

PAUL AND GOD'S TEMPLE

**A HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION
OF CULTIC IMAGERY
IN THE CORINTHIAN CORRESPONDENCE**

Albert L.A. Hogeterp

PAUL AND GOD'S TEMPLE

RIJKSUNIVERSITEIT GRONINGEN

PAUL AND GOD'S TEMPLE

A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery

in the Corinthian Correspondence

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van het doctoraat in de
Godgeleerdheid en Godsdienstwetenschap
aan de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
op gezag van de
Rector Magnificus, dr. F. Zwarts,
in het openbaar te verdedigen op
donderdag 29 januari 2004
om 16.00 uur

door

Albert Livinus Augustinus Hogeterp

geboren op 3 december 1973
te Dronrijp

Promotor(es) : Prof.dr. G.P. Luttikhuisen
: Prof.dr. F. García Martínez

Co-promotor : Dr. A. Hilhorst

Beoordelingscommissie : Prof.dr. R. Roukema
: Prof.dr. E. Noort
: Prof.dr. P.J. Tomson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	xiii
List of Abbreviations	xv
Introduction	1
1. Paul's cultic imagery in the context of his time	1
2. Previous scholarly interpretations of Paul's cultic imagery	2
2.1 Spiritualisation	2
Scholarly criticism of the approach of 'spiritualisation'	3
Historical problems with the approach of 'spiritualisation'	4
2.2 Substitution	7
2.3 The comparative religions approach	8
3. The use of new approaches	11
3.1 Rhetorical criticism	11
The application of rhetorical theory to the exegesis of Paul's Letters	11
Criticism of the approach of rhetorising Paul	13
Evaluation of the use of rhetorical criticism	14
3.2 Cultic language and the philosophy of religious language	15
3.3 Social-scientific approaches	17
3.3.1 Cultural anthropology	17
Anthropological models and Paul's cultic imagery	17
3.3.2 Sociology	19
4. Summary and outline of this study	20
PART ONE. PERSPECTIVES ON THE TEMPLE IN JUDAISM AND THE JESUS-MOVEMENT BEFORE 70 CE	23
Chapter One. Jewish attitudes to the Temple of Jerusalem from the Maccabees to Paul's time	25
1. Jewish Temple religiosity in the Hellenistic and Roman periods	25
1.1 The Temple of Jerusalem in relation to Israel and the Diaspora	26
1.2 Rival Temples to the Temple of Jerusalem	28
a. The Jewish temple at Elephantine in Egypt	29
b. The temple of Leontopolis in Egypt	29
c. The Samaritan temple of Gerizim	31
2. Josephus' perspective on the Palestinian-Jewish schools	32
2.1 The relative priority of Josephus' historical works	32
2.2 The Hellenistic-Jewish works of Josephus and the Palestinian-Jewish situation	34
3. Josephus on the Palestinian-Jewish schools and the literature of Qumran	36
3.1 The Essene hypothesis	36

3.2 Different Essene orders and differentiation of groups in the <i>Damascus Document</i>	37
3.3 References to Jewish groups in the literature of Qumran	38
4. The Jewish schools and the Temple in the Maccabean era	40
4.1 The historical context of Josephus' systematic accounts of the Jewish schools	40
4.2 The rise of the Jewish schools in the Maccabean era	41
4.3 Differences between the Jewish schools pertaining to Temple worship and religiosity	43
4.4 The Temple cult and the crisis of Hellenisation in the Maccabean era	44
5. The Divide between the Jewish schools in the Hasmonean period	47
6. The Palestinian-Jewish schools and the Temple in the Roman period	49
6.1 The Pharisees and the Temple service	49
6.2 The Sadducees and the Temple service	50
6.3 The Essenes and the Temple	51
6.4 A newcomer among the Jewish schools: the 'Fourth Philosophy'	53
7. Attitudes to the Temple in Jewish Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Second Temple Period	53
7.1 Testaments	55
a. The Testament of Levi	55
b. The Testament of Moses	56
7.2 Expansions on Scripture	57
a. The Letter of Aristeas	57
b. Jubilees	58
c. Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities	59
7.3 Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha related to Solomon	59
a. The Psalms of Solomon	59
b. The Wisdom of Solomon	60
8. Issues concerning the Jerusalem Temple cult contemporary to Paul	60
8.1 The offering of the Gentiles in a Palestinian-Jewish context	60
8.2 The purity of the Temple and purity laws	62
8.2.1 Purity laws concerning the Temple cult	62
8.2.2. Food laws	62
9. Summary	62
Chapter Two. The literature of Qumran about the Temple	65
1. Purity Laws and Separation from the Temple Cult	65
1.1 4QMMT	65
1.1.1 The composite text and suggested contexts	65
1.1.2 The rhetoric of separation in 4QMMT and its addressees	67
1.1.3 Halakhot pertaining to the Temple cult in 4QMMT	69
1.1.4 The eschatological perspective of 4QMMT on the Jerusalem Temple and Israel	70
1.2 The Damascus Document	71
1.2.1 The text and composition of the Damascus Document	71
1.2.2 Sectarian self-definition of the Qumran community and differentiation of rules	72
1.2.3 Polemic against the contemporary Temple cult in the Damascus Document	74
1.2.4 Covenant and Temple in the Damascus Document	75
a. The role of Temple and priesthood in the covenant of the forefathers	75
b. The peshet on Isaiah 24:17 in CD-A IV, 12-19: The three nets of Belial	76
c. The New Covenant and the Temple in the Damascus Document	77
1.2.5 Offerings for the Temple and sectarian worship in CD-A XI,7-XII,1	78

2. Visions of the Temple	78
2.1 The Temple Scroll	78
2.1.1 The text and its sources	78
2.1.2 The vision of the Temple in the Temple Scroll	80
2.1.3 Temple architecture and Temple cult in the Temple Scroll	80
2.1.4 The Temple and the theology of God's presence in the Temple Scroll	80
2.1.5 The eschatological perspective on the Temple in 11QT ^a XXIX	81
2.2 New Jerusalem Text	82
2.2.1 Fragments of an Aramaic composition	82
2.2 The vision of the Temple and its worship service in the New Jerusalem composition	82
3. The Eschatological Temple	83
3.1 The Eschatological Midrash	83
3.1.1 The text	83
3.1.2 Midrash and eschatological Temple in 4Q174	84
3.1.3 The 'Temple of man' in 4Q174	86
3.2 The Rule of the Community	86
3.2.1 The text of the Community Rule	86
3.2.2 The Community Rule and the Damascus Document	87
3.2.3 The Temple as a metaphor of the community in the Community Rule	87
4. Poetical and liturgical texts and temple imagery	90
4.1 Temple worship and sectarian worship in poetical and liturgical texts	90
4.2 Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice	91
4.2.1 The text	91
4.2.2 The Earthly Temple in relation to the Heavenly Temple	91
4.2.3 Heavenly temple imagery in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice	92
4.3 4QDaily Prayers (4Q503)	93
4.4 4QWords of the Luminaries	93
5. Temple Theology and Scripture	94
5.1 Temple theology in the literature of Qumran	94
5.2 Qumran temple theology and biblical interpretation	95
6. Summary	95
Chapter Three. The early Jesus-movement and the Temple	97
1. Introduction	97
1.1 Problems of historical criticism	97
1.2 The conceptual starting point: the early Jesus-movement before 70 CE	98
1.3 The historical framework for our approach to the early Jesus-movement	99
2. Prophetic traditions of cult criticism	101
2.1 Prophetic traditions: the priority of morality above ritual	101
2.2 The impact and use of prophetic traditions	102
a. Prophetic cult criticism in other biblical and apocryphal texts	102
b. Universalism vs. exclusivism	102
c. Contemporary Jewish perspectives on the corruption of the Temple cult	103
d. The early Jesus-movement and prophetic traditions of cult criticism	104
3. Sources about Jesus	108
3.1 Christian literary sources about Jesus	108
3.1.1 The Canonical Gospels	108
a. The Synoptic Gospels and the 'two-sources hypothesis'	108

Mark	109
The Sayings Source (Q)	109
Additional material in Matthew and Luke	111
b. John	111
3.1.2 Extra-canonical Gospels	112
The Gospel of Thomas	112
The 'Jewish-Christian' Gospels and Christian Judaism	114
Non-canonical Gospel fragments on papyrus	115
Non-canonical Gospels under canonical names	116
Gnostic 'Dialogue Gospels'	118
3.2 Non-Christian literary sources about Jesus	119
3.2.1 Early Jewish literature	119
3.2.2 Graeco-Roman literature	120
3.3 Epigraphical evidence	120
4. The historical Jesus and his Galilean background	121
4.1 The importance of Galilee in the Gospel traditions about Jesus	121
4.2 The socio-religious geography of Galilee in relation to Judaea	125
4.2.1 'Galilee of the Gentiles' and Jewish Galilee	125
4.2.2 Galilee and the Pharisees	127
4.2.3 Galilean attitudes to the Herodian dynasty	129
4.2.4 Jesus and Galilean attitudes to the Jerusalem Temple	130
a. Galilean attitudes to Jerusalem and the Temple	130
b. Jesus' Galilean attitude to the Jerusalem Temple	133
5. John the Baptist and Jesus	134
6. Individual Gospel traditions about Jesus and the Temple	137
6.1 Jesus and the religious practices of the Temple	137
a. The healed leper in the Synoptic tradition and in P.Eg. 2	137
b. Purification and the inner Temple court in P.Oxy. 840	138
c. Matthean traditions about Jesus and the practices related to the Temple	140
The Temple Tax	140
The priority of moral obligations to cultic offerings	140
Korban	141
d. Purity regulations applied outside the Temple cult	142
6.2 Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts from commerce	142
6.2.1 Mark 11:15-18	143
Matthean and Lucan revision of Mark's account	145
6.2.2 John 2:13-22	146
6.3 Jesus' teachings in the Temple	147
6.4 Parables of Jesus and polemic against the priestly establishment	147
6.4.1 The parable of the vineyard	148
6.4.2 The parable of the Good Samaritan	150
6.5 Synoptic traditions about Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of the Temple	151
6.6 Jesus about true worship in John 4:19-26	153
6.7 The Temple as a metaphor in Jesus-traditions	153
6.7.1 Mark 14:58	153
6.7.2 John 2:18-22	154
7. Early Christian-Jewish encounters with Jewish movements concerning the Temple	155
7.1 The historicity of Acts	155
7.2 The early Jesus-movement and the priestly establishment	156
7.3 The early Jesus-movement and the Pharisees	157

7.4 The early Jesus-movement and the Essenes	158
7.4.1 Commonalities in traditions of cult criticism	158
7.4.2 The silence about the Essenes in the New Testament	159
7.5 Stephen and the Hellenists	160
8. Summary	162
PART TWO. PAUL'S RELATION TO CONTEMPORARY JUDAISM	165
Chapter Four. Paul's previous life in Judaism	167
1. Models for reconstructing the social world of Paul's life	167
1.1 Rhetorical analysis	167
1.2 Social-scientific approaches	169
2. Situating Paul's prior life as a Pharisee	171
2.1 'In regard to the Law a Pharisee'	171
2.2 Paul's former life in Judaism as a Pharisee and Pharisaic traditions	173
2.3 Pharisaic traditions and the social geography of Pharisaic activity	178
3. Pharisaism and Palestinian-Jewish schooling	181
4. The problem: Locating Paul's Pharisaic study of the Law	183
4.1 Interpretation of Galatians 1:13-24	185
4.1.1 Paul's silence about the place of his Pharisaic education	185
4.1.2 Gal 1:22-23 in the argument about the location of Paul's former life as a Pharisee	186
4.2 Paul's Jewish Background and his Former Persecution of the Church	187
4.2.1 The context of persecution of the church	188
4.2.2 The reasons for persecution of the church	190
4.2.3 From Jerusalem to Damascus	191
4.3 Jerusalem in Galatians 4:21-31 and Paul's former persecution of the church	191
4.4 Contemporary Jewish evidence about the location of Pharisaic education	193
5. Summary	194
Chapter Five. Paul and the contemporary Jewish culture of scriptural interpretation	197
1. The literary context of temple imagery in Paul's Letters and contemporary Judaism	197
2. Synagogal culture and scriptural reading	198
2.1 The diversity of first-century CE synagogues and synagogal culture	198
2.1.1 The context of the Hellenistic environment in the Diaspora	198
2.1.2 Greece and Asia Minor	199
2.1.3 Syria	199
2.1.4 Differences between the Syro-Palestinian situation and the Hellenistic Diaspora	200
2.1.5 Synagogues in Israel	201
a. Synagogues of the people	201
b. Essene synagogues	201
2.2 The liturgy of first-century CE synagogues	202
2.2.1 Commonalities according to the literary sources	202
2.2.2 Scriptural reading and interpretation in a sectarian context	204

a. Practices of the Essenes	204
b. Interrelations between the Essenes and the Qumran community	204
2.3 Paul and the contemporary synagogal culture	206
3. Paul and the languages of Scripture in Second Temple Judaism	208
3.1 Language and scriptural culture in Paul's Letters	208
3.2 The text of Paul's quotations from Scripture and the textual types of Scripture	211
3.2.1 Introductory formulas to quotations from Scripture	211
3.2.2 Quotations from Scripture	213
3.3 Textual theories about Scripture in light of the Dead Sea discoveries	214
3.4 Paul's Use of Scripture and Aramaic Targum	215
4. Shared methods of biblical interpretation	217
4.1 Midrash, Peshet and the New Testament in light of the Dead Sea discoveries	217
4.2 Midrash, Peshet and Biblical Interpretation in the Pauline Letters	218
5. Summary	220
PART THREE. CULTIC IMAGERY IN THE CORINTHIAN CORRESPONDENCE	221
Chapter Six. Preliminary issues to cultic imagery in the Pauline corpus	223
1. Cultic imagery and its interpretation	223
1.1 The identification of cultic terms	223
1.2 The application of cultic imagery	224
2. The delimitation of Pauline authorship from pseudepigraphy and interpolation	225
2.1 Pauline Letters and Deutero-Pauline Letters	225
2.2 The question of interpolations	227
3. Cultic imagery in the Pauline Letters other than 1-2 Corinthians	228
3.1 Romans	228
3.1.1 Rom 3:21-26	228
3.1.2 Romans 9-11	230
Rom 9:1-5	230
Rom 9:30-33	231
Rom 11:1-16	231
Rom 11:25-32	232
3.1.3 Rom 12:1-2	232
3.1.4 Rom 15:14-33	234
Rom 15:16	234
Rom 15:27-28	235
3.2 Philippians	236
3.2.1 Phil 2:12-18	236
3.2.2 Phil 4:14-20	237
4. Summary	238

Chapter Seven. Cultic imagery in 1 Corinthians	241
1. Introduction: Toward a new perspective on Paul's temple imagery	241
1.1 From cultic imagery to theological message	241
1.2 The Temple and God's Spirit	243
1.3 A new approach to Paul's cultic imagery and methodology	245
2. The rhetorical situation of 1 Corinthians	246
2.1 The exigence	246
2.2 The audience	248
2.2.1 Jewish tradition and Corinth	249
The Jewish community and its synagogue in Corinth	249
The Jewish religious calendar	249
The Corinthians' knowledge of Scripture	250
2.2.2 Corinth in its Hellenistic environment	251
2.2.3 Corinth and the church of God	251
2.3 The constraints	252
3. 1 Corinthians 3:9-17, the Temple and God's Spirit	253
3.1 The rhetorical unit of 1 Cor 3:9-17	253
a. Arguments from textual criticism	253
b. Arguments from the context	254
3.2 Text, translation, and variant readings	255
3.3 Building imagery and temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:9-17	256
3.3.1 1 Cor 3:9. The Corinthians as God's field, God's building	257
3.3.2 1 Cor 3:10-11. Paul the master builder and the one foundation, Jesus Christ	259
3.3.3 1 Cor 3:12-15. The individual work and the eschatological test of fire	259
3.3.4 1 Cor 3:16-17. The Corinthian congregation as God's Temple	261
3.4 The Temple and God's Spirit in 1 Cor 3:16-17 and contemporary Judaism	264
3.4.1 The Septuagint	264
The Wisdom of Solomon 9:1-18	264
3.4.2 Hellenistic-Jewish literature	265
Josephus' <i>Jewish Antiquities</i> 8.108-114	265
3.4.3 The literature of Qumran	267
4. 1 Corinthians 5:6-8, purity from sin in light of Christ's sacrifice	267
4.1 1 Cor 5:6-8 in the context of 1 Cor 5:1-13	267
4.2 1 Cor 5:6-8 and its cultic imagery	269
5. 1 Corinthians 6:18-20, πορνεία and the body as Temple	271
5.1 The rhetorical unit of 1 Cor 6:18-20	271
5.2 Text, translation, and variant readings	272
5.3 Cultic imagery in 1 Cor 6:18-20	275
5.4 The body as Temple from an anthropological perspective	278
6. 1 Corinthians 9:1-14, Paul's apostolic rights	279
7. 1 Corinthians 10:14-22, an exhortation against idolatry	283
8. Summary	286
Chapter Eight. Cultic imagery in 2 Corinthians	289
1. The rhetorical situation of 2 Corinthians	289
1.1 The exigence	289
1.2 The Corinthian audience and Paul's opponents	290

1.3 The constraints	291
2. 2 Corinthians 2:14-17, the sincerity and truth of Paul's gospel	291
3. 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1, God's Temple and the communal way of life	292
3.1 The rhetorical unit and literary status of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1	292
3.1.1 Hapax legomena	293
3.1.2 Non-Pauline ideas	294
The idea of separation in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 and anthropology	294
Non-Pauline and anti-Pauline features	296
3.1.3 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 in the context of 2 Cor 6-7	297
3.1.4 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 as a Pauline passage	297
3.2 Text, translation, and variant readings	298
3.3 Cultic imagery in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1	299
4. Summary	300
Summary and Conclusions	303
Bibliography	309
Samenvatting	335

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Upon the completion of my Ph.D dissertation, I would like to express my gratitude and indebtedness to several persons and institutions. Before I started with my Ph.D research, I was awarded a scholarship and fellowship aid by the Hebrew Union College – Jewish Institute of Religion at Cincinnati. This enabled me to study within an M.A. Programme in Bible and Cognate Studies at this institution during three semesters in the years 1998-1999, supervised by Prof. A. Kamesar. My subsequent Ph.D research during four years (1999-2003) was made possible by the appointment granted by the University of Groningen, Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies in the Netherlands.

