abingdon, 1975.
- . *Promise and Fulfilment*. London: SCM Press, 1957,
- Lampe, G. W. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.
- Lanci, J. R. *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.
- Landau, T. *Out-Heroding Herod: Josephus, Rhetoric, and the Herod Narratives*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Lanier, G. "Luke's Distinctive Use of the Temple: Portraying the Divine Visitation." *JTS* 65 (2014): 433–62.
- Larsson, E. "Temple-Criticism and the Jewish Heritage: Some Reflexions on Acts 6–7." *NTS* 39 (1993): 379–95.
- Lied, L. I. *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Lietzmann, H. *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*. Vol. 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1932.
- . *Petrus und Paulus in Rome*. Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1915.
- Lietzmann, H., and Bertram L. Woolf. *The Beginnings of the Christian Church*. London: Lutterworth, 1937.
- Lieu, Judith M. *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- . "'The Parting of the Ways': Theological Construct or Historical Reality?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 17 (1995): 101–19.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *The Apostolic Fathers. Part 1. S. Clement of Rome*. Vols. 1-2. London: Macmillan, 1891 (1890).
- . *The Apostolic Fathers. Part 2*. 3 Vols. London: Macmillan, 1885–89.
- . *The Apostolic Fathers: Revised Texts*. London: Macmillan, 1891.
- Lincicum, D. "The Paratextual Invention of the Term 'Apostolic Fathers'," *JTS* 66.1 (2015), 139-48.
- Lindemann, A. *Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechisch - Deutsch Parallelausgabe*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.

- . *Die Clemensbriefe*. HNT 17. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- . *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979.
- Lohfink, G. *Die Sammlung Israels : eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie*. München : Kösel, 1975.
- Lohmeyer, E. *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.
- . “Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern.” ZST 18 (1941): 242–59.
- . *Lord of the Temple: A Study of the Relation between Cult and Gospel*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1961.
- Loisy, A. *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*. Ceffonds : Chez l'Auteur, 1908,
- Lona, H. E. *Der Erste Clemensbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Lucius, E. *Die Therapeuten und ihre Stellung in der Geschichte der Askese*. Strasbourg: Bull, 1879.
- Lührmann, D. *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.
- Luz, U. *Matthew 1-7*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2007.
- Malina, B. *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology: Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1986.
- Mann, C. S. *Mark*. The Anchor Bible Commentary. London: Doubleday, 1986.
- Manning Jr., G. T. *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Manson, Thomas Walter. *Sayings of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1949.
- Manson, William. *The Gospel of Luke*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1963.
- Marcovich, M., ed. *Origenis: Contra Celsum Libri VIII*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Marcus, J. *Mark 8-16*. The Anchor Bible Commentary. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Marshall, I. H. *Commentary on Luke*. New International Greek Testament Commentary 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Martens, John W. *One God, One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Martin, Dale B. *New Testament History and Literature*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012, 150-1.

Mason, S. "Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome: Reading On and Between the Lines." Pages 559-90 in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image and Text*. Edited by W. J. Dominik and A. J. Boyle. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

———, ed. *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*. Vol. 5. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Massaux, E. *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Irenaeus*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1990.

Matthews, S. *Perfect Martyr: The Stoning of Stephen and the Construction of Christian Identity*. Oxford: OUP, 2010.

Mattingly, H. "The restored coins of Trajan." *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society* 6 (1926): 232-278.

Mayer, G. *Index Philoneus*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974.

McKeever, M. C. "Sacred Space and Discursive Field: The Narrative Function of the Temple in Luke-Acts." PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 1999.

McKelvey, R. J. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

McLaren, J. S. "Josephus on Titus: The Vanquished Writing about the Victor." Pages 279-95 in *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*. Edited by G. Lembi and J. Sievers. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Merkel, H. *Sibyllinen, Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit Band V*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1998.

Merrill, E. T. *Essays in Early Christian History*. London: Macmillan, 1924.

Mildenberg, Leo. "Bar Kokhba Coins and Documents." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 84 (1980): 311-35.

Mildenberg, Leo, and Patricia Erhart Mottahedeh. *The Coinage of the Bar Kokhba War: Typos VI*. Aarau: Sauerländer, 1984.

Miller, R. "The Rejection of the Prophets in Q," *JBL* 107.2 (1988), 225-40.