I would like to express my indebtedness to my supervisors, Prof. Gerard Luttikhuisen, Prof. Florentino García Martínez, and Dr. Ton Hilhorst, for their many detailed comments for the improvement of my dissertation. Their sustained advice helped me to achieve the present level of sophistication, although any remaining errors or shortcomings in it are of course my own responsibility. In addition, I would like to thank my first promotor, Prof. Gerard Luttikhuisen, for his structural advices concerning the chapter on the early Jesus-movement and the ‘Pauline’ chapters as well as for his teaching me and other Ph.D students Coptic grammar. I am grateful to my second promotor, Prof. Florentino García Martínez, for his structural advices concerning the chapters and parts of my dissertation which deal with contemporary Judaism and in particular the Dead Sea Scrolls. I would like to thank the co-promotor, Dr. Ton Hilhorst, for his many structural comments and detailed suggestions for the improvement of the manuscript which, in addition to discussion, he often put in writing for me.

A very stimulating atmosphere at the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies of the University of Groningen also encouraged my training as a Ph.D student. Prof. Gerard Luttikhuisen and Dr. Ton Hilhorst generously provided me the opportunity to gain experience in teaching Hellenistic Greek to first-year students of theology. The study group on the Qumran Rule of the Community led by Dr. Eibert Tigchelaar during the first half of 2002 provided a platform for critical discussion. The discussions with the Centre for Religious Studies (CRS) further gave rise to critical reflection in support of the progress in my Ph.D research. Discussions with Dr. Eibert Tigchelaar and Prof. Ed Noort about parts of my dissertation and conversations with fellow Ph.D students Dr. Lautaro Roig-Lanzillotta and Dr. Istvan Czachesz about the Gospel of Thomas also added to my education.

I would finally like to thank my parents and my parents-in-law for their love and support, but I would particularly like to thank my wife, Marguérite Corporaal. She has made my work light with her loving support, her faith in me, and her correction of the English of the present dissertation.

Albert L.A. Hogeterp
Groningen
September 2003

ABBREVIATIONS

For Journals, Book Series and Other Cited Works

This list of abbreviations generally follows the system as set out by Patrick H. Alexander *et al.* (eds.), *The SBL Handbook of Style. For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass., 1999). The same reference work has further been used for abbreviations of place names and sources.

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by D.N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ASTI	<i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>
BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BCH	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</i>
BDAG	Bauer, W., F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3d ed. Chicago, 1999
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
<i>BN</i>	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CHJ</i>	<i>Cambridge History of Judaism</i> . Ed. W.D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein. Cambridge, 1984-
<i>CII</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum iudaicarum</i> . Edited by J.B. Frey. 2 vols. Rome, 1936-1952
CNRS	Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique
ConBNT	Coniectanea neotestamentica or Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
<i>FO</i>	<i>Folia orientalia</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte
<i>GNS</i>	<i>Good New Studies</i>
HDR	Harvard Dissertations in Religion
HO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
ICC	International Critical Commentary
Jastrow	Jastrow, M. <i>A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature</i> . 2d ed. New York, 1903
KBL	Koehler, L., and W. Baumgartner, <i>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros</i> . 2d ed. Leiden, 1958 Including the <i>Supplementum ad Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros</i>
<i>JANES</i>	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society</i> . Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, N.Y.
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JDS	Judean Desert Series
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>

JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period</i>
JSJ Sup	Supplements to the <i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSP	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar)
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H.S. Jones, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996
<i>NewDocs</i>	<i>New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity</i> . Edited by G.H.R. Horsley and S. Llewelyn. North Ryde, N.S.W., 1981-
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to <i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTApo</i>	<i>New Testament Apocrypha</i> . Revised Edition edited by W. Schneemelcher. English translation of the German edition, <i>Neutestamentliche Apokryphen</i> (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1989-1990), edited by R. McL. Wilson. 2 vols. Clarke: Cambridge & WJK: Louisville, Ky., 1991 & 1992
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
OTP	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York, 1983 & 1985
PAM	Palestine Archaeological Museum
PEFQS	Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement
PGL	<i>Patristic Greek Lexicon</i> . Edited by G.W.H. Lampe. Oxford, 1968.
PSI	Papiri greci e latini: Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la Ricerca dei Papiri Greci e Latini in Egitto. Florence, 1912 ff
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLRBS	Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study
SBLSP	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBLWAW	Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World
SC	Sources chrétiennes. Paris: Cerf, 1943 –
<i>ScrHier</i>	<i>Scripta hierosolymitana</i>
SEG	<i>Supplementum epigraphicum graecum</i>
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SPCK	Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge
STAC	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPB	Studia post-biblica
<i>SubBi</i>	<i>Subsidia biblica</i>
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
TANZ	Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TS	Texts and Studies

<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
<i>TWNT</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.</i> Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Stuttgart, 1932-1979
UBS	United Bible Societies
UTB	Uni-Taschenbücher für Wissenschaft
VCSup	Vigiliae christianae: Supplement Series
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WJK	Westminster John Knox Press
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

INTRODUCTION

1. Paul's cultic imagery in the context of his time

In his First Letter to the Corinthians, Paul addresses the Corinthians as “God’s Temple”, referring to the indwelling presence of God’s Spirit among them (1 Cor 3:16-17). Paul’s use of the expression of the Temple has often been interpreted as designating a ‘spiritual temple’.¹ Paul’s temple imagery does not stand isolated in his Letters. The concept of God’s Temple recurs in 1 Cor 6:19 and 2 Cor 6:16. Moreover, Paul uses cultic imagery derived from the temple service, such as references to a priestly service (e.g. 1 Cor 9:13; Rom 15:16), incense offering (2 Cor 2:14-16; Phil 4:18), libation (e.g. Phil 2:17), sacrifices (e.g. 1 Cor 10:18, Phil 2:17, 4:18) and the offering of the Gentiles (Rom 15:16). This pluriform, recurring presence of cultic imagery in Paul’s Letters suggests that Paul does not use a chance metaphor, but draws on relevant issues for himself and his readers when he employs this imagery.

What is the message underlying Paul’s idea of the Corinthian community as God’s Temple? What does Paul mean when he calls the material contribution by Diaspora congregations the ‘offering of the Gentiles’? The cultic imagery of Paul, which might sound arcane in certain respects today,² must have appealed to his original readers in their world of thought and experience. At least, we may assume that Paul’s aim was to make his message understandable to his readers. The phrase ‘*Do you not know that you are God’s Temple?*’ in 1 Cor 3:16a shows that Paul presupposed certain notions which were immediately clear to the intended hearers. An adequate understanding of Paul’s cultic imagery calls for an interpretation which explores the relation between imagery and message in its contemporary context.

A historical interpretation of Paul’s cultic imagery may bring the idea of the community as God’s Temple out in sharp relief. This interpretation should clarify what Paul’s undeniably figurative notion of a temple denotes and how Paul’s figurative uses of cultic imagery may and may not be related to literal dimensions of cultic service. Apart from his figurative references to aspects of cult, Paul points to the Jerusalem Temple cult of his time in a concrete way in a number of cases (cf. Rom 9:4; 1 Cor 10:18). In fact, Paul’s mentioning of sacrificial meals of the “Israel according to the flesh” in 1 Cor 10:18 has generated divergent or even opposite interpretations.³ The question of how Paul’s cultic imagery was connected to the cult of the contemporary Jerusalem Temple merits close examination of both the historical context of Paul’s time and of the theological dimensions of Paul’s Letters with respect to the issue of cultic terms.

Before investigating these issues, it is, however, necessary to survey previous scholarly interpretations of Paul’s cultic imagery as well as new approaches from which a historical interpretation may benefit.

¹ Cf. most recently, J. Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life* (Oxford University Press: Oxford & New York, 1996) 226 about Paul’s “vision of the community as a spiritual temple (1 Cor 3:16-17; 6:19)”.

² Cf. e.g. the comment on Phil 2:17 by G.D. Fee, *Paul’s Letter to the Philippians* NICNT (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich., 1995) 251 “in a sentence which was undoubtedly perfectly clear to Paul and probably reasonably understandable to the Philippians as they heard it read, the *distance of time and circumstances* has left us to wonder both what the imagery denotes and how the sentence fits into the letter”.

³ 1 Cor 10:18 has recently been interpreted by W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther 2 1Kor 6,12-11,16* EKKNT (Benziger: Düsseldorf / Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1995) 442-444 as an example of the disobedient Israel tempted to idolatry, whereas G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* NICNT (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich., 1987) 470-471 instead refers to it as Paul’s argument “that there *is* religious significance to the Lord’s Table and to the sacrificial meals of Israel” (471).

2. Previous scholarly interpretations of Paul's cultic imagery

2.1 Spiritualisation

The interpretation of cultic terminology in Paul's Letters is part of the study about the 'spiritualisation of the cultic concepts of Temple, priesthood, and sacrifice in the New Testament' which H. Wenschkewitz published in 1932.⁴ Wenschkewitz distinguished between occasional, naïve forms of spiritualisation, as in the prophetic literature of the Old Testament and in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, and reflective forms of spiritualisation, as in Hellenistic and Hellenistic Jewish literature. In his study about cultic terms in the New Testament, Wenschkewitz elaborated an approach which has been very influential and nearly unchallenged in subsequent scholarship up till the 1970s. The influence of Wenschkewitz' idea of 'spiritualisation' has, however, also extended to some of the most recent publications.⁵

The idea of a contrast with literal cultic practices is inherent in the concept of 'spiritualisation'. Because of this contrast, 'spiritualisation' not infrequently entails a tension with or even a substitution for the literal dimension of cultic practices. From Wenschkewitz's study up till recent scholarship, 'spiritualisation' has been understood as a process of spiritual forms of piety superseding cultic forms of piety.⁶ After I will have surveyed the scholarly use of the concepts of 'spiritualisation' and 'substitution', I will draw attention to similarities and differences between these two concepts.

Several scholarly studies on cultic terminology in Paul's letters and the other New Testament writings appear to have been derived from the approach of 'spiritualisation' or do even explicitly claim to follow this approach. In an article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* of 1950, C.F.D. Moule reads the cultic terminology in, among other New Testament writings, the Pauline letters in somewhat different terms of 'sublimation' of the sacrificial system, though also implying spiritualisation, for he notes Paul's use of cultic concepts in "purely spiritual senses".⁷

The article by K. Weiß in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* of 1954 aligns explicitly with the approach of 'spiritualisation' by Wenschkewitz. Weiß stresses the fact that 'spiritualisation' entails other aspects than the figurative use of cultic terms in a non-cultic context, instead creating an essentially new perspective.⁸ It may be useful to quote Weiß's definition of 'spiritualisation' here:

"Es handelt sich nicht um eine äußere, sondern eine innere Loslösung von den kultischen Vorgängen und Objekten, weil diese als nicht mehr gültiger Ausdruck oder geradezu als im Widerspruch zu den gemeinten und beabsichtigen geistigen Wirklichkeiten stehend empfunden werden".⁹

⁴ H. Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*. Angelos Beihefte 4 (Leipzig, 1932).

⁵ Cf. e.g. F. Siegert, "'Zerstört diesen Tempel ...!'. Jesus als "Tempel" in den Passionsüberlieferungen', in Johannes Hahn (ed.), *Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels. Geschehen – Wahrnehmung – Bewältigung* (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 2002) 108-139 at 135-137 who appears to prefer the term *Metaphorisierung*, but on the other hand still uses the term 'spiritualisation' as applied to Hellenistic Judaism and 'Urchristentum'.

⁶ G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1971) 144 quotes Wenschkewitz about 'spiritualisation' as a process in which "die Frömmigkeitsformen *geistiger* Art die Ausdrucksformen der *kultischen* Frömmigkeit für sich in Anspruch nehmen" (8) from the perspective of a "relative Freiheit vom Kultus, eine gebrochene Stellung zu ihm" (9).

⁷ C.F.D. Moule, 'Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament', *JTS* n.s. 1 (1950) 29-41 at 36.

⁸ K. Weiß, 'Paulus – Priester der christlichen Kultgemeinde', *TLZ* 79 (1954) 355-364 at 360.

⁹ Weiß, 'Paulus', 361.

Thus, Weiß's longer definition of spiritualisation suggests that the actual Jerusalem Temple cult was either not a valid expression for Paul, or in tension with Paul's message of a spiritual reality. We perceive here that some of the implications of the 'spiritualisation' perspective are exemplified.

The monographs by B. Gärtner in 1965¹⁰ and by R.J. McKelvey in 1969¹¹ further apply the concept of 'spiritualisation' to the cultic terminology in the New Testament and to contemporary Jewish writings. In view of Wenschkewitz's distinction between a naïve and a reflective form of spiritualisation, McKelvey has proposed to broaden Wenschkewitz's approach of 'reflective spiritualisation'. McKelvey not only employs the concept in relation to Hellenism and Hellenistic Judaism, in particular Philo's writings, but also in relation to Palestinian Jewish literature, that is, the Dead Sea Scrolls in particular.¹² Both Gärtner and McKelvey understand 'spiritualisation' as a historical process which provides the context for the use of cultic concepts in the New Testament at large, and by implication also in Paul's Letters.¹³

The article about the 'spiritual Temple in the Pauline Letters' by J.C. Coppens in the *Studia Evangelica* of 1973 still suggests the idea of 'spiritualisation', even though Coppens casts doubt on the link between temple imagery in the New Testament and the literature of Qumran, as supposed by Gärtner and McKelvey.¹⁴ The 'spiritualised' perspective on Pauline temple imagery in 1-2 Corinthians has also found its way into some older commentaries and into the Theological Dictionary to the New Testament edited by G. Kittel.¹⁵

Scholarly criticism of the approach of 'spiritualisation'

Since the 1970s, New Testament scholars have formulated methodological criticism against the approach of 'spiritualisation', although there were some antecedents before the 1970s of critical observations by Old Testament scholars.¹⁶ In his monograph of 1971, G. Klinzing expressed caution against the term 'spiritualisation', which, because of its set theological connotations, gives a misleading perspective on the literature of Qumran. Klinzing prefers the term *Umdeutung* for his study of cultic terminology in the literature of Qumran and the New Testament.¹⁷ Likewise, E. Schüssler Fiorenza has challenged the approach of 'spiritualisation'

¹⁰ B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran texts and the New Testament* (SNTSMS 1; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1965) 17 refers to Wenschkewitz as "one of the leading authorities in this field"; cf. 44, 72.

¹¹ R.J. McKelvey, *The New Temple. The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford UP: Oxford, 1969) 42-57.

¹² McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 43.

¹³ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 17-18; McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 122, 180.

¹⁴ J.C. Coppens, 'The Spiritual Temple in the Pauline Letters and its Background', *Studia Evangelica* VI (Akademie-Verlag: Berlin, 1973) 53-66.

¹⁵ E.g. H. Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1969) 96-97. G. Kittel (ed.), *TWNT III Θ-K* (Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1938) 189 about early Christian perspectives on sacrifice, in comparison to the New Testament, being "nichtstdestoweniger *spiritualisierend*". Cf. F. Mußner, 'Jesus und »das Haus des Vaters« - Jesus als »Tempel«', J. Schreiner (ed.), *Freude am Gottesdienst. Aspekte ursprünglicher Liturgie* (Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk: Stuttgart, 1983) 267-275 (268-269) claiming a stronger degree of *Spiritualisierung* of cultic terms in the New Testament as compared to the Old testament and early Judaism due to developments in early christology, referring to the study of Wenschkewitz and other literature on p. 269 n. 9.

¹⁶ For the antecedents, see S. Mowinckel, *Psalmstudien I-VI* (Kristiania, 1921/1924) 51; H.-J. Hermisson, *Sprache und Ritus im altisraelitischen Kult* (Neukirchen, 1965) 8, 24-28, quoted in Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 145.

¹⁷ Klinzing, 'Zum Begriff "Spiritualisierung"', in idem, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 143-147 at 146 about the "dualism between cultic and spiritual piety" inherent in the term 'spiritualisation'.

because of its 'dogmatic presuppositions' and the diversity of meanings covered by it, preferring the "more descriptive term *transference*".¹⁸

The idea of the Qumran community as a 'spiritual' Temple which would substitute the concrete Jerusalem Temple cult has further received a divided evaluation on the part of Qumran scholarship. In an article of 1986, D. Dimant argued against this idea of substitution in favour of the view of analogy and complementarity with the Second Temple.¹⁹ In her study of evidence for sectarian houses of prayer in the Damascus Document,²⁰ A. Steudel discussed the self-definition of the sectarian worship service as equivalent with and competitive to the Jerusalem Temple, suggesting that the sectarian public prayers were still oriented towards Jerusalem. Other scholars, like L.H. Schiffman and G.J. Brooke, who have recently published articles on the theme of the 'Qumran Community without Temple', appear to have no problem with the idea of substitution and spiritualisation respectively.²¹

With regard to recent critical evaluation of the 'spiritualisation' approach in New Testament scholarship, we should finally mention the contributions of W. Strack and Ch. Böttrich. In his monograph of 1994, W. Strack objected to the viewpoint of 'spiritualisation' of the Temple in Paul's Letters, claiming that Paul does not redefine the Temple cult itself, but the situation of the Gentiles in relation to salvation, which he expresses in cultic terms.²² However, this still leaves the question why Paul expressed his message through cultic terms supposedly derived from contemporary Jewish tradition, while he had converts from the Gentiles in mind. Further criticism against the approach of 'spiritualisation' was articulated by Christfried Böttrich in an article in a congress volume of 1999. Böttrich opposes the idea of 'spiritualisation' as well as that of 'substitution', believing that Paul's metaphor of the Temple must be seen in contrast to the contemporary Jerusalem Temple.²³

Historical problems with the approach of 'spiritualisation'

The historical problem with the assumption of a 'spiritualisation' of cult is, in my view, twofold. The first problem concerns the presupposition of a contemporary *Jewish context* for a broad tradition of 'spiritualisation'. With regard to the literature of Qumran, we have already emphasised the fact that there is a divided scholarly reception concerning the question whether 'spiritualisation' applies to the temple imagery in the Qumran texts, and whether this concept constitutes the background for the spiritualisation of cult in the New Testament writings.

The idea that contemporary Judaism, in particular Hellenistic Judaism, as reflected in the writings of Philo of Alexandria, paved the way for the kind of 'spiritualisation' of cult

¹⁸ E. Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Cultic language in Qumran and in the NT', *CBQ* 38 (1976) 159-177, there p. 161.

¹⁹ D. Dimant, '4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple', in A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel and J. Riaud (eds.), *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (Peeters: Leuven-Paris, 1986) 165-189 at 187.

²⁰ A. Steudel, 'The Houses of Prostration. CD xi 21-xii 1 – Duplicates of the Temple', *RevQ* 16/1 (1993) 49-68 at 56-57 and 62-65.

²¹ L.H. Schiffman, 'Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple', and G.J. Brooke, 'Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community', in B. Ego *et al.* (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple*. (WUNT 118; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1999) 267-301 at 272-274, 297.

²² W. Strack, *Kultische Terminologie in ekklesiologischen Kontexten in den Briefen des Paulus* (BBB 92; Beltz Athenäum Verlag, Weinheim 1994) 'Spiritualisierung bei Paulus?', 375-399 at 380 and 397.

²³ C. Böttrich, "'Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes". Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus', in Ego *et al.* (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*, 411-425 at 422.

which substituted the Jerusalem Temple cult is undermined by Jewish sources which express adherence to the concrete Temple cult. Thus, even though Philo uses cultic imagery in allegorical, figurative ways, he stresses the importance of pilgrimage to the Jerusalem Temple at the same time (*Spec.Laws* 1.66-70). Why would Philo of Alexandria, who wrote *On the Embassy to Gaius* to the Roman emperor Caligula, in order to dissuade him strongly from his plan to have his statue set up in the Jerusalem Temple, aim to substitute the concrete Temple cult with his figurative cultic imagery?

Another example from Jewish literature in a post-70 CE context may be mentioned here to emphasise that caution is needed against the assumption that ‘spiritualisation’ of cult, in the sense of substitution for the concrete cult, would be a long-standing process in contemporary Judaism. In *bMenah* 110a, we read the following about the rabbinic discussion surrounding the Mishnah-treatise *Menahot* on meal offerings:

Rabba said: everyone who is engaged in the Torah does not have to offer a burnt-offering nor a meal offering nor a sin-offering nor a guilt-offering. Rabbi Isaac said: Whence is that proven? As it is said: ‘and this is the Torah of the sin-offering’ (Lev 6:18), ‘and this is the Torah of the guilt-offering’ (Lev 7:1). Everyone who is engaged in the Torah of the sin-offering is as if he sacrifices a sin-offering, and everyone who is engaged in the Torah of the guilt-offering is as if he sacrifices a guilt-offering.

This example from the Babylonian Talmud shows that the rabbis of late antiquity had come to redefine religious worship in view of the destruction of the Temple in such a way that the study of the Torah sufficed and could replace the actual sacrifices of the Temple cult. This idea of substitution is, however, not yet present in the Mishnah-treatise *Menahot*. Thus, the idea of an exclusively figurative sense of cult, which replaced the concrete cult, apparently became established in rabbinic Judaism only at a later stage.²⁴ It therefore appears tendentious to single out figurative usages of cultic imagery in Jewish literature as contemporary contextual evidence for the early Christian sense of a ‘spiritualisation’ of cult.

The second historical problem concerns the presupposed *early Christian context* of ‘spiritualisation’ for Paul’s cultic imagery. The studies of Gärtner and McKelvey focus on a common tradition of temple imagery in early Christianity and its background, in which Paul’s temple imagery is one component.²⁵ This perspective carries the danger of imposing post-70 CE notions of the established church, as the ‘new Temple’, onto the interpretation of Paul’s cultic imagery. Paul wrote his Letters around the middle of the first century CE to nascent congregations which he or other missionaries had founded. By contrast, the late New Testament writings and patristic literature represent more developed notions of a clerical hierarchy,²⁶ and of Christianity as a separate religion.²⁷

²⁴ Cf. G. Stemberger, ‘Reaktionen auf die Tempelzerstörung in der rabbinischen Literatur’, in Hahn (ed.), *Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels*, 207-236 at 207-215 about the idea that the reserved rabbinic perspective on the destruction of the Temple may be understood as a reaction to the repression of the revolt of Bar Kokhba, and as a response to the apocalyptic tendencies which focused on the transformation of the Temple.

²⁵ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 49-71 categorises 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, 1 Cor 3:16-17, but also Eph 2:18-22 and 1 Tim 3:15 under the heading ‘Paul and the Temple of Christ’; in *The New Temple*, 98-107, McKelvey, rather than focusing on the difference between Eph and Cor, stresses how Eph 2:18-22 elaborates on 1 Cor 3:16-17. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 167-213, though avoiding the term ‘spiritualisation’, still surveys ‘New Testament parallels’ at large with a view to ‘Traditionszusammenhang’ (191), thereby passing too easily over the later developments in Christian traditions.

²⁶ Cf. the different ecclesiological context to the temple imagery in 1-2 Corinthians and in Ephesians respectively, and the clerical hierarchy reflected in 1 Peter 5:1-5. See my discussion in chap. 6, section 2.1.

²⁷ The term Χριστιανός, as an act of self-designation, figures only in the later New Testament writings, 1 Pet 4:16, and Acts 11:26, 26:28, but does not appear in Paul’s Letters; the terms ὁ πιστεύων and πιστός dominate in Pauline usage. See chap. 3 about the distinction between pre-70 CE and post-70 CE levels of Jesus-tradition and of self-definition by congregations of believers in Jesus Christ.

The distinction between earlier and later texts and traditions within the earliest history of Christianity touches upon the issue of cultic imagery in a very direct way. That is, the later Christian standpoint of the church as a 'spiritual Temple' carries polemical aspects against Judaism in the light of the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. Patristic literature comprises the notion of a 'spiritual Temple' and the church as the true Temple.²⁸ The standpoint of the church as the true Temple in patristic literature is interrelated with the polemical Christian viewpoint of Christianity as the 'true Israel', as we may infer from, among other writings, Justin's work.²⁹ The tendency towards a spiritual understanding of cult and sacrifice is clearly discernible in later New Testament writings, like 1 Peter 2:5 and Hebrews. However, Paul does not specify his figurative use of cultic terms as spiritual (πνευματικός) concepts. Furthermore, Paul's theology on Israel (Rom 9-11), which warns against Gentile presumption and boasts against the Jews (Rom 11:17-24), stands in contrast with later polemical developments in Christian apologetical literature. Justin, for example, defined Christianity as the 'true, spiritual Israelite race', in contrast with Judaism and the former Temple cult.

The approach of 'spiritualisation' to Paul's cultic imagery is misleading as it often tends to take later theological developments and the historical situation of the parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity after 70 CE as a referential framework for the perspective on Paul. The above-mentioned scholarly search for a common tradition in the cultic imagery in New Testament writings is just an implicit example of this. For a historical interpretation of Paul's cultic imagery, it is, however, necessary to interpret Paul on his own terms and in the context of his own time, that is, *before 70 CE* when the Jerusalem Temple still existed and when its worship cult was also vital for the Jerusalem church (Acts 21:17-26).

Finally, let us briefly return to the implications of 'spiritualisation' as we have come across this idea earlier in the case of Weiß's article. Weiß implies an inevitable contrast or tension between Paul's supposed 'spiritual' temple imagery and the contemporary Jewish Temple cult. It would, however, be too simplistic to start with the supposition of a complete disjunction between Paul's cultic terminology and cultic symbolism in contemporary Jewish literature, the latter of which certainly being to a large extent rooted in traditional temple religiosity.³⁰ With his landmark study about Paul and Palestinian Judaism, E.P. Sanders has eschewed the simplistic juxtaposition between Jewish and Christian religion as materialistic on the one hand and spiritual on the other.³¹ It is therefore also necessary to reconsider Paul's cultic terminology.

²⁸ Cf. G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1961) 897-898 with the following, significant entries about the metaphor of the Church as temple of God: *Barnabas* 4.11: γενόμεθα πνευματικοί, γενόμεθα ναός τέλειος τῷ θεῷ; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 7.13 (p.58.30; 516A): ναός δέ ἐστιν ὁ μὲν μέγας, ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία, ὁ δὲ μικρός, ὡς ὁ ἄνθρωπος; Origen, *Hom. 26.3 in Jos.* (p.463.15; M.87.1041C): παρ' ἡμῖν γὰρ ὁ ἀληθινὸς ναός; Chrysostom, *Hom. 6.1 in Eph.* (11.40A): ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ναός ἐστι, καὶ κοινῇ πάντες, καὶ ὡς ἐν σώματι Χριστοῦ οἰκεῖ, καὶ ὡς ἐν ναῷ πνευματικῷ οἰκεῖ.

²⁹ Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* (ed. Edgar J. Goodspeed, 1914) 11.5: Ἰσραηλιτικὸν γὰρ τὸ ἀληθινόν, πνευματικόν, καὶ Ἰουδα γένος (..) ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν; cf. 40.1 f. about Justin's christological interpretation of the cessation of the Jerusalem Temple cult. Cf. *Barnabas* 4.7-14.

³⁰ About cultic symbolism in contemporary Jewish literature, cf. e.g. Psalm 50:23; Philo, *Det.* 21; cf. literary and epigraphic evidence of designations of the pre-70 CE synagogue as ἱερόν (e.g. Josephus, *JW* 4.406-409; 7.44-45) and τὸ ἱερόν περίβολον (e.g. *CII* 2.1433). For a discussion of this terminology for the ancient synagogue, see D.D. Binder, *Into the Temple Courts. The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period* (SBLDS 169; Society of Biblical Literature: Atlanta, Ga., 1999) 122-132. Cf. my chapter 5.

³¹ In his *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (SCM: London, 1977) 12-13 E.P. Sanders objects to the idea, inherent in much comparative scholarship up till then, of comparing and contrasting two religions, Christianity and Judaism, on the basis of a supposed 'essence of religion', like faith versus works of the Law, or spiritual versus materialistic.

2.2 Substitution

The second long-standing approach in scholarly literature concerns the idea of the church as the ‘new Temple’, which substitutes the Jerusalem Temple cult. This approach of substitution may be intertwined with the aforementioned approach of ‘spiritualisation’ in the older scholarly literature. R.J. McKelvey focused on the church in the New Testament as the ‘new Temple’ in his monograph of 1969; a work in which he also uses the concept of ‘spiritualisation’.³² The idea of a new, spiritual Temple which replaces the old, material Temple may, however, again be a scholarly interpretation influenced by later Christian tradition and not explicitly demonstrable in the text of Paul’s Letters.³³

The idea of temple imagery as substitution for a concrete temple cult also figures in recent scholarly literature which has abandoned the approach of ‘spiritualisation’. G. Klinzing connects the christological orientation of atonement in the New Testament at large and in the Pauline Letters in particular with the idea of a definite substitution for a sacrificial cult.³⁴ Romans 12:1 and Paul’s supposedly loose applications of cultic imagery provide important evidence for Klinzing in favour of the idea that the literal dimension of cultic practices has lost its significance for Paul.³⁵

W. Strack has more recently studied the cultic terminology in Paul’s Letters, abandoning the perspective of ‘spiritualisation’ for the idea of ‘cult typology’.³⁶ Yet, this ‘cult typology’ still entails the idea of substitution. In his chapter on Rom 15:14-21 as an ‘ecclesiological message of Paul’, Strack interprets Paul’s cultic terminology in Rom 15:16 in the following ‘typological’ way:

“Wenn im Kreuzestod Christi eschatologische Sühne geschehen ist, bedarf es keiner weiteren kultisch-rituellen Reinigung und Heiligung der Glaubenden”.³⁷

Strack’s ecclesiological interpretation of Paul’s cultic terminology entails the idea that Christ substituted the Jewish cult of ritual purification and atonement.

In view of Strack’s interpretation of Paul’s cultic terminology, it should be noted that Paul does write about redemption through Christ’s blood (Rom 3:25-26) and about Christ as the paschal lamb (1 Cor 5:7), but not explicitly about the idea that every ritual or cultic purification would be pointless since Christ’s atoning sacrifice. If 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 is accepted as a Pauline pericope, it may be noted that 2 Cor 7:1 suggests a kind of ritual purification, even though Christ is mentioned in 2 Cor 6:14. Paul’s thought about atonement is undeniably christologically oriented, but it is difficult to find a Pauline passage in which Paul explicitly contrasts the atonement for sin through Christ with contemporary Jewish cultic practices.

In contrast with Paul’s Letters, we do find the explicit idea that Christ’s sacrifice has definitely substituted priestly sacrifices and cultic purifications in Hebrews 4:14-7:28, 10:1-18. The author of Hebrews repeatedly stresses that the priestly cult of sacrifices and offerings

³² McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 42-57.

³³ Paul writes about a new covenant in Christ, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, in 1 Cor 11:25 and 2 Cor 3:6, but not about a ‘new Temple’.

³⁴ Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 221 about the death of Jesus as the eschatological sacrifice and atonement “das an die Stelle aller herkömmlichen Opfer tritt”, referring to Rom 3:25, 1 Cor 15:3, 2 Cor 5:21, 1 Cor 5:7, 1 Pet 1:19f., Heb 9:26, 10:5ff. (221 n. 4).

³⁵ Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 214-217, 221.

³⁶ Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 69-70.