- Minns, D., and Paul Parvis, eds. *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Mittelstaedt, A. *Lukas als Historiker: Zur Datierung des lukanischen Doppelwerks*. Bern: Francke, 2006.
- Moessner, David P. *Luke the Historian of Israel's Legacy, Theologian of Israel's 'Christ'*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2016.
- Moffat, J. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 163.
- Moll, S. *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*. WUNT 250. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- . “Three against Tertullian: The Second Tradition about Marcion's Life.” *JTS* 59 (2008): 169-180.
- Monier, M. “The Composition of Luke-Acts and Marcion: A Proposal.” *Biblical Interpretation* 25 (forthcoming).
- . “Early Christian Communities between Ideal and Reality. Edited by Mark Grundeken and Joseph Verheyden.” *JTS* 68.1 (2017): 343–45.
- Montefiore, H. “Does 'L' Hold Water?” *JTS* 4 (1953): 27–31.
- Moreland, Milton C. and James M. Robinson, “The International Q Project Work Sessions 23-27 May, 22-26 August, 17-18 November 1994,” *JBL* 114.3 (1995), 475-85.
- Morin, G., ed. *Sancti Clementis Romani Ad Corinthios Epistulae. Versio Latina Antiquissima*. Editorem Oxoniae: J. Parker & soc. Bibliopas, 1894.
- Mottu, H. “The Pharisee and the tax collector: Sartian notions as applied to the reading of Scripture.” *USQR* 29 (1974): 195–213.
- Moulton, J. H., and G. Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Müller, C. G. *Mehr als Ein Prophet: Die Charakterzeichnung Johannes des Täufers im lukanischen Erzählwerk*. Wien: Herder, 2001.
- Murphy, F. J. “The Temple in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch.” *JBL* 106.4 (1987): 671-683.
- Najman, H. “The Law of Nature and the authority of Mosaic Law.” *The Studia Philonica Annual* 11 (1999): 55–73.

- . *Losing the Temple and Recovering the Future: An Analysis of 4 Ezra*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Neiryck, F., ed. *L'Évangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques*. Gembloux: Duculot, 1973.
- . “Recent Developments in the Study of Q.” Pages 29-75 in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus*. Edited by J. Delobel. Leuven: Peeters, 1982.
- Neusner, J. *Early Rabbinic Judaism: Historical Studies in Religion, Literature and Art*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- . *Three Questions of Formative Judaism: History, Literature and Religion*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Neusner, J., and A. J. Avery-Peck, eds. *The Blackwell Companion to Judaism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
- Nibley, H. “Christian Envy of the Temple.” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 2 (1959): 97-123.
- Nickelsburg, G. *1 Enoch: Chapters 1-36, 81-108*. Hermeneia Series. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001.
- Nickelsburg, G., and J. VanderKam. *1 Enoch: Hermeneia Translation*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2012.
- Nicol, W. “Tradition and Redaction in Luke 21.” *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973): 61–71.
- Nikiprowetzky, V. “Réflexions sur quelques problèmes du quatrième et du cinquième livre des Oracles sibyllins.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 43 (1972): 29–76.
- Nir, R. *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Nolland, J. *The Gospel of Matthew 2*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . *Luke 1-9:20*. World Biblical Commentary. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989.
- . “No Son-of-God Christology in Matthew 1.18-25.” *JSNT* 62 (1996): 3–12.
- Noreña, C. F. *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Noy, D. *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- O’Neill, J. C. *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting*. London: SPCK, 1970.
- Olsen, D. C. *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

- Oxford Committee, ed. *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1905.
- Paffenroth, K. *The Story of Jesus according to L*. London: Black, 1997.
- Paget, James C. “1 Clement, Judaism, and the Jews.” *Early Christianity* 8 (2017): 218–50.
- , ed. *Christianity Second Century Themes and Developments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- . “The Epistle of Barnabas and the Writings that later formed the New Testament.” Pages 229–249 in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by A. Gregory and C. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*. WUNT 64. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- . “Jewish Proselytism at the Time of Christian Origins: Chimera or Reality?” *JSNT* 18 (1996): 65–103.
- . *Jews, Christians and Jewish Christians in Antiquity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- . “Paul and the Epistle of Barnabas.” *Novum Testamentum* 38 (1996): 359–81.
- Parker, P. “A Proto-Lukan Basis for the Gospel According to the Hebrews.” *JBL* 59 (1940): 471–78.
- Parkes, James. *The Conflict of the Church and Synagogue: A Study in the Origins of Anti-Semitism*. Hindhead, Surrey: Soncino, 1934.
- Patterson, S. J. “Twice More—Thomas and the Synoptics.” *JSNT* 36 (2014): 251–261.
- Paul, G. M. “The Presentation of Titus in the “Jewish War” of Josephus: Two Aspects.” *Phoenix* 47 (1993): 56–66.
- Paul, Shalom M., Robert A. Kraft, Eva Ben-David, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields, eds. *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Perry, A. M. *The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1920.
- Pervo, R. *Acts: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2009.
- . *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 2006.
- Petzke, G. *Das Sondergut des Evangeliums nach Lukas*. Zürich: TVZ, 1990.