³⁷ Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 70.

cannot take away sins (Hebrews 10:1.4.11.18), and he contrasts this priestly cult of sacrifices and offerings with the offering of the body of Jesus Christ as an expression of the will of God (Hebrews 10:5-10). Hebrews 10:9b is revealing for this perspective of substitution: 'he abolishes the first in order to establish the second', ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον στήσῃ. The perspective of Hebrews 3:1 on Jesus as the 'apostle and high priest of our confession' is unfamiliar to Paul. Since Hebrews is usually dated to the last decades of the first century CE,³⁸ that is, *after 70 CE*, we should bear in mind that the idea of substitution may have been related to the parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity in post-70 CE circumstances.³⁹

Having surveyed the scholarly use of the concepts of 'spiritualisation' and 'substitution', certain similarities and differences may be noted. The approach of 'spiritualisation' has been characterised by a distance from and reinterpretation of the concrete dimension of cultic practices, due to a perceived contrast between cultic piety and spiritual piety. The supersession of cult by spiritual forms of religion is the ultimate consequence of the process of 'spiritualisation', and is equivalent to the idea of 'substitution'. Nevertheless, apart from 'spiritualisation', the concept of 'substitution' is also used in more recent scholarship, based on the interpretation of temple imagery in the New Testament at large, the Pauline tradition in particular, and the interpretation of cultic terms in Paul's Letters in connection with Pauline christology.

The ambiguous Pauline evidence, however, leaves the question whether the substitution perspective is an adequate interpretation of Paul's cultic imagery in all respects. The tentative argument of Christfried Böttrich against the interpretation of Paul's temple imagery as a substitution for the Jerusalem Temple cult, which we have already mentioned, deserves further attention. A comprehensive interpretation of Paul's cultic imagery in context, which will be undertaken in part three (chaps. 6-8), might yield further insights on this issue.

2.3 The comparative religions approach

In the above survey we have already come across scholarly tendencies to understand the cultic imagery of the New Testament writings in a broader historical context, drawing Hellenistic, Hellenistic Jewish and Palestinian Jewish texts into the debate. The study of common motifs and themes in Christian and non-Christian (Jewish and Hellenistic) texts, in search of an evolution from pre-Christian to Christian thought, was a traditionally common approach to the history of religions.⁴⁰ Many older studies on cultic imagery in the New Testament are characterised by a comparative perspective which reflects the influence of the history of religions school. The comment by R.J. McKelvey that, after the developments in Jewish and Greek thought about cult, "it was left to Christianity to solve the problem in terms of a temple which was at once new and spiritual", is a typical example of the influence exerted by the evolutionary perspective of the history of religions school.⁴¹

³⁸ See U. Schnelle, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (UTB 1830; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 21996) 422; B.D. Ehrman, *The New Testament. A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* (Oxford University Press: New York & Oxford, 2000) 378-384 about early Christian self-definition in Hebrews as continuous with, but also superior to Judaism. Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 371-373 further refers to a post-70 CE 'historising' perspective of Hebrews on cultic practice.

³⁹ *Contra* Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 373 who compares cult typology in Hebrews with Philo's metaphors.

⁴⁰ For a brief historiographical survey, see e.g. W.A. Meeks, 'Judaism, Hellenism, and the Birth of Christianity', in T. Engberg-Pedersen (ed.), *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide* (WJK: Louisville [etc.], 2001) 17-27.

⁴¹ McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 57.

Introduction

The problematic aspects of a comparative religious approach are particularly illustrated by older studies which combine cultic imagery in the New Testament with contemporary Judaism. Pre-1950s scholarly work on cultic imagery in the New Testament, published before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls,⁴² mainly focused on the comparison with Hellenistic and Hellenistic Jewish literature.⁴³ In the above sections we have already discussed how scholarly approaches to cultic imagery in the New Testament have been intertwined with spiritualisation and substitution since the influential study of Wenschkewitz, which drew mainly on a comparative approach to Hellenism and Hellenistic Jewish literature.

The main project of the studies by B. Gärtner in 1965 and by G. Klinzing in 1971 was a comparative study between temple imagery in the New Testament and the literature of Qumran. The study of R.J. McKelvey further accords an important place to the literature of Qumran in the survey of Jewish and Greek conceptualisations of the temple.⁴⁴ The studies by Gärtner and Klinzing served to point to the Palestinian, or even specifically Qumranite, background of traditions of temple imagery in the New Testament. However, the authors admit that the historical context for this background can be outlined only in a hypothetical way at best.⁴⁵ Since this historical context is not further specified, the idea of a direct link between Qumranite temple imagery and, in our case, Paul's temple imagery also remains suspect and hypothetical. The thematic comparison, which lacks specific historical connections, forms a weak point in the above mentioned studies.

The thematic comparison by itself has, however, been criticised by a number of scholars. First, we should mention the general caution expressed by S. Sandmel against speculations about one text as a literary source for another text.⁴⁶ Sandmel defines the search for connections between two texts on the mere basis of literary parallels out of context as *parallelomania*. He proposes to interpret acknowledged parallels in Jewish texts, without further specification, pointing to common Jewish tradition rather than to specific literary connections.⁴⁷ The epoch-making study of E.P. Sanders on *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A*

⁴² For the impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on the exegesis of Paul's letters, note for example W.D. Davies, 'Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit', in K. Stendahl (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (SCM: London, 1958) 157-182; the bibliographical survey of H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament I* (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1966) 169-215; J. Murphy-O'Connor (ed.), *Paul and Qumran. Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (Geoffrey Chapman: London [etc.] 1968); W.S. LaSor, 'The Pauline Writings and Qumran', in idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. 1972) 168-178; H.-W. Kuhn, 'The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the understanding of Paul', in D. Dimant and U. Rappaport (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Brill: Leiden [etc.] / Magness Press, Hebrew University / Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi: Jerusalem) 327-339; T.H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1997); J.A. Fitzmyer, S.J., 'Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls', in P.W. Flint & J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment II* (Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1999) 599-621; H. Räisänen, 'Paul's and Qumran's Judaism', in A.J. Avery-Peck et al. (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls 2 World View, Comparing Judaisms* (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 2001) 173-200.

⁴³ Cf. the study of H. Wenschkewitz cited in section 2.1 above. Cf. Gärtner's 'Introduction', in idem, *The Temple and the Community*, ix-xi about the "influence of Hellenistic civilization on the Christian thought-world" (ix) and the Dead Sea Scrolls as "a most important source of *supplementary* information" (x).

⁴⁴ Cf. McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 36-38, 46-53.

⁴⁵ Cf. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 138-142 after admitting "since our knowledge of the factual situation is strictly limited, we must present our findings in the form of a hypothesis" (138), concludes about the "Palestinian rather than the Hellenistic background" of Paul's temple imagery (142). Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 210-212 recapitulates his argument about the idea of the early Christian community as Temple as ultimately originating from Qumran, but without a clear hypothesis about the historical context: "Fragt man aber, wann und wo sie zuerst übernommen wurde, so bleibt vieles im dunkeln" (210).

⁴⁶ S. Sandmel, 'Parallelomania', *JBL* 81/1 (1962) 1-13.

⁴⁷ Sandmel, 'Parallelomania', 5-6.

Comparison of Patterns of Religion in 1977 extensively discussed the failure of the older comparative religious approach. Sanders has illustrated the arbitrariness of a comparison of texts from different religions on the basis of literary parallels through the example of an analogy between identical blocks in two very different buildings.⁴⁸ Just as the blocks in two different buildings have a different place and function, the comparison between motifs and themes in Paul's Letters and Palestinian Jewish literature does not allow for conclusions by itself. Paul's perspective and the perspective(s) of Palestinian Judaism should each be taken on their own terms in order to avoid a biased comparison.

Second, J.C. Coppens and E. Schüssler Fiorenza have specifically criticised the comparative studies of B. Gärtner, R.J. McKelvey, and G. Klinzing. In his article published in 1973, Coppens has rather stressed the fundamental differences between Qumranite temple imagery, with its emphasis on cultic functions, and Paul's temple imagery.⁴⁹ Coppens has also criticised the lack of foundation for Gärtner's hypothesis that Jesus was aware of the Qumranite idea of the community as a Temple.⁵⁰ Schüssler Fiorenza has criticised the comparative approach of 'religionsgeschichtlich background or parallels' as inadequate. According to Schüssler Fiorenza the inadequacy consists in the fact that this kind of comparative approach neither explains 'theological differences' between the two communities which are compared, nor studies the "social context and the theological interest and function" of the temple imagery.⁵¹

The recent study by W. Strack also carries problematic aspects of a comparative approach. The problem with Strack's perspective of 'ecclesiology' consists in the fact that it lends itself for intra-Christian discussion but less well for a comparative study between the New Testament and contemporary Jewish literature, to which Strack nevertheless applies the term.⁵² Ecclesiology has too fixed theological connotations about the Christian Church to be useful as a comparative term.

Nevertheless, the reason for a comparison with contemporary Jewish traditions is clearly expressed by H.-J. Klauck, who has stressed the earliest Christianity's dependence on the Jewish "Umwelt, die voll war von kultischen Symbolen".⁵³ Paul at times explicitly mentions Israel's cult (cf. 1 Cor 10:18, Rom 9:4). He also writes about his relation to the Jerusalem church, fellow missionaries, opponents, and Judaism in his Letters. In order to understand Paul's position within the context of contemporary Jewish and Christian attitudes to the Temple, a historical comparative study will be necessary.

In my view, for a comparative approach to Paul's cultic imagery to succeed, we should start from a perspective which takes the above-mentioned scholarly criticism into account. We should not apply the comparative approach to a comparison between two communities, but, rather, to the larger fabric of contemporary Jewish culture, of which the earliest followers of Jesus Christ were part. The question will need to be addressed whether and how Paul's cultic imagery related to or contrasted with perspectives on cultic worship within contemporary Judaism and earliest (pre-70 CE) Christianity. It will be necessary to reconsider the historical context of Paul's cultic imagery by surveying contemporary Jewish

⁴⁸ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 1-13.

⁴⁹ Coppens, 'The Spiritual Temple', 53-66 at 62.

⁵⁰ Coppens, 'The Spiritual Temple', 64.

⁵¹ Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Cultic Language', 159-177 at 162.

⁵² Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 141-156 at 142 about the "ecclesiology" of Deuteronomy'; 149 about the 'ecclesiological understanding' of קהל in the Qumran-text 1QS^a 2,4. Strack takes a study of L. Rost in 1938 about the 'alttestamentlichen Vorstufen von Kirche' as a point of departure (141).

⁵³ H.-J. Klauck, 'Kultische Symbolsprache bei Paulus', in Schreiner (ed.), *Freude am Gottesdienst*, 107-118.

attitudes to the Temple (chapter 1); by discussing how Qumranite perspectives on the Temple relate to the larger fabric of contemporary Jewish culture (chapter 2); and by examining what information the earliest Christian texts may yield about the perspective(s) of the early Jesus-movement on the Temple (chapter 3). Taking into account the reconsideration of this historical context to cultic imagery, a re-examination of Paul's own relation to Judaism (chaps. 4-5) is required.

Recent developments in Qumran scholarship and in discussions about the relationship between the parts and the whole in contemporary Jewish culture may give a further impetus to the renewed study of monotheistic temple-theological ideas in Paul's time. Recent discussions in Qumran scholarship about the dividing line between sectarian and non-sectarian Qumran texts and possible intersections⁵⁴ may help to elaborate a working hypothesis which can bring a Palestinian Jewish background to Paul's temple imagery into focus. It should further be noted that many new publications of Qumran texts since the 1960s and 1970s - like 4QMMT, the 4Q fragments of the Community Rule, and the 4Q fragments of the Damascus Document - have substantially added to our picture of the literature of Qumran in relation to the idea of the Temple (chapter 2).

In order to take scholarly criticism of the pitfalls of the older comparative religions approach fully into account, we should reconsider the historical context to Paul's references to Israel's cult as well as Paul's relation to Judaism. An accurate historical interpretation of Paul's cultic imagery can only be established on the basis of sound methodology. In the following sections, we will see how this interpretation may benefit from new approaches to biblical texts.

3. The use of new approaches

3.1 Rhetorical criticism

The application of rhetorical theory to the exegesis of Paul's Letters

Since the 1970s, the application of ancient rhetoric to the exegesis of Paul's Letters has become increasingly influential as a method for analysing the argumentation and literary structure of Paul's Letters. Paul's Letters are not interpreted as a systematic expression of theology, but rejoined to their respective historical occasions and original audiences, and re-interpreted with a view to what Paul has to say in this historical context and how he says this. At this point, ancient rhetoric is put to the use of the exegesis of Paul's Letters: just as orators employed a specific kind of argumentation in their speeches to persuade or dissuade a specific audience, the writer of a letter may also have used a specific strategy of persuasion to convey his message to his addressees.

The commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians by Hans Dieter Betz has marked a breakthrough of rhetorical criticism in the exegesis of Paul's Letters.⁵⁵ While subsequent scholarship has agreed on the use of ancient rhetorical theory as the means to throw light on the structure of argumentation and the *rhetorical situation* of Paul's Letters, scholarly opinions have diverged about the kind of rhetoric identifiable in Paul's respective Letters. To

⁵⁴ Cf. the discussion in my chapter 2, section 4.1.

⁵⁵ H.D. Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1979). For a survey of scholarly interest in rhetorical criticism, as applied to biblical texts anterior to the 1970s, see e.g. R.D. Anderson Jr., 'Modern Rhetorical Criticism and New Testament Scholarship', in idem, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* (CBET 18; Kok Pharos: Kampen, 1996) 13-28.

take Paul's Letter to the Galatians again as an example: Betz read this as an *apologetic* Letter, whereas G.A. Kennedy and J. Smit have interpreted Galatians as an example of a *deliberative* discourse.⁵⁶

In his influential handbook on *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* from 1984, G.A. Kennedy has set out to explain how the three basic types of speech in ancient rhetoric, that is, the *epideictic*, the *deliberative*, and the *forensic* types, may also apply to written letters. Recent surveys and handbooks on rhetorical criticism as applied to biblical exegesis, have expressed more caution against identifying Paul's Letters with a particular ideal type of rhetorical genre which might amount to 'eisegesis' rather than to exegesis.⁵⁷ This caution is particularly expressed in reaction to previous identifications of Paul's Letter to the Galatians with one ideal type of rhetorical speech.⁵⁸

According to the treatise on *Rhetoric* (1.3-2.17) by Aristotle, the integral parts of an ancient rhetorical discourse comprised the argumentation concerning the debated matter (λόγος), the argument about the reliability of the rhetor's position (ἤθος), and the appeal to the emotions of the audience with regard to the issues at stake (πάθος).⁵⁹ The structural elements of an ancient rhetorical discourse have further been compared to the literary structure of Paul's Letters in order to bring out the main issues in relation to the rhetorical situation.

Apart from paying attention to the application of ancient rhetorical theory, recent studies have focused on the modern definition of the *rhetorical situation* of a (written) act of communication. The influential study of L.F. Bitzer distinguishes three constituent parts of a *rhetorical situation*: the *exigence* (the occasion which gives rise to the communication), the *audience* addressed by the communication, and certain *constraints* (circumstances which defy the purpose of the communication).⁶⁰

The reconstruction of the rhetorical situation of Paul's Letters is complicated by the fact that we only have Paul's part of the correspondence. Nevertheless, Paul refers explicitly to written communication by his addressees in the case of the Corinthian congregation (1 Cor 7:1) and to contacts with other believers and missionaries, as in the closing greetings in Romans 16:1-23. We only have Paul's perspective, since the account of the book of Acts,

⁵⁶ G.A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill & London, 1984) 144-152; J. Smit, 'The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: A Deliberative Speech', *NTS* 35 (1989) 1-26.

⁵⁷ Cf. the emphasis in S.E. Porter, 'Paul of Tarsus and His Letters', in idem (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period (330 B.C. – A.D. 400)* (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1997) 533-585 on the formulation of criteria to avoid arbitrariness in the application of rhetorical criticism. In his article 'Rhetorical and Narratological Criticism', in S.E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* (NTTS 25; Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1997) 219-239 at 227 D.L. Stamps notes: "The problem is whether rhetorical criticism, in analyzing a unit of text, discerns a textual integrity which was intentionally created, or critically imposes a pattern of coherence as an analytical procedure", but concludes that it is a "very helpful critical perspective".

⁵⁸ Cf. the caution against over-interpretation in J.D.G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC; A & C Black: London, 1993) 20; see also P.H. Kern, *Rhetoric and Galatians. Assessing an approach to Paul's epistle* (SNTSMS 101; Cambridge UP: Cambridge [etc.], 1998) 260-261 at 261 who pleads for the application of a "new rhetoric – one which accounts for developments in disciplines such as psychology, pragmatics and sociology of knowledge".

⁵⁹ For a survey of 'the Sources for Ancient Rhetorical Theory', see Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 29-92.

⁶⁰ Cf. e.g. the recent commentary by P.F. Esler, *Galatians* (Routledge: London & New York, 1998), 17 who refers to the definition by L.F. Bitzer, 'The Rhetorical Situation', *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968) 1-14; see also the discussion of Bitzer's theory in J.D. Kim, *God, Israel, and the Gentiles. Rhetoric and Situation in Romans 9-11* (SBL: Atlanta, Ga., 2000) 33-35.

which was composed much later, cannot substitute contemporary perspectives of Pauline congregations.