- Philonenko-Sayar, B., and Marc Philonenko. *Die Apokalypse Abrahams*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1982.
- Piper, O. "The Nature of the Gospel According to Justin Martyr." *Journal of Religion* 41 (1961): 155–68.
- Plummer, A. *A critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922.
- Porter, S. "P.Oxy. 655 and James Robinson's Proposals for Q: Brief Points of Clarification." *JTS* 52 (2001): 84–92.
- Priest, J. "Testament of Moses." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol.1. Edited by J. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Prigent, P. *Épître de Barnabé*. Source Chrétiennes 172. Paris: Cerf, 1971.
- . *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif: l'Épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses sources*. Paris: Gabalda, 1961.
- Prigent, P., and R. Kraft. *L'Épître de Barnabé*. Paris: Cerf, 1971.
- Prostmeier, F. *Der Barnabasbrief. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern*. Vol. 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
- Quispel, G. "Marcion and the Text of the New Testament." *Vigiliae Christianae* 52 (1998): 349–60.
- Radl, Walter. *Der Ursprung Jesu: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Lukas 1-2*. Wien: Herder, 1996.
- Räisänen, H. "Marcion." Pages 100-24 in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian*. Edited by A. Marjanen and Petri Luomanen. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Redford, Donald B. *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Ancient Egypt: G-O*. Vol 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Redmond, S. A. "The Date and Provenance of the Fourth Sibylline Oracle." PhD diss., University of Ottawa, 1985.
- Reed, Annette Y. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Regev, E. "Temple Concerns and High-Priestly Prosecutions from Peter to James: Between Narrative and History," *NTS* 56 (2010): 64-89.

- Rehkopf, F. *Die lukanische Sonderquelle. Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1959.
- Rese, M. "The Jews in Luke-Acts: Some Second Thoughts," in Verheyden, *Unity of Luke-Acts*, 185-201.
- Rhodes, J. *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Rice, G. E. "The Alteration of Luke's Tradition by the Textual Variants in Codex Bezae." PhD diss., Case Western Reserve University, 1974.
- Richard, E. "Acts 7: An Investigation of the Samaritan Evidence." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39 (1977): 190–208.
- Robinson, J. A. T. *Redating the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1976.
- Robinson, James M. "A Written Greek Sayings Cluster Older than Q: A Vestige." *HTR* 92 (1999): 61–77.
- Robinson, James M., and C. Heil, "The Lilies of the Field: Saying 36 of the Gospel of Thomas and Secondary Accretions in Q 12.22b–31." *NTS* 47 (2001): 1–25.
- Robinson, James M., Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds. *The Critical Edition of Q: A Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German and French Translations of Q and Thomas*. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Robinson, James M., and Helmut Koester. *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- Robinson, Thomas A. *The Bauer Thesis Examined*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988.
- . *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations*. Ontario: Hendrickson, 2009.
- Robinson, W. *Der Weg des Herrn*. Zollikon-Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1964.
- Rodkinson, M. L., trans. *Babylonian Talmud VIII*. Boston: The Talmud Society, 1918).
- Roloff, J. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- Rossi, G. "Insigne vetro rappresentante il Tempio di Gerusalemme." *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana* 20 (1882): 137–58.

Roth, Dieter T. "Marcion's Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 513–27.

———. "Matthean Texts and Tertullian's Accusations in *Adversus Marcionem*," *JTS* 59 (2008): 580–597.

———. *The Text of Marcion's Gospel*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Rowe, C. K. *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.

———. "Literary Unity and Reception History." *JSNT* 29 (2007): 449–57.

Runia, D. *Philo of Alexandria and the "Timaeus" of Plato*. Leiden: Brill, 1986.

Runia, D. *Exegesis and Philosophy: Studies in Philo of Alexandria*. Berlin: Variorum, 1990.

———. "The Idea and the Reality of the City in the Thought of Philo of Alexandria." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 61 (2000): 361–79.

Rusam, D. *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.

Sahlin, H. *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk: Studien zur protolukanischen Theologie*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1945.

Saldarini, S. J., trans. *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Sanders, E. P. *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

———. *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*. London: SCM, 1990.

———. *Judaism: Practice and Belief*. London: SCM, 1992.

Sanders, Jack T. *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. London: SCM Press.

Sanders, L. *L'Hellénisme de saint Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme*. SH 2. Lovanii: Bibliotheca Universitatis, 1943.

Sharlemann, M. H. *Stephen: A Singular Saint*. *Analecta Biblica* 34. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968.

Schelkle, K. "Israel und Kirche im Anfang." *Theologische Quartalschrift Tübingen* 163.2 (1963): 86–95.

Schenk, Kenneth. *A Brief Guide to Philo*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005.

Schenk, W. *Synopse zur Redenquelle der Evangelien: Q-Synopse*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1981.

- Schmidt, C. *Der Erste Clemensbrief in Altkoptischer Übersetzung*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908.
- Schmithals, W. *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*. Zürich: TVZ, 1982.
- . *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Zürich: TVZ, 1980.
- Schneider, G. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 2 vols. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1992.
- . “Stephanus, die Hellenisten und Samaria.” Pages 215-40 in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by J. Kremer. Gembloux: Duculot, 1979.
- . *Verleugnung, Verspottung und Verhor Jesu nach Lukas 22.54–71, Studien zur lukanische Darstellung der Passion*. Münster: Kosel, 1969.
- Schoedel, W. R. *Ignatius of Antioch*. Hermeneia Series. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Schoeps, H. J. *Jewish Christianity: Factional Disputes in the Early Church*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- . *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1949.
- Schowalter, D. N. *The Emperor and the Gods: Images from the Time of Trajan*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1993.
- Schramm, T. *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Schulz, S. Q. *Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. Zürich: TVZ, 1972.
- Schürmann, H. *Das Lukasevangelium 1*. Freiburg: Herder, 1969.
- . “Perikopen-Umstellungen Bei Lukas?” *NTS* 4 (1958): 115–19.
- . *Protolukanische Spracheigentümlichkeiten*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968.
- Schwartz, D. “The Accusation and the Accusers at Philippi. Acts 16,20-21.” *Biblica* 65 (1984): 357–63.
- . “Place beyond Place.” Pages 115-26 in *Was 70 CE a Watershed in Jewish History?* Edited by Daniel R. Schwartz and Zeev Weiss. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- . *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *The Good News According to Luke*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1957.
- Scott, K. “The elder and younger Pliny on emperor worship.” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 63 (1932): 156–65.

- Sherwin-White, A. N. *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Shukster, Martin B., and P. Richardson. "Temple and Bet Ha-midrash in the Epistle of Barnabas." Pages 17-31 in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*. Vol. 2. Edited by S. G. Wilson. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1986.
- Shuve, K. "The Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and the Antiochene Polemic Against Allegory." PhD diss., McMaster University, 2007.
- Simon, M. "Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 2 (1951): 127–42.
- . "Sur quelques aspects des Oracles Sibyllins juifs in Hellholm." Pages 12-17 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Edited by David Hellom. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Simons, R. *Kritische Historie des Textes des neuen Testaments*. Halle: Gebauer, 1776.
- Skeat, T. C. "The Lilies of the Field." *ZNW* 37 (1938): 211–14.
- Smallwood, E. *The Jews under Roman Rule*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- . "The Legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Circumcision." *Latomus* 18 (1959): 334–47.
- Smaltz, W. "Did Peter Die in Jerusalem?" *JBL* 71 (1952): 211–16.
- Smith, Morton. "The Dead Sea Sect in Relation to Ancient Judaism." *NTS* 7.4 (1960-61): 347–60.
- . "The Report About Peter in I Clement V. 4." *NTS* 7 (1960): 86–88.
- Smith, Steve. *The Fate of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke-Acts: The Role of the Old Testament in Stephen's Speech and Jesus' Laments over Jerusalem*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2017.
- Snodgrass, K. *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants: An Inquiry into Parable Interpretation*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Soltau, W. "Die Herkunft der Reden in der Apostelgeschichte." Pages 128-154 in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urschristentums*. Edited by E. Preuschen. Leipzig: Drugulin, 1903.
- Sparks, H. F. D. *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.

———. “St Luke's Transpositions.” *NTS* 3 (1957): 219–23.