E. Schüssler Fiorenza has argued that the rhetorical situation, as it may be reconstructed from Paul's Letters, cannot be equated with the historical situation. According to Schüssler Fiorenza, a careful analysis of Paul's rhetorical strategies should move beyond the face value reading of Paul's Letters as just a response to a rhetorical situation to the idea that Paul also "creates" the rhetorical situation.⁶¹ With this approach, Schüssler Fiorenza distances herself from the idea that the rhetorical situation that can be inferred from Paul's text brings us automatically closer to the historical situation.⁶² Schüssler Fiorenza contributes to the rhetorical analysis of Paul's Letters by the important methodological point of the difference between rhetorical situation and historical situation. With this distinction in mind, Paul's cultic imagery cannot be aligned with a presupposed idea of the historical context. For instance, some of the older studies presupposed a historical context to the (disputable) idea of spiritualisation of cult in the New Testament, taking the New Testament as the culmination of an evolutionary process within Judaism (cf. section 2.3 above).

Criticism of the approach of rhetorising Paul

In recent scholarship, the use of rhetorical criticism has also been challenged. R.D. Anderson Jr. has recently questioned the idea that Paul would have made conscious use of categories from ancient rhetorical theory to build up his argumentation in his Letters. Anderson aims at "a more careful approach to the application of rhetorical theory".⁶³ He observes that the idea that Paul would have had a formal rhetorical training cannot be demonstrated by the evidence which we have, arguing that Paul's Jewish education could only have allowed for a limited extent of Hellenistic rhetorical training (249f.). Anderson's rhetorical analysis of Gal 1-5:12 (111-167) and Rom 1-11 (169-219), and his discussion of scholarship on rhetorical criticism of 1 Corinthians (221-248) further point to the limitations of classifying these Letters according to rhetorical genres. Anderson finally concludes from "Paul's own characterisation of his literary abilities" that it is unlikely that Paul made deliberate and consistent use of ancient rhetorical theory throughout his Letters.

Anderson's criticism against the uncritical and rigorous application of ancient rhetorical theory to the Pauline Letters in previous scholarship is also reflected in other recent studies (cf. n. 57 above). However, Anderson's argument against too general assumptions about rhetorical training as part of Paul's upbringing is controversial, for this argument depends on the perspective taken on the extent of intersection between Hellenistic and Jewish education in the first century CE. In his critical biography of Paul, J. Murphy-O'Connor has recently placed Jewish upper class education in a Hellenistic context which included

⁶¹ E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic. The Politics of Biblical Studies* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1999), 138, 139-140. Cf. eadem, 'Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Cor', *NTS* 33 (1987) 386-403.

⁶² In her book *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (Crossroad: New York, 1983) 29 Schüssler Fiorenza argues that a 'feminist critical hermeneutics' should "move from androcentric texts to their social-historical contexts". As evidence for the androcentrism of Paul's Letters, Schüssler Fiorenza mainly refers to 1 Cor 14:33-36, but she also notes that "exegetes are divided on the question of whether the influence of Paul was negative or positive with respect to the role of women in early Christianity" (50). Cf. the evidence against generalisations about 'patriarchal' or 'androcentric' culture in antiquity presented in the studies like those of B. J. Broton, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue* *BJS* 36 (Scholars Press: Atlanta, Ga., 1982) and S. Matthews, *First converts: rich pagan women and the rhetoric of mission in early Judaism and Christianity* (Stanford UP: Stanford, Calif., 2001) 96-100.

⁶³ Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 257, further concludes: "Despite the necessary restrictions and limitations to such application, there is still much to be gained from further study in this field".

rhetorical training. Murphy-O'Connor mentions Philostratus' information about rhetorical training in Tarsus (*Life of Apollonius* 1.7) and Philo's information about Hellenistic-Jewish education (*Spec.Laws* 2.229-230) to sustain the argument that Hellenistic rhetoric may have been a component of Paul's previous education.⁶⁴

It is further possible to provide an interpretation of "Paul's own characterisation of his literary abilities", as in 1 Cor 1:17, 2:2.4.5; 2 Cor 10:10, 11:6, 11:1-12:13, which is different from Anderson's. Murphy-O'Connor has emphasised that Paul's presentation of his own (lack of) oratorical skills in reaction to the criticism by others should not be taken at face value, for it fits in a rhetorical context of countering his opponents.⁶⁵ Paul's awareness of different possible rhetorical situations for letters is apparent from his negative reference to opponents who would need 'letters of recommendation', *συστατικαὶ ἐπιστολαί* (2 Cor 3:1). This type of letter is included in the classification of epistolary theory, the *τύποι ἐπιστολικοί*, by the first-century BCE Pseudo-Demetrius.⁶⁶ Thus, even though Anderson has made an important contribution to the critical and careful use of ancient rhetorical theory, some of his points of criticism with regard to Paul's education and (un)awareness of rhetorical strategies are debatable.

Most recently, Lauri Thurén has criticised the implications of the use of rhetorical criticism for the exegesis of the Pauline Letters as a shift of focus from the theology represented by the texts of Paul's Letters to the historical 'context' of the rhetorical situations. Thurén formulates these possible implications as follows:

"As a result of the "contextual" studies, many exegetes are increasingly persuaded that Paul was merely a situational thinker or a practical pastor, and possessed only a vague theology, if any".⁶⁷

Thurén does not criticise the use of rhetorical analysis in the exegesis of Paul's Letters *per se*, but pleads for a *de-rhetorizing* of the text of Paul's Letters in order to find the underlying theological ideas expressed by Paul (28). Thus, according to Thurén, rhetorical criticism should not be one-dimensionally applied to the texts of Paul's Letters in terms of technical conventions and non-theological strategies of persuasion, but it should be combined with a dynamic perspective on how such rhetorical devices interact with and effect Paul's theological ideas.

Evaluation of the use of rhetorical criticism

Rhetorical criticism may be helpful in evaluating the argumentative context in which Paul uses cultic language, and in assessing its relation to the issues at stake which prompted Paul to write the particular Letter in which the idea of cultic language occurs. Even though Paul does not rigorously follow the scheme of a particular rhetorical genre, the significance of cultic language in a particular context of argumentation may yield information about what Paul means with these cultic terms, and about what message he aims to convey to his audience with precisely this language.

Determining the rhetorical situation of each specific Letter is important, both for the more general question of Paul's relation to Judaism (chapters 4-5) and for the specific issue of

⁶⁴ Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life*, 49-51, 49.

⁶⁵ Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life*, 50-51 at 50: "Paul's disclaimer in 2 Corinthians 11:6 is a *rhetorical convention*".

⁶⁶ Cf. Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 98 n. 257.

⁶⁷ L. Thurén, *Derhetorizing Paul: a dynamic perspective on Pauline Theology and the Law* (WUNT 124; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 2000), 5.

Paul's use of cultic imagery (chapters 6-8). It is vital to identify the context of communication at the different levels of structure of each Letter. A careful rhetorical analysis of Paul's Letters may yield a more critical perspective on the way in which one should proceed from text to historical context with regard to the subject of cultic imagery.

3.2 Cultic language and the philosophy of religious language

The central question about Paul's cultic language concerns not so much its meaning at face value, but its meaning as applied in the context, as we have already seen. Scholars have used different terms, like 'spiritualisation', 'sublimation', 'Umdeutung', 'transference', or 'Metaphorisierung', to characterise the kinds of application which Paul could have had in mind with his use of cultic imagery. In recent scholarly literature, Paul's temple imagery in particular is mainly described as a 'metaphor'.⁶⁸

The identification of Paul's temple imagery as a metaphor makes sense, for this imagery goes beyond mere analogy or comparison. Metaphor may be defined as a figure of speech which applies language outside its original semantic context, thereby generating a creative tension from which a new perspective emerges. An example of a biblical metaphor from Paul's Letters may serve to illustrate my point. Paul uses the metaphor of the vessel and applies it to human beings in Romans 9:19-24. Although human beings cannot be understood as pottery, as made of clay on a literal level, the application serves to make concrete an aspect of the relation between human beings and God as the creation and the Creator respectively. Since the term 'metaphor' is relatively neutral in designating non-literal language, and since the word does not carry *a priori* suppositions about the nature of the application, we may indeed consider to take the Temple concept in 1-2 Corinthians as a *metaphor*.

It is important not to confuse the concept with its application, for the application depends on the context in Paul's Letters, and is not inherent in the cultic language itself. For instance, when Paul writes about God's indwelling Spirit in relation to the metaphor of the Temple in 1 Cor 3:16-17, this does not necessarily imply a process of 'spiritualisation', since the idea of God's presence and activity through his Spirit is a constant factor in biblical theology. 'Spiritualisation' implies a process, a development away from the material domain, while 'Umdeutung' suggests a direction to an entirely different domain. These descriptive terms, however, leave the question open as to why the concepts subjected to reinterpretation are used at all if their original meaning and context do not matter anymore.

Philosophical perspectives on metaphor in religious language may help to throw a light on the significance of metaphor in Paul's theology. Ancient philosophical theory about metaphors can be put to use in order to understand Paul's figurative language in a contemporary context. Modern philosophical discussions of metaphor, on the other hand, may contribute to the critical awareness of the sensitivities involved in interpreting metaphorical language.

First, we should note that the use of metaphor was an established form in ancient literary theory. Aristotle already noted the importance of metaphor as a literary mode of expression, as we read in his treatise on *Poetics*:

⁶⁸ Cf. e.g. D.R. de Lacey, 'οἰτινὲς ἐστε ὑμεῖς: The Function of a Metaphor in St Paul', in W. Horbury (ed.), *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel* (JSNTSup 48; Sheffield AP, JSOT Press, Sheffield 1991) 391-409; C. Böttrich, "Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes", 411-425. Cf. F. Siegert, "Zerstört diesen Tempel ...!", 135-136 who appears to prefer the term 'Metaphorisierung' to 'Spiritualisierung'.

Paul and God's Temple

'but it is of utmost importance to be apt at metaphors. For it is only this matter which one cannot receive from another and which is the sign of talent, since the right use of a metaphor constitutes the perception of resemblance' (*Poetics* 1459a 5-8).⁶⁹

Aristotle emphasises the perception of resemblance, τὸ ὅμοιον, and analogy, τὸ ἀνάλογον, between current and metaphorical usage in order to avoid misunderstanding about the meaning of the metaphor. According to Aristotle, if metaphors cannot be received from others, this makes clear that metaphor is the product of creativity and natural gift of the one who coins the metaphor. Metaphor goes beyond the established conventions of descriptive language, whereas it illuminates the relation between two objects at the same time. Aristotle circumscribes metaphor by relating it to resemblance and analogy for the sake of clarity, σαφήνεια (*Poetics* 1458a 18-34).

Josephus conveys an interesting connotation to the act of transference, μεταφερεῖν, that is, the translation of his work from his native tongue into a foreign language and culture (cf. *Ant.* 1.7). Thus, we could also perceive a metaphor as the act of transferring something from one culture to another, or from one domain of culture to another. In the case of Paul's metaphor of the Temple, the metaphor transfers a concept of monotheistic worship to the Hellenistic domain of Paul's audience, the Corinthian congregation.

Different theories have been developed about the function of metaphor in modern scholarship. In her monograph on *Metaphor and religious language* of 1985, Janet Martin Soskice categorised three different types of theories about metaphor. These types are *substitution* theories, *emotive* theories and *incremental* theories.⁷⁰ Soskice characterises the 'substitution view' of metaphor as a 'decorative word or phrase' substituting 'for an ordinary one' and traces it back to classical accounts of metaphor.⁷¹ She criticises this view for being reductionist and untenable, and redefines the question of what constitutes a good metaphor: "the good metaphor does not merely compare two antecedently similar entities, but enables one to see similarities in what previously had been regarded as dissimilars".⁷² Soskice points to the emotive theory, which views metaphor as having an affective impact; and to incremental theories as the view that "what is said by the metaphor can be expressed adequately in no other way". Soskice prefers a philosophical perspective on metaphor along the basic lines of the incremental theory.⁷³

Other scholars, who have discussed the use of metaphor in religious language, agree with Soskice that the substitution theory is unsatisfactory and inadequate. Thus, Sallie McFague emphasises the creative process which a metaphor entails by constructing new meanings.⁷⁴ Walter Van Herck has further criticised the 'substitution theory' of metaphor in

⁶⁹ πολὺ δὲ μέγιστον τὸ μεταφορικὸν εἶναι. Μόνον γὰρ τοῦτο οὔτε παρ' ἄλλου ἔστι λαβεῖν εὐφυΐας τε σημείον ἔστιν· τὸ γὰρ εὖ μεταφέρειν τὸ τὸ ὅμοιον θεωρεῖν ἔστιν. Greek text from J. Hardy, *Aristote. Poétique* (Les Belles Lettres: Paris, 21995) 65. Cf. *Poetics* 1457b 6-33 about metaphor and analogy; 1458a 18-34 and 1458b 11-14 about the necessity of a balance between figurative language and current use of language for clarity. Cf. J.M. Soskice, 'Classical accounts of metaphor', in eadem, *Metaphor and religious language* (paperback ed. 1987; Oxford University Press: Oxford [etc.], 1985) 1-14.

⁷⁰ Soskice, *Metaphor and religious language*, 24-51.

⁷¹ Soskice, *Metaphor and religious language*, 1-14 at 8 about Aristotle as the 'originator and Quintillian (as) the exponent of (this) clearly unsatisfactory view'.

⁷² Soskice, *Metaphor and religious language*, 26.

⁷³ Soskice, *Metaphor and religious language*, 26, 30-44 at 44.

⁷⁴ S. McFague, 'Metaphor: The Heart of the Matter', in eadem, *Speaking in Parables. A Study in Metaphor and Theology* (2002 reprint with preface by Gerard Loughlin; SCM Press: London, 1975) 33-53 at 37-42.

light of the paradigm change in favour of a model of interaction (between the metaphor and the signified subject).⁷⁵

Scholars disagree about the cognitive value of the religious metaphor. In her elaboration of a theory of metaphor applied to theology, Soskice connects metaphor in religious language with a 'theological realism', in that it is "reality depicting without claiming to be directly descriptive".⁷⁶ In this idea of 'theological realism', the emphasis is not on description but on experience, that is, the horizon of experience of a religious community with its traditions of conviction and practice.⁷⁷ As Walter Van Herck has objected to Soskice's notion of 'theological realism', this view rather undermines the cognitive value of religious metaphor.⁷⁸ The cognitive function of the religious metaphor is analysed by Van Herck as comprising a variety of possible forms of religious knowledge gained from natural reason, from the theology of religious traditions, and from religious experience.⁷⁹ Van Herck sees the metaphor in relation to the religious community as an embodiment of 'tacit knowledge', which is a combination of attitudes, practical knowledge and 'knowing how'.⁸⁰

The implications of these philosophical arguments for our understanding of Paul's metaphor of the Temple may be put as follows. Following the philosophical criticism against the 'substitution theory', an interpretation of Paul's metaphor of the Temple as simply another, ornamental word for the church should be excluded. It is further interesting to follow the suggestion of Van Herck that religious metaphor should be seen as an embodiment of 'tacit knowledge'. Thus, we can specify the aim of our historical interpretation of Paul's cultic imagery as the search for the *tacit knowledge* which Paul presupposes by using this language.

3.3 Social-scientific approaches

3.3.1 Cultural anthropology

Anthropological models and Paul's cultic imagery

Cultural anthropology may provide us with a methodology for analysing the 'tacit knowledge' presupposed by Paul's cultic language in its ancient cultural context. Clinton Bennett has written that 'the anthropologist's task' consists in 'reading cultural sub-texts', that is, in approaching texts in search of the 'tacit knowledge' of unwritten rules and thought patterns underlying the 'explicit knowledge' which is presented in a straightforward way in texts.⁸¹ Bennett thus elaborates on the perspective of the anthropologist Clifford Geertz who

⁷⁵ W. Van Herck, *Religie en metafoor. Over het relativisme van het figuurlijke* (Peeters: Leuven, 1999) 35-58.

⁷⁶ Soskice, *Metaphor and religious language*, 148.

⁷⁷ Soskice, *Metaphor and religious language*, 150-153, cf. 160.

⁷⁸ Van Herck, *Religie en metafoor*, 35-58.

⁷⁹ Van Herck, *Religie en metafoor*, 60-66.

⁸⁰ Van Herck, *Religie en metafoor*, 82-84, 107, 201-203.