Spence, S. *Parting of the Ways: The Roman Church as a Case Study*. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

Spiro, A. “Stephen’s Samaritan Background.” Pages 285–300 in *The Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by Johannes Munck. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967.

St Clair, A. “God's House of Peace in Paradise: The Feast of Tabernacles on a Jewish Gold Glass.” *Journal of Jewish Art* 11 (1985): 6–15.

Stadter, P. A. “Plutarch and Trajanic ideology.” Pages 227–242 in *Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek intellectuals, and Roman power in the time of Trajan (98–117 AD)*. Edited by P. A. Stadter and L. Van der Stockt. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.

Stanton, Graham. *The Gospels and Jesus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Stone, Michael E. *Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia Series. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990.

———. “Reactions to the Destructions of the Second Temple.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 12 (1981): 195–204.

Stone, Michael E., and M. Henze. *4 Ezra and 2 Baruch*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2013.

Strecker, G. *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981.

Streeter, B. H. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates*. London: Macmillan, 1924.

Swarup, P. *The Self-Understanding of the Dead Sea Scrolls Community*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2006.

Sweeney, James P. “Stephen's Speech (Acts 7:2–53): Is It as 'Anti-Temple' as is Frequently Alleged?,” *TRINJ* 23 (2002): 185–210.

Sylva, D. “The Meaning and Function of Acts 7:46–50.” *JBL* 106 (1987): 261–75.

Tannehill, R. “Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story,” *JBL* 104 (1985), 69–85.

Taylor, Joan E. *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

———. *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997.

———. *Jewish Women Philosophers of First-Century Alexandria: Philo's 'Therapeutae' Reconsidered*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

- . “The Nazoraeans as a ‘Sect’ in ‘Sectarian’ Judaism?” Pages 87-118 in *Sects and Sectarianism in Jewish History*. Edited by S. Stern. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- . “The Phenomenon of Early Jewish-Christianity: Reality or Scholarly Invention?” *Vigiliae Christianae* 44 (1990): 313–34.
- . “Philo of Alexandria on the Essenes: A Case Study on the Use of Classical Sources in Discussions of the Qumran-Essene Hypothesis” in *The Studia Philonica Annual*. Volume XIX Runia. Edited by D. and G. Sterling. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.
- . “Spiritual Mothers: Philo on the Women Therapeutae.” *JSP* 23 (2002): 37–63.
- Taylor, N. H. “Stephen, the Temple, and Early Christian Eschatology,” *Revue Biblique* 110.1 (2003): 62-85.
- . “The Jerusalem Temple in Luke Acts.” *HTS Teologiese Studies* 60 (2004): 459–85.
- Taylor, Vincent. *Behind the Third Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1926.
- . “A Cry from the Siege: A Suggestion Regarding a Non-Marcian Oracle Embedded in Luke xxi 20-36.” *JTS* 26 (1925): 136–44.
- . *The First Draft of St. Luke's Gospel*. London: SPCK, 1927.
- . “Important Hypotheses Reconsidered.” *ET* 67 (1955): 12–16.
- . *The Passion Narrative of St. Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Telford, W. R. *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1980.
- Temple, P. J. “What is to be Understood by en tois, Luke 2,49?” *Irish Theological Quarterly* 17 (1922): 248–63.
- Thomas, J. *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie*. Louvain: Université catholique de Louvain, 1935.
- Thornton, T. “Stephen’s Use of Isa. LXVI.” *JTS* 25 (1974): 432–34.
- Thorsteinsson, R. M. *Roman Christianity and Roman Stoicism: A Comparative Study of Ancient Morality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Tiede, D. L. “Weeping for Jerusalem.” Pages 103-18 in *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*. Edited by D. L. Tiede. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