⁸¹ Cf. C. Bennett, *In Search of the Sacred. Anthropology and the Study of Religions* (Cassell: London & New York, 1996) 137 quoting L.W. Neuman, *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (Allyn & Bacon: Boston, 1994) 224 about 'tacit knowledge' as 'unspoken cultural norms' and about 'explicit knowledge' as 'what we know and talk about'.

expressed the aim to proceed from 'thin description' (observation) to the construction of a 'thick description' (interpretation of the meaning of an observation).⁸²

Since Paul's cultic terminology entails notions of holiness and purity,⁸³ anthropological approaches may help us to 'read the cultural sub-texts' to holiness and purity in Paul's time. What did holiness and purity mean in contemporary Jewish culture and for Christian Jews? An influential anthropological approach to the concept of purity and its counterpart, impurity, in their social context is the study of 'purity and danger', which Mary Douglas first published in 1966.⁸⁴ In her introduction, Douglas argues how 'pollution beliefs' function analogously to beliefs about social order. She proposes the idea that "an understanding of rules of purity is a sound entry to comparative religion".⁸⁵

Before entering the subject of comparative religion, however, Douglas reviews certain long-standing presuppositions in this field. Douglas observes that the traditional classification of a religion as primitive or advanced depends on the question whether or not rules of holiness are intertwined with rules of uncleanness.⁸⁶ Douglas subsequently counters assumptions about a dividing line between advanced, moral religion concerned with spiritual matters on the one hand and primitive religion which is concerned with material circumstances and devoid of ethics on the other,⁸⁷ by eventually demonstrating a link between pollution ritual and morality.⁸⁸

The relation between purification ritual and morality is an important point: the expression 'purification of flesh and spirit from every defilement' in 2 Cor 7:1 has appeared to some scholars as an arcane, perhaps even non-Pauline idea.⁸⁹ However, ideas about ritual purification need not be viewed as inconsistent or even incompatible with morality in Paul's theology. In her study about 'ritual in the Pauline churches',⁹⁰ Margaret Y. MacDonald applies an idea of Clifford Geertz about ritual as 'consecrated behaviour' to the Pauline churches by viewing traditions of baptism and the Lord's supper in a ritual context which equally served to demarcate purity.

⁸² C. Geertz, 'Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture', in idem, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (Hutchinson: London, 1975) 3-30.

⁸³ Cf. M. Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (Cambridge UP: Cambridge [etc.] 1985). Note that Paul discusses holiness and uncleanness also in other contexts, e.g. in 1 Cor 7:14.

⁸⁴ M. Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (first published 1966; pagination of Routledge Classics, Routledge: London 2002). Cf. M. Douglas, 'Pollution', in eadem, *Implicit Meanings. Selected Essays in Anthropology* (2nd ed.; Routledge: London & New York, 1999) 106-115.

⁸⁵ Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 1-7 at 7.

⁸⁶ Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 8-35 refers to Christian rules of holiness which, from the standpoint of spiritual religion, set the standard for classifying religions as advanced or as primitive in influential anthropological discourses of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

⁸⁷ Douglas, 'Ritual Uncleanness', in eadem, *Purity and Danger*, 8-35.

⁸⁸ Douglas, 'Internal Lines', in eadem, *Purity and Danger*, 160-162 at 162: "pollution rules can serve to settle uncertain moral issues".

⁸⁹ Cf. e.g. V.P. Furnish, *II Corinthians* (Doubleday: Garden City, N.Y., 1984) 376: "several of the most fundamental ideas in the passage seem to be non-Pauline (..) Nowhere else does he hold that believers are morally defiled in both *flesh and spirit*".

⁹⁰ M.Y. MacDonald, 'Ritual in the Pauline Churches', in D.G. Horrell (ed.), *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1999) 233-247; reprint from M.Y. MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and deutero-Pauline Writings* (Cambridge UP: Cambridge, 1988) 61-71.

3.3.2 *Sociology*

An early main exponent of an approach to the New Testament in the light of its social context is form criticism, which aimed to trace the *Sitz im Leben* of the genres of oral tradition underlying the written text of the New Testament. Since the 1970s, sociological approaches to the New Testament have started to explore the social setting of early Christian traditions and texts in a more extensive way.⁹¹ More recently, a project of social-scientific commentaries on New Testament writings has been set up by scholars, starting with the synoptic Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.⁹²

How should we regard the *Sitz im Leben* or social setting of Paul's cultic terminology? As we have already argued before, the interpretation of Paul's cultic terminology in terms of Christian spiritualisation as opposed to Jewish materialism is simplistic and erroneous. We have further seen that Paul's cultic terminology does not necessarily evade the realm of ritual. Nevertheless, Christian Jews instituted their own rituals in relation to their belief in Christ, and Paul argues against the view of his opponents that all converts to the faith in Christ should live a Jewish way of life (Gal 2:14f.). Thus, the question arises how Paul's view on relations between Judaism and the congregations of Christ corresponds with his use of cultic terminology.

A sociological approach to Paul may help to reconsider how Paul related to and at the same time differed from contemporary Judaism.⁹³ New Testament scholars have applied a sociology of ancient sectarianism to the study of the earliest Christian communities in order to analyse aspects of the process of separation,⁹⁴ self-definition⁹⁵ and the creation of boundary lines.⁹⁶ In this application of theory to textual interpretation, however, caution has been expressed against static models of sectarianism in favour of a dynamic model which allows for an analysis of developments in the attitudes among earliest Christianity in relation to Judaism.⁹⁷

⁹¹ Cf. Horrell, 'Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament: Retrospect and Prospect', in idem (ed.), *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*, 3-27 with further bibliography.

⁹² Cf. B.J. Malina & R.L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* (Fortress: Minneapolis, 1992); B. Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich., 1998).

⁹³ An early example of a sociological approach to Paul and Judaism is F. Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach* (SNTSMS 56; Cambridge UP: Cambridge, 1986). Cf. my chap. 4, 'Paul's previous life in Judaism', about the interpretation of key passages in Galatians and Philipians in context.

⁹⁴ Cf. J.H. Elliott, 'The Jewish messianic movement. From faction to sect', in P.F. Esler (ed.), *Modelling in early Christianity. Social-scientific studies of the New Testament in its context* (Routledge: London & New York, 1995) 75-95.

⁹⁵ Cf. the 1980-1982 3-volume project edited by E.P. Sanders about *Jewish and Christian Self-definition*.

⁹⁶ Cf. e.g. R. Scroggs, 'The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement', in Horrell (ed.), *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*, 69-91 with 'introduction' and 'further reading'; reprint from J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults, Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part Two: Early Christianity* (Brill: Leiden, 1975) 1-23. For examples of sociological approaches applied to the study of early Jewish sectarianism, see the books of A.J. Saldarini (1988) and A.I. Baumgarten (1997) discussed in my chapter 1.

⁹⁷ Cf. the 'introduction' to Scroggs, 'The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement', 69-70.

4. Summary and outline of this study

Having discussed the problems with older scholarly approaches to Paul's cultic imagery and the potential usefulness of new approaches to Paul's Letters, it is clear that a re-examination of Paul's cultic imagery is needed. This re-examination also serves to put the theology underlying Paul's cultic language in a new historical perspective. My historical interpretation aims to answer the following question: *what does Paul's cultic imagery signify in view of Paul's gospel mission to the Diaspora?* As I have already pointed to different aspects to be taken up, I will systematically outline the structure of my study below.

Starting from the historical context to which Paul refers when he mentions Israel's cult and Jerusalem, chapter one will deal with *Jewish attitudes to the Jerusalem Temple from the Maccabees to Paul's time*, with an emphasis on temple-theological developments and ideas. The broad matrix of Jewish tradition related to cultic worship may be justified in view of Paul's Jewish background and his discussion of Israelite themes of God's covenant, the Law, and the concept of monotheistic worship. Chapter one will include a discussion of the renewed debate about Judaism and Hellenism, and of the place of Israel's cult in this debate as well as of the social boundaries expressed by the cult. The demarcation of a period of time starting from the Maccabees may be justified by the fact that from this period we have the first traces of Jewish schools which also characterised Jewish culture in first-century CE Israel.

The wealth of material from the literature of Qumran merits a separate chapter, even though I will include some discussion of the sectarian Qumran community in the historical survey of chapter one. Thus, chapter two deals with *The literature of Qumran about the Temple*. In this chapter, the issue of the dividing lines between sectarian and non-sectarian literature will be further analysed in view of the question of what temple-theological thoughts were more widely reflected in first-century CE Palestinian Jewish culture.

Chapter three, *The early Jesus-movement and the Temple*, will discuss the place of the early Jesus-movement within this matrix of contemporary Judaism. This chapter will deal with the historical issue of how to retrieve information about pre-70 CE traditions from New Testament writings, of which a large part is dated after 70 CE. It will centralise the question of how the attitude(s) of the early Jesus-movement to the Jerusalem Temple relates to or contrasts with contemporary Jewish attitudes to the Temple.

From the historical context of ideas about God's Temple in contemporary Judaism and earliest Christianity I will turn to the text of Paul's Letters in chapters four through eight. Thus, the question of how Paul's use of cultic imagery can be related to the contemporary matrix of Judaism and earliest Christianity may be divided in a subset of question discussed in the respective chapters.

Chapter four, *Paul's previous life in Judaism*, raises the question of how Paul represents his own Jewish background in the rhetorical context of his Letters. Rhetorical analysis of the passages in which Paul writes about his Jewish background may help to evaluate the function and significance of Paul's words about his previous life in Judaism.

Chapter five, *Paul and the contemporary Jewish culture of scriptural interpretation*, surveys the issue of Paul's use of Scripture in the context of contemporary Jewish culture. This issue may yield further information about Paul's relation to Judaism, and may provide a broader context for the question of how the apostle redefined his understanding of Judaism.

On the basis of this broader discussion of Paul's relation to Judaism in the context of his Gentile mission, the last three chapters will go into the subject of Paul's cultic imagery. Chapter six focuses on *Preliminary issues to cultic imagery in the Pauline corpus*, such as the delimitation of Pauline authorship from pseudepigraphy and interpolation, and the identification and application of cultic imagery. Since Paul's Letters to the Corinthians are the

Introduction

only undisputed Pauline Letters which comprise the metaphor of the Temple (1 Cor 3:17, 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16) as well as as literal references to cult (1 Cor 9:13, 10:18), this Corinthian correspondence constitutes the main evidence for my study of Pauline cultic imagery. Chapters 7 and 8 will subsequently deal with cultic imagery in 1 Corinthians and in 2 Corinthians. This last and third part of my study integrates insights from the previous chapters about temple-theological views contemporary to Paul and from Paul's place among Jews and Gentiles.

Part One

PERSPECTIVES ON THE TEMPLE IN JUDAISM AND THE JESUS-MOVEMENT BEFORE 70 CE

CHAPTER 1

JEWISH ATTITUDES TO THE TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM FROM THE MACCABEES TO PAUL'S TIME

In his Letters Paul the apostle refers to Jerusalem, the Temple service, the priesthood and the metaphor of God's Temple. Paul's Letters go back to the end of the Second Temple period, when the Temple of Jerusalem still existed. This chapter deals with the historical context of Jewish attitudes to the Temple of Jerusalem during the late Second Temple period. My survey presupposes a broad perspective on Jewish attitudes to the Temple, including temple-theological ideas which go beyond the historical Temple service of Jerusalem.¹ On the basis of this survey, it may be possible to examine whether and how Paul's cultic imagery and, more specifically, his temple imagery relates to Jewish temple-theological traditions. The Jewish concepts of communal worship and holiness, which underly texts about the Temple and its cult, provide the evidence for this comparative study.

The general context of Jewish temple religiosity will be surveyed first. Next I will discuss how we can retrieve information from our historical sources about the attitudes of the Palestinian Jewish schools to the Temple, from their rise in the Maccabean era to Paul's time. As the Palestinian Jewish schools were at the heart of discussions about purity laws and the laws concerning the Temple cult, the diverging attitudes to the Temple of Jerusalem is an essential part of the historical context. Attitudes to the Temple of Jerusalem as reflected in Jewish apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, which often relate to the same late Hellenistic and early Roman periods, will subsequently be studied. Finally, I will discuss certain specific issues concerning the Temple cult which may explain Paul's use of cultic imagery.

1. Jewish temple religiosity in the Hellenistic and Roman periods

The Temple cult was an ancestral tradition which in different periods, like the Maccabean era and during the reign of the Roman emperor Caligula, was defended against attempts of Hellenisation, perceived by many Jews as an impermissible profanation. Nevertheless, Hellenistic culture formed part and parcel of the Greek-speaking Diaspora, and its influence was also widespread in Israel.² Although Jewish temple religiosity gave an important expression to the worship of the one God, Jewish attitudes to the Temple of Jerusalem were far from homogeneous. The contrast between the status accorded to the Jerusalem Temple in Jewish literature concerning the late Second Temple period, and the existence of rival temples during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, which will be discussed below, may open the discussion of Jewish attitudes to the Jerusalem Temple.

¹ The otherwise useful survey of post-biblical Jewish sources about the Temple by C.T.R. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple. A non-biblical sourcebook* (Routledge: London & New York, 1996), which provides a commentary on evidence from Hecataeus of Abdera, Aristaeus, Hebrew and Greek Sirach, *Jubilees*, Philo, Josephus, and Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, hardly deals with the evidence of the pseudepigraphic Testaments literature or the Wisdom of Solomon and the Psalms of Solomon.

² Cf. the recent collection of studies about the Jewish response to and appropriation of Greek culture in J.J. Collins and G.E. Sterling (eds.), *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (University of Notre Dame Press: Notre Dame, Indiana, 2001) among which J.J. Collins, 'Cult and Culture. The Limits of Hellenization in Judea', 38-61, concluding on the "persistence of Jewish separatism in matters of worship and cult" as the limit of Hellenisation.

1.1 The Temple of Jerusalem in relation to Israel and the Diaspora

The acclaim of the Jerusalem Temple cult representing Jewish worship of the one God is already expressed in post-restoration prophecies in Scripture, like Isaiah 56:6-8. This prophetic passage accords a universalist role to the Temple as 'a house of prayer for all peoples'. Jewish literature from the Hellenistic and early Roman periods displays in various ways the tendency to give a universalist, positive acclaim of the Temple.³

2 Maccabees, a condensed composition by an epitomist about Israelite history between 180 and 161 BCE mainly focused on Jerusalem and Judaea,⁴ attests to the Jewish acclaim of the Jerusalem Temple in many ways. 2 Macc 2:22, for instance, refers to the 'Temple famous throughout the world', τὸ περιβόητον καθ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην ἱερόν. Even more expressive about the holy status of the Jerusalem Temple are the words attributed to a former captain of the Temple, Simon. Simon's words concern 'the holiness of the place and the sanctity and inviolability of the Temple (ἱερόν) which is honoured throughout the whole world'. This description, however, comprises general terms of sanctity (σεμνότης) and inviolability (ἄσυλία) which could equally apply to Greek or Roman temples.

The temple-theological perspective of 2 Maccabees is very explicit in certain passages. 2 Maccabees 3:38-39 reveals the following perspective on the relation between the power of God and 'the place', that is, the Temple of Jerusalem: "for there certainly is about the place some power of God. For he who has his dwelling in heaven watches over that place himself and brings it aid, and he strikes and destroys those who come to do it injury".⁵ The epitomist accounts for the sacrilege and restoration befalling the Jerusalem Temple in the Maccabean era in a theological way as a result of the sins of God's people (2 Macc 4:17, 5:17-18) and the necessary reconciliation of God with his people (2 Macc 5:20). 2 Macc 5:19 emphasises the priority of the Jewish people over the Temple in God's plan of election: "But the Lord did not choose the nation for the sake of the holy place, but the place for the sake of the nation", ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ τὸν τόπον τὸ ἕθνος, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἕθνος τὸν τόπον ὁ κύριος ἐξελέξατο.⁶

As the Hellenistic Jewish historian Flavius Josephus writes in his treatise *Against Apion* 2.102-104,⁷ the sanctity of the Jerusalem Temple was protected by inviolable barriers. He distinguishes between four surrounding courts with restrictions concerning their accessibility. These were the outer court, open to all including foreigners; the second court, only admitting Jews, the third court, only open to male Jews who were clean and purified, and the fourth court, exclusively admitting the priests. The inner sanctuary or holy of holies was only accessible to the high priest once a year.⁸

³ See also E.P. Sanders, 'Common Judaism and the Temple', in idem, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE – 66 CE* (SCM: London / Trinity Press International: Philadelphia, 1992) 47-76 at 52 about the "overwhelming impression from ancient literature" of general Jewish support of the Jerusalem Temple cult, which, remarkably, is contradicted by a "scholarly tradition" of which Sanders mentions one exponent: M. Simon's *Verus Israel*.

⁴ Cf. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah. A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1981) 118-121.