- Torrey, C. C. trans. *The Lives of the Prophets*. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1946.
- Townsend, J. "The Jerusalem Temple in the First Century." Pages 48–65 in *God and His Temple: Reflections on Professor Samuel Terrien's The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology*. Edited by L. E. Frizzell. South Orange, NJ: Seton Hall, 1981.
- . "The Jerusalem Temple in New Testament Thought." PhD diss., Harvard Divinity School, 1958.
- Tuckett, C. M. *Q and the History of Early Christianity*. Edinburgh T&T Clark, 1996.
- Turner, H. E. W. *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church*. London: Mowbray, 1954.
- Tyson, J. B. *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1986.
- . *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988),
- . *Luke, Judaism and the Scholars*. South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1999.
- . *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006.
- Ulrich, J. *Euseb von Caesarea und die Juden*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999.
- Um, Stephen T. *The Theme of Temple Christology*. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Van Aarde, A. G. "The Most High Does Live in Houses, but not Houses Built by Men." *Neotestamentica* 25 (1991): 51–64.
- Van den Broek, R. *The Myth of the Phoenix: According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Van der Host, W. *Chaeremon*. Leiden: Brill, 1984.
- Van der Waal, C. "The Temple in the Gospel According to Luke." *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973): 49–59.
- Van Henten, J. W., and Steve Mason, eds. *Judean Antiquities 15: Translation and Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Van Unnik, W. C. "Is 1 Clement 20 purely stoic?" *Vigiliae Christianae* 4.3 (1950): 181–89.
- Veil, H. "Barnabasbrief." In *Handbuch zu den Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*. Edited by Edgar Hennecke. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1904.

Verheyden, J. "Israel's Fate in the Apostolic Fathers: The Case of 1 Clement and the Epistle of Barnabas." Pages 237-262 in *Q in Context II Social Setting and Archaeological Background of the Sayings Source*. Edited by M. Tiwald. Bonn: Bonn University Press, 2015.

———. "Proto-Luke, and What Can Be Made of It." Pages 202-26 in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem*. Edited by J. Verheyden, J. S. Kloppenborg, A. Gregory and P. Foster. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

Vermes, G., trans. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. London: Penguin, 1962.

Vielhauer, P. *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die apostolischen Väter*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978.

Vinzent, M. *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.

von Campenhausen, H. *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1968.

Von Harnack, A. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911.

———. *Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. 2 Vols. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904.

———. *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte: Das Schreiben Der Römischen Kirche an Die Korinthische Aus Der Zeit Domitians. I Clemensbrief*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1929.

———. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1897.

———. *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom Fremden Gott*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924.

———. *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924.

Von Tischendorf, C. *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1851.

Waitz, H. *Die Pseudoklementinen, Homilien und Rekognitionen*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904.

Wardle, T. *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Wasserberg, G. *Aus Israels Mitte-Heil: Eine narrativ-exegetische Studie zur Theologie des Lukas*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998.

Watson, F. *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.

Weinert, F. D. "Luke, Stephen, and the temple in Luke-Acts." *Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 17 (1987): 88–90.

- . "Luke, the Temple and Jesus' Saying about Jerusalem's Abandoned House (Luke 13:34-35)," *CBQ*, 44.1 (1982), 68-76
- . "The meaning of the Temple in Luke-Acts." *Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 11 (1981): 85–89.
- . "The Meaning of the Temple in the Gospel of Luke." PhD diss., Fordham University, 1979.
- Weiß, B. *Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums*. Berlin: Gotta, 1907.
- Welborn, Laurence L. "The Preface to 1 Clement: The Rhetorical Situation and the Traditional Date." Pages 197-216 in *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement*. Edited by Tobias Nicklas, C. Breytenbach and L. L. Welborn. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Wendt, H. H. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.
- Wengst, K. *Pax Romana and the Peace of Jesus Christ*. London: SCM, 1987.
- . *Schriften des Urchristentums*. Vol. 2. München: Kösel, 1984.
- . *Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971.
- Wentling, J. L. "Unravelling the Relationship Between 11QT, the Eschatological Temple, and the Qumran Community." *Revue de Qumran* 53 (1989): 61–73.
- Whitters, M. F. *The Epistle of Second Baruch: A Study in Form and Message*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2003.
- Williams, D. "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 477–96.
- Willing, M. *Eusebius von Cäsarea als Häreseograph*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- Wills, Lawrence M. "The Depiction of the Jews in Acts," *JBL* 110.4 (1991), 631-654
- Wilson, S. G. *Luke and the Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Windisch, H. *Der Barnabasbrief*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920.
- Winter, P. "The treatment of his sources by the third evangelist in Luke XXI-XXIV." *Studia Theologica - Nordic Journal of Theology* 8 (1954): 138–72.
- Wissowa, G. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. Munich: Beck, 1902.
- Wolter, M. *Das Lukasevangelium*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Wong, D. W. F. "Natural and divine order in I Clement." *Vigiliae Christianae* 31.2 (1977): 81–87.

Wrede, W. *Untersuchungen zum ersten Klemensbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1891.

Wuthnow, R. *Communities of Discourse*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Zeller, E. ed. *Die Apostelgeschichte, ihre Composition und ihr Charakter*. Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues, 1851.