⁵ Translation from RSV. The Greek text (ed. Rahlfs) reads: διὰ τὸ περὶ τὸν τόπον ἀληθῶς εἶναι τινα θεοῦ δύναμιν · αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ τὴν κατοικίαν ἐπουράνιον ἔχων ἐπόπτης ἐστὶν καὶ βοηθὸς ἐκείνου τοῦ τόπου καὶ τοὺς παραγινομένους ἐπὶ κακῶσει τύπτων ἀπολλύει. Cf. 2 Macc 2:21-22f. on appearances from heaven, αἱ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενομένα ἐπιφανεία, to those who defended Jewish traditions and recovered the Temple.

⁶ Translation from RSV.

⁷ About the text of *Against Apion*, see L.H. Feldman, 'Josephus (CE 37-c.100)', in *CHJ III The Early Roman Period* (Cambridge UP: Cambridge, 1999) 917: "For the treatise *Against Apion* we are dependent upon a single manuscript dating from the eleventh century, for which II.52-113, which is missing, must be supplied from the Latin version of Cassiodorus' school".

⁸ Cf. Exod 30:10; Lev 16:2, 11-12, 15, 34; 3 Macc 1:10-11; Heb 9:7.

Jewish Attitudes to the Temple of Jerusalem

In his first treatise *On Special Laws* § 67 Philo of Alexandria writes about Jerusalem as the one and only designated place for God's Temple. Philo's universalist temple theology is apparent from the fact that he associates the whole universe with the 'holy temple of God', to which the Jerusalem Temple is the earthly counterpart, a Temple 'made by hands'. It has been noted that this temple theology accords a central role to the Temple as the intermediary institution between heaven and earth.⁹ Philo also digresses on pilgrimage by Jews from the Diaspora to the Jerusalem Temple in his treatise *On Special Laws* 1.66-70. We have knowledge of Philo's own visit to the Jerusalem Temple from his second treatise *On Providence* § 64 where he writes that he went there to offer prayers and sacrifices, εὐξόμενός τε καὶ θύσων.¹⁰

Acts 2:9-11 further attests to the strong relations between Diaspora Jews and the Jerusalem Temple cult, as is revealed by its enumeration of pilgrims from various regions in the Hellenistic as well as Eastern Diaspora, who were present in Jerusalem at the occasion of celebrating the 'feast of weeks' or Pentecost. The Jewish acclaim of the Temple cult is also indicated by the enumeration of synagogues in Acts 6:9. These synagogues were named after the geographical background of the Diaspora Jews who were hosted in Jerusalem.

Flavius Josephus stresses in his treatise *Against Apion* 2.193 that the Jerusalem Temple embodies the Jewish monotheistic worship of the one God: Εἷς ναὸς ἑνὸς θεοῦ, φίλον γὰρ ἀεὶ παντὶ τὸ ὅμοιον, κοινὸς ἀπάντων κοινοῦ θεοῦ ἀπάντων, "We have but one Temple for the one God, for the likeness is always dear to everyone, common to all as God is common to all". This description implicitly concerns the Jerusalem Temple, for in the next paragraphs Josephus writes about the cult of sacrifices accompanied by prayers and purifications led by priests (*Ag.Ap.* 2.193-198). Josephus' references to the sacrificial cult and the prescriptions of the Law strongly suggest the context of the Jerusalem Temple cult.¹¹

The Temple service was sustained in Israel and the Diaspora by the various offerings and sacrifices. The offering of the first fruits, which is stipulated in Deut 26:1-11, is frequently mentioned in Jewish post-biblical literature. 1 Macc 3:49 refers to the first fruits and to the tithes, apart from the garments of the priesthood. Philo writes about the offerings of the first fruits, ἀπαρχαί, which constituted the revenues of the Temple in order to enable the priests to conduct the Temple service properly (*Spec.Laws* 1.76-78, cf. §§ 133-152). Philo also alludes to sacred envoys, ἱεροπομποί, who were sent to Jerusalem to offer the first fruits to the Temple officials (*Embassy* 156 and 312). Flavius Josephus occasionally mentions the offering of first fruits from the western diaspora (*Ant.* 16.172). Josephus also discusses the offerings for sacrifices¹² as well as the sending of 'sacred monies', ἱερὰ χρήματα,¹³ to Jerusalem by Jewish communities of Asia Minor in his *Jewish Antiquities*. The Qumranite *Temple Scroll* comprises various references to the offering of the first fruits, הבכורים, and the feast of the first fruits, חג בכורים.¹⁴ Early rabbinic literature discusses offerings related to the

⁹ See e.g. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 109.

¹⁰ Cf. C. Mondésert, 'Philo of Alexandria', in *CHJ III The early Roman period*, 894 n. 26 with bibliography.

¹¹ See *Ag.Ap.* 2.195 on the sobriety of the priests who minister in the Temple; cf. the overlap with the description of the priestly service in *Ag.Ap.* 1.197-199 which mentions the Jerusalem Temple explicitly.

¹² E.g. *Ant.* 14.227 τὰ πρὸς τὰς θυσίας ἀφαιρέματα (Ephesus); 242 τὰ λοιπὰ ἱερὰ ἐπιτελεῖν κατὰ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους (Laodicea); 245 τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ πάτρια τελεῖν καὶ τοὺς καρποὺς μεταχειρίζεσθαι, καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς (Miletus); 257 αἱ εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἱεροποιεῖν καὶ ἑορταῖ αἱ εἰθισμέναι (Halicarnassus); 260 αἱ πάτριον εὐχαὶ καὶ θυσίαι τῷ θεῷ (Sardis).

¹³ E.g. *Ant.* 16.160, 163-164, 166-171.

¹⁴ 11Q19 (11QT^b) XI, 11; XIX, 2, 5, 6, 9, 12 (+ 11QT^b 5-6); XXI, 16 (+ 11QT^b 8 D); XXXVII, 10 (+ 11QT^b 12); XXXVIII, 4, 5 (+ 4Q365); XLIII, 3, 6, 7. Cf. e.g. 4Q251 (4QHalakha A) frag. 5, lines 2, 4, 5, 6.

Temple cult, among which is the offering of the first fruits (cf. *m. Peah* 1:1; *m. Ter.* 3:6). The Mishnaic treatise *Bikkurim* is even entirely dedicated to the subject of first fruits.

The Temple cult was conducted by priests, while the high priest was the supreme dignitary. At the end of his *Jewish Antiquities* (*Ant.* 20.224-251), Josephus furnishes us with a list of high-priests. Josephus names four priestly tribes, each consisting of more than five thousand members and taking turns in the priestly cycles of the Temple service, in his treatise *Against Apion* 2.108. On various occasions in his *Jewish Antiquities*, Josephus also enumerates diverse groups presumably associated with the Temple establishment: the council of elders, the priests, the scribes of the temple and the temple-singers, ἡ γερουσία καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ ἱεροψάλται (*Ant.* 12.142); the tribe of Levites and, among them, the singers of hymns, τῶν Λευιτῶν ὅσοι περ ἦσαν ὕμνοδοι (*Ant.* 20.216). 2 Maccabees 1:30, however, attributes the singing of hymns more specifically to priests.¹⁵ This evidence suggests that the cult of sacrifices and offerings was surrounded by liturgical hymns and blessings.¹⁶

The acclaim and influence of the Jerusalem Temple cult in the Diaspora led Philo, who wrote some decades before Paul's missionary journeys, to draw a symbolic analogy between a particular group of devoted Jewish worshippers of God and priests in their way of life. In his treatise *On the Contemplative Life*, Philo describes this group, called θεραπευταὶ and θεραπευτρίδες, as living near Alexandria.¹⁷ He asserts that their way of life in abstinence from wine is comparable to the state of priests when sacrificing.¹⁸ The supper of the "Therapeutae" is further described by Philo in terms of ritual practices which aimed to show "reverence for the holy table enshrined in the sacred vestibule of the temple". The superiors of this group are symbolically compared with priests who receive the purest and simplest food, τὰ ἀπλοῦστάτα καὶ εἰλικρινέστατα, as a reward for their ministry.¹⁹ This symbolical comparison with priestly functions and cultic symbolism does not contradict Philo's words about the Jerusalem Temple and related pilgrim festivals. It rather appears to enhance the holy status which Philo accorded the Jerusalem Temple cult.

1.2 Rival Temples to the Temple of Jerusalem

In spite of the Jewish literary evidence for the widespread acclaim among Jews of the Jerusalem Temple as the Temple of God, the existence of rival Temples from the Hellenistic period points to some diversity of cultic practice, notwithstanding the greater appeal of the Jerusalem Temple cult. The impression of Jewish temple religiosity as a harmonious constitution, which could arise from the descriptions in Josephus' treatise *Against Apion* 2. 184-189, 193-197 and in Philo's first treatise *On Special Laws*, §§ 66-70, presents an idealised, distorted picture. The existence of rival Temples as well as the divergence among

¹⁵ Οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς ἐπέψαλλον τοὺς ὕμνους.

¹⁶ Cf. Sirach 50 about the Temple service under Simon the high priest, son of Onias. The author of Sirach refers to the finishing of the service at the altars, συντέλεια λειτουργῶν ἐπὶ βωμῶν, in verse 14, the singers, οἱ ψαλτωδοὶ, in verse 18, and the blessing of the Lord, εὐλογία, by the high-priest. Cf. *m. Yoma* 7:1 which mentions eight benedictions pronounced by the high-priest on the Day of Atonement.

¹⁷ *Contempl.Life* 2, 21-22. See most recently the article of Joan E. Taylor and P.R. Davies, 'The So-Called Therapeutae of *De Vita Contemplativa*: Identity and Character', *HTR* 91 (1998) 3-24 for a disidentification of the "Therapeutae" as a branch of Essenes in view of comparative evidence and the context of Philo's digression.

¹⁸ *Contempl.Life* 74 νηφάλια γὰρ ὡς τοῖς ἱερεῦσι θύειν.

¹⁹ *Contempl.Life* 81-82. Translation from F.H. Colson, *Philo in ten volumes (and two supplementary volumes)* IX (Harvard UP: Cambridge, Mass., & London, 1941) 165.

Jewish movements in Israel with regard to their attitudes to the Temple, a subject dealt with in the subsequent sections, defy such a general picture.

a. *The Jewish Temple at Elephantine in Egypt*

Among the Jewish archives from Elephantine in Egypt, three papyrus letters in Aramaic dated to the last quarter of the fifth century BCE concern the reaction of Jews in Egypt to the destruction of the Jewish Temple there in 410 BCE.²⁰ We find data about the history of this Jewish Temple in the most extensive papyrus letter: “Our ancestors built that Temple in Fort Elephantine back during the time of the kings of Egypt, and when Cambyses came into Egypt, he found it already built” (A (Recto), 13).²¹ This remark could suggest that the Elephantine temple was built in a period shortly before Cambyses’ expansion of the Persian empire and invasion into Egypt (529-522 BCE; cf. Herodotus’ *Histories* 2). This could be the period of the Babylonian exile of Judah, before the building of the Second Temple (presumably around 520 BCE). Thus, we have evidence of a Jewish Temple in Egypt from the very beginning of the Second Temple period.

The fact that the above mentioned letter is addressed as a petition to the contemporary governor of Judah, within the administrative framework of the Persian empire ruled by king Darius, explains the formal style of Aramaic, which was also the administrative language of the Persian empire. The petition concerns the rebuilding of the Jewish Temple at Elephantine. The Temple at Elephantine, which was destroyed in 410 BCE, is designated as ‘Temple of the God YHW’, אגורא זי יהו אלהא (A, 6; cf. B, 24) in this letter. The other papyrus letter, which contains a short memorandum, comprises the term ‘the Temple of the God of heavens’, בית מדבחה זי אלה שמיא (lines 3-4).²²

The references to Judaeans and Jerusalemite religious leadership in this letter reveals the attitude of the Jerusalem priestly establishment of the time: in response to a previous request for assistance against the destructive action of Egyptian priests and the Egyptian military governor Vidranga, none of the Judaeans or Jerusalemite authorities replied (B (verso), 18). It may be inferred that the priestly establishment in Jerusalem was apparently not on speaking terms with the worship cult of the Jews of Elephantine.²³ Josephus, a native of Jerusalem and of priestly ancestry, does not even refer to this history of the Jewish Temple at Elephantine in his *Jewish Antiquities*.

b. *The Temple of Leontopolis in Egypt*

Another Jewish Temple in Egypt which continued to exist into the first century CE, when Josephus wrote his historical works, is the Temple of Leontopolis. At the time of the Maccabean revolt against Antiochus IV Epiphanes, when the Temple of Jerusalem was desecrated, one of the chief priests of Jerusalem, Onias, fled into exile to Alexandria in Egypt.

²⁰ Cf. J.M. Lindenberger, *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters* (SBLWAW 4; Scholars Press: Atlanta, Ga., 1994) 53-55; the three papyrus letters concerned with the destruction of the Jewish temple are numbered 34-36.

²¹ Translation from Lindenberger, *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters*, 67; Aramaic text of the document, entitled “AP 30/31 (Berlin, St.Mus. P. 13495 / Cairo P. 3428 = J. 43465) (November 25, 407 B.C.E.)”, on p. 65. Cf. Lines 3-5 of the letter, in Lindenberger’s categorization number 35 (p. 68), which is called a ‘Memorandum on Reconstructing the Temple’ by Lindenberger.

²² Texts and translations from Lindenberger, *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters*, 63-68.

²³ Cf. the conclusion of J. Frey, ‘Temple and Rival Temple – The Cases of Elephantine, Mt. Gerizim, and Leontopolis’, in Ego *et al.* (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*, 171-203, at 179 that the Jerusalem authorities probably “disapproved of the existence of a Jewish temple at Elephantine”.

There he obtained permission from king Ptolemy Philometor to build the Temple of Leontopolis in the *nome* of Heliopolis for the worship of God.²⁴ According to Josephus' version in *Jewish Antiquities* 13.63-64, this "Temple to the Most High God", ναὸς τοῦ μεγίστου θεῶ, was modelled on the Temple of Jerusalem. Certain Levites and priests were appointed to its service and its building would bring a prophecy of Isaiah to fulfillment (Isaiah 19:18-19). In his *Jewish War* 1.33, Josephus also writes about the likeness of the temple of Onias to the Temple of Jerusalem.

Yet, at the end of the *Jewish War* (*J.W.* 7.420-433 at 427), when Josephus writes about the demolition of the Jewish Temple of Onias in the aftermath of the Jewish war against Rome (66-70 CE), he appears to change his previous view, denying that the Temple of Onias is similar to the Jerusalem Temple. Josephus also casts doubt on Onias' motives for building this Temple in Egypt,²⁵ calling the building of this temple a "sin and transgression against the Law", ἡ ἀμαρτία καὶ ἡ τοῦ νόμου παράβασις (*Ant.* 13.69). Early rabbinic literature further includes a passage which denounces the legitimacy of the Temple built by Onias: "[If he said,] 'I pledge myself to offer a Whole-offering', he must offer it in the Temple. And if he offered it in House of Onias he has not fulfilled his obligation" (*m. Menah.* 13:10).²⁶

Most Alexandrian Jews were probably loyal to the recognition of the Temple of Jerusalem as the Temple of God. For according to Josephus, a quarrel in Alexandria between Jews and Samaritans concerning the question which Temple had been built according to the laws of Moses, was decided in favour of the Jerusalem Temple (*Ant.* 13.74-79). A stronger argument for the unbroken relations between Alexandrian Jews and Jerusalem, and more in general between Diaspora Jews and Jerusalem, are the descriptions of pilgrimage, envoys and offerings by the Alexandrian Jewish writer Philo.²⁷

Nevertheless, the existence of a Jewish Temple in the district of Heliopolis may also have added to the tenacity of stories concerning an Egyptian history of Moses, denounced by Josephus as false stories. In his apologetic treatise *Against Apion* Josephus refers to a story in Manetho's work about Egyptian history, in which a certain Osarsiph, a native and a priest of Heliopolis, changed his name into Moses and would have been expelled from Heliopolis for leprosy (*Ag.Ap.* 1.228-287, there 238-241, 248-250, 261-270, 279-286). Josephus, in his criticism of the fictitious stories of Manetho, concludes that there is a total disjunction between the ancient records and unfounded legends which are mixed up in Manetho's work (*Ag.Ap.* 1.287). The biased picture of such unfounded legends of Egyptian opponents to the Jews could perhaps rather be influenced by their hostile attitude to contemporary Jewish settlements in Egypt, which included the Jewish Temple at Leontopolis in the district of Heliopolis during the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods.

²⁴ *J.W.* 7.423-432; *Ant.* 13.62-73.

²⁵ According to *Ant.* 13.62-63 the desire of eternal fame and glory for himself; according to *J.W.* 7.431 the will to rival the Jews at Jerusalem, bearing in mind the outrage of his exile against them.

²⁶ Translation from H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1933) 512-513. *Contra* J. Frey, "Temple and Rival Temple", 194 and n. 134 who excludes any "explicit or even polemic reference to the temple of Onias" in Palestinian Jewish texts.

²⁷ *Spec.Laws* 1.67-70; *Embassy* 156, 278, 312-313, 315.

c. The Samaritan Temple of Gerizim

The reason for including the Samaritan temple of Gerizim in this survey consists in the fact that the origins of the Samaritans went back to Israelite history.²⁸ The Samaritan schism from the Jews concerned the place of cultic worship, but not worship as such. In Jewish and Christian literature of the Second Temple period, we encounter the idea that Jews and Samaritans worshipped the same God (cf. 2 Kgs 17:6.24; Ezra 4:1-3f.; 2 Macc 6:1-2). It should also be noted that, in relation to cultic places other than the Jerusalem Temple, Josephus reserves the Greek adjective ἅγιος only for the Samaritan perception of Mount Gerizim as a holy place (*J.W.* 3.307).

The conflict between Samaritan worshippers of God and Judaeans who rebuilt the Temple of Jerusalem at the time of Ezra is represented differently in Ezra 4:1-5 and Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 11.85-88 respectively. In a recent discussion of this divergent evidence, Seán Freyne has examined the Judaeans perspective of Josephus, a native of Jerusalem and of priestly ancestry, on the Samaritans: "Perhaps modern scholarship has been unconsciously influenced by Josephus' anti-Samaritan handling of this episode, highlighting their foreign 'Cuthean' origins and their devious and unfaithful character as expressed in their religious rites 'up to this day' (*Ant.* 11.290)".²⁹ Freyne has also pointed to similarities in the material culture of religious observances in Judaea and Samaria from archaeological evidence.³⁰ Josephus' anti-Samaritan polemic probably arises from the Samaritan hostility to the Jerusalem Temple cult (cf. e.g. *Ant.* 18.30 about the pollution of the porticoes and other parts of the Jerusalem Temple by Samaritans through the scattering of human bones).

In his *Jewish Antiquities*, Josephus refers to a Samaritan Temple on mount Gerizim (*Ant.* 11.310, 346), built by Sanballates in the time of the conquest of Alexander the Great. This Temple rivalled the Jerusalem Temple with regard to holiness and the requirement of sacrifices, which was the subject of quarrels between Jews and Samaritans who had settled in Egypt (*Ant.* 12. 7-10; 13.74-77). From the argumentation conveyed by Josephus (*Ant.* 13.74-79), it appears that the Jerusalem Temple had a greater name and, in contrast to the temple of Gerizim, received many offerings from the kings of Asia Minor. The dispute was settled in favour of the Jerusalem Temple under the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor (ca. 171-145 BCE).

The Temple of Gerizim is also mentioned in 2 Maccabees 6:1-2 along with the Temple of Jerusalem, of which the cults became the objects of hellenisation under Antiochus Epiphanes by 167 BCE. The Temple of Gerizim and the Temple of Jerusalem were desecrated and renamed the 'Temple of Zeus the Friend of Strangers' and the 'Temple of Olympian Zeus' respectively. Josephus relates in his *Jewish Antiquities* 13.255-256 that the Temple of Gerizim had been built after the model of the Temple of Jerusalem, in the context of his narration that the Temple of Gerizim was destroyed by Hyrcanus about 129 BCE.

²⁸ Cf. the general evidence of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the epigraphic evidence of Samaritans in Delos calling themselves Ἰσραηλιῖται who contribute to Mount Gerizim; see P. Bruneau, 'Les Israélites de Délos et la juiverie délienne', *BCH* 106 (1982) 465-504.

²⁹ S. Freyne, 'Behind the Names: Galileans, Samaritans, *Ioudaioi*', in idem, *Galilee and Gospel. Collected Essays* (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 2000) 114-131, there 119; cf. 122-123 for Freyne's discussion of the divergent accounts concerning Gerizim at the time of the Hellenising tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 12.257-264 and 2 Maccabees 6:2.

³⁰ S. Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*, 122: "The remains of Samaritan synagogues as well as domestic and communal *mikwa'oth* at various sites point to developments similar to those that occurred among Judean Yahweh-worshippers".

2. Josephus' perspective on the Palestinian Jewish schools

2.1 The relative priority of Josephus' historical works

The sources for our historical survey of developments in Israelite temple religiosity and criticism of the Temple cult are diverse and need to be discussed with a careful approach of source-criticism. With regard to the late Second Temple period, the predominance of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes in Israelite and, more specifically, Judaeon society becomes clear from various sources. Because of this, these movements and their traditions merit extensive discussion in search of their respective attitudes to the Temple. Since the use of the term 'sect' is problematic with regard to all three of these movements, I will rather discuss the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes as schools, following the idea of A.J. Saldarini.³¹ Such an approach corresponds with Josephus' information about their organised education (*Life* 9-12) and with the Graeco-Roman idea of *αἵρεσις* as school.³²

There are no direct, contemporary Palestinian Jewish testimonies from the Jewish schools of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes available to us. Josephus writes about the Jewish schools from a post-70 CE viewpoint as a historian, and his supposed adherence to a Pharisaic way of life, inferred from Josephus' *Life*, has been called into question.³³ His public career, diplomatic missions and political office (cf. *Life* 13, 21-22, 28-29, 190-198), depended, however, on cooperation with and support from the chief priests and leading Pharisees. In such cases Josephus' evidence can count as eyewitness accounts. Being a Hellenistic Jewish historian, Josephus nevertheless relied on the "Hebrew records" for writing his *Jewish Antiquities*, as he remarks in the proem of this work.³⁴

The historical works of Flavius Josephus, on which we depend largely for a chronological framework of Jewish history from the Hellenistic period to the aftermath of the Jewish War (73 CE), were written from a post-war perspective in Rome, and addressed to a Hellenistic audience.³⁵ Treatises of Philo of Alexandria, which contain historical evidence, are either related to the Hellenistic Diaspora³⁶ or they contain generalised statements about temple religiosity in the late Second Temple period (e.g. *Spec.Laws* 1.66-78).

³¹ Cf. A.J. Saldarini, 'Social Relations and Groups in Palestine', in idem, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society. A Sociological Approach* (First edition 1988; Foreword by J.C. VanderKam, 2001; Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. / Cambridge, U.K. & Dove: Livonia, Mich., 2001) 50-75 for a sociological survey and a discussion of the problematic term of 'sects', concluding that an understanding of the Pharisees and Sadducees as "schools of thought" (75) is to be preferred. See also 123-127 on 'Hairesis: sect or school?'. The use of the term 'sect' in Qumran scholarship has also become subject of sociological discussion, witness J.M. Jokiranta, "'Sectarianism" of the Qumran "Sect": Sociological Notes', *RevQ* 20 (2001) 223-239.

³² See BDAG 27-28 for examples. Cf. my chap. 4, section 2.2.

³³ *Life* 10-12. S.N. Mason, 'Was Josephus a Pharisee? A Re-Examination of *Life* 10-12', *JJS* 40 (1989) 31-45 argues that this passage should rather be understood as Josephus' entry in public life, not as a deliberate conversion to the Pharisaic way of life. A.I. Baumgarten, *The flourishing of Jewish sects in the Maccabean era: an interpretation* Supplements to JSJ (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1997) 51-52 rather claims that Josephus' account of his past is an example of a *topoi* in ancient autobiography, "which derive their power because they describe a usual experience"; at 63-64, Baumgarten categorises Josephus' choice for Pharisaism in the interpretation of S.N. Mason among more mundane reasons of the public influence of the Pharisees.

³⁴ *Ant.* 1.5 (ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν μεθρημηνευμένην γραμμᾶτων), 10-13.

³⁵ *Ag.Ap.* 1.50-51; *Ant.* 20.267 on completion in the "thirteenth year of the reign of Domitian Caesar", 93/94 CE.

³⁶ *Against Flaccus* and *On the Embassy to Gaius*.

Only Josephus' works contain both historical and systematic descriptions of the Jewish schools of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes.³⁷ Moreover, Josephus provides certain information about their interaction, conflicts or, in the case of the Essenes, nonconformity to dominant practices. The prominent place of the Essenes in one of Josephus' digressions (*J.W.* 2.119-161) is remarkable in this respect. Apart from Josephus' extensive information, there are only scattered discussions of the religious thought and practice of the Essenes in ancient literature of the first century CE, that is, in treatises from Philo of Alexandria³⁸ and in the *Natural History* from Pliny the Elder.³⁹

As for references to the Pharisees and the Sadducees, the passages in the New Testament may sometimes provide information about these Jewish schools for their own sake, but they are mostly related to narrative situations of confrontations with the Jesus-movement. Early rabbinic evidence about the Pharisees and the Sadducees occurs in the context of the controversy about halakhic rules concerning uncleanness.⁴⁰ The rabbinic information on the Pharisees and the Sadducees therefore figures in a didactic setting of prescriptions for the interpretation of purity laws, as operating in the context of later development of halakha rather than a historical setting.⁴¹

Later traditions about the Jewish schools in patristic literature have usually been discussed as rooted in Josephus' account in the second book of his *Jewish War* (*J.W.* 2. 119-161), or, in a rare case, as related to a source also used by Josephus.⁴² Thus, the passages from patristic literature do not add completely new evidence, and if they do add certain details or divergent data, the question remains whether these are Christian ideas superimposed on Josephus' text or data from other source materials.

³⁷ Historical descriptions in *J.W.* 1.78, 110-114, 571; 2.411, 567; 3. 11; *Ant.* 13.288-289, 292-298, 311, 400-406, 408-417, 422-429; 14.3, 370-379; 17.41-46, 346; 18.4; 20.199; *Life* 191, 197. Systematic descriptions in *J.W.* 2.119-166; *Ant.* 13.171-173; *Ant.* 18.11-25.

³⁸ *Every Good Man is Free* 75-87; *On the Contemplative Life* 1; *Hypothetica* 11.1-18 apud Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 8.5, 11. Cf. Baumgarten, *The flourishing of Jewish sects*, 58-60 at 59 about the relative merit of Philo's comparison of the Essenes to a θάσος in *Hypothetica* 11.5, which, however, 'also obscured important differences'. Note that the term θάσος appears in a document quoted by Josephus in his *Jewish Antiquities* 14.215-216 which designates religious societies in general, including those of the Jews in the Hellenistic Diaspora, in this case Delos.

³⁹ *Natural History* 5.73. Cf. J.C. VanderKam, 'The Evidence from Pliny the Elder', in idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. / SPCK: London, 1994) 71-75; O. Betz, 'The Essenes', in *CHJ III The early Roman period*, 444-447. S. Goranson, 'Posidonius, Strabo and Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa as Sources on Essenes', *JJS* 45 (1994) 295-298 has suggested that Pliny relied on second-hand information for his account on the Essenes, using the work of Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa as his source. R.A. Kraft, 'Pliny on the Essenes, Pliny on Jews', *DSD* 8 (2001) 255-261 points to Pliny's distance to the ethnicity of the Essenes, loosely defined as a "gens", apart from the variety of sources available to him.

⁴⁰ E.g. *m. Yadaim* 4:6-8. Other passages of the Mishnah, such as *m. 'Erub.* 6:2, *m. Hag.* 2:7, *m. Sotah* 3:4, *m. Mak.* 1:6, *m. Parah* 3:3.7, *m. Tehar.* 4:12, *m. Nid.* 4:2, contain terse references to the Pharisees and Sadducees, from which hardly any direct information can be derived about their teachings or religious thought. Cf. e.g. *t. Sabb.* 1:15; *y. Ber.* 9:14b.

⁴¹ See also the discussion of rabbinic evidence about Pharisees and Sadducees by G. Stemberger, *Jewish contemporaries of Jesus. Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes* (ET by Allan W. Mahnke; Fortress: Minneapolis 1995) 38-66 at 66: "Rabbinic texts are therefore useful only for certain halakhic differences between the Sadducees and the Pharisees".

⁴² M. Smith, 'The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena', *HUCA* 29 (1958) 273-313; C. Burchard, 'Zur Nebenüberlieferung von Josephus' Bericht über die Essener Bell 2,119-161 bei Hippolyt, Porphyrius, Josippus, Niketas Choniates und anderen', in O. Betz *et al.* (eds.), *Josephus-Studien. Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1974) 77-96; C. Burchard, 'Die Essener bei Hippolyt. Hippolyt, Ref. IX 18,2-28,2 und Josephus, Bell. 2, 119-161', *JSJ* 7 (1978) 1-41.

The rich availability of sources to Josephus when writing his historical works on the history of the Jewish people up to the end of the Second Temple period has no parallel in other extant ancient literature on the Jews in this era.⁴³ Thus, Josephus' works deserve a relative priority in giving the most elaborate account of the history of the Second Temple period and of the emergence as well as the thought and practice of the Jewish schools.

2.2 The Hellenistic Jewish works of Josephus and the Palestinian Jewish situation

Granting a relative priority to Josephus' works as a historical source, we need to be aware of the fact that Josephus' perspective on the Jewish schools was probably influenced by the circumstances under which he wrote his works. Even though he could write about the Jewish war as an eye-witness and about Jewish culture as an insider, Josephus was confronted with the predominance of Hellenistic culture through rhetoric and eloquence as well as biased attitudes about the centrality of this culture. Such attitudes of prejudice tended to overlook or, in case of polemic, deny the antiquity of the Jewish people and other people of the Near East (*Ag.Ap.* 1.2-27; cf. *Ant.* 20.263). As Josephus was engaged in the publication of his works in the Greek language in Rome, with the aid of assistants and under the protection of emperor Titus,⁴⁴ he addressed his readers through a Hellenistic conceptual framework.⁴⁵

The circumstances of writing for a Greek audience prompted Josephus to digress apologetically on the antiquity and respectability of Jewish culture in the face of prejudices that non-Hellenic documents were barbarian and untrustworthy.⁴⁶ In his apologetic treatise, *Against Apion*, Josephus writes about the Temple rites and statutes of Judaism in general, in defence against accusations and slander concerning, among other things, the Jerusalem Temple cult.⁴⁷ The impression of unity in Jewish religious culture, which arises from the apologetic picture, may be misleading, because the divergences between the Jewish schools concerning the Temple cult are kept in the background.⁴⁸ Only in one place does Josephus write about the division on the subject of rites of purification between Essenes and other

⁴³ Cf. L.H. Feldman, 'Josephus (CE 37 – c. 100)', 901-921 at 906, 909-910, 913, referring to, among other source texts, a Hebrew original and a Greek translation of 1 Maccabees, the writings of Nicolaus of Damascus, Polybius, Posidonius, Strabo and Diodorus, and documents from the Roman archives for the Hellenistic and early Roman periods.

⁴⁴ *Ag.Ap.* 1.50-51; *Life* 361-367.

⁴⁵ For a discussion of the influence of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities* as a model and of the Hellenistic historical tradition of thematic subject arrangement in Josephus' composition of his *Jewish Antiquities*, see L. H. Feldman, 'Josephus (CE 37 – c. 100)', 901-921 at 906-913.

⁴⁶ Cf. *Ag.Ap.* 1.2-3f., especially Josephus' apologetic statement in § 161, after a discussion of Egyptian, Phoenician and Chaldaean evidence about the Jewish people (§§ 69-160) – text and translation from H.St.J. Thackeray, *Josephus in nine volumes* I (W. Heinemann, London / Harvard UP, Cambridge, Mass., 1926) 226-227: Δεῖ δ' ἄρα καὶ τῶν ἀπιστούντων μὲν ταῖς ἐν τοῖς βαρβάροις ἀναγραφαῖς μόνοις δὲ τοῖς Ἑλλησι πιστεῦειν ἀξιούντων ἀποπληρῶσαι τὴν ἐπιζήτησιν, "I am, however, it seems, under the further obligation of satisfying the requirements of persons who put no faith in non-Hellenic documents, and maintain that none but the Greeks are to be trusted." Josephus then supplies a survey of allusions to the Jews in Greek works in the subsequent paragraphs.

⁴⁷ *Ag.Ap.* 2.7 τρίτον δ' ἐπὶ τούτοις μέμικται περὶ τῆς ἀγιστείας τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἱερόν ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων νομίμων κατηγορία. The first and second categories of Josephus' apologetic against distortions and accusations, related in § 6, concern the account of the departure of the Israelites (τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων) from Egypt and charges against the Jewish inhabitants of Alexandria.

⁴⁸ Cf. L.H. Feldman, 'Josephus (CE 37 – c. 100)', 904 about another important apologetic tendency of Josephus, found in his *Jewish War*, to downplay the national character and the messianic goal of the Jewish revolt against the Romans, indicated by other ancient historians.

Jewish movements, namely in the eighteenth book of his *Jewish Antiquities* (*Ant.* 18.19). Furthermore, Josephus' harmonious description of the 'one Temple for the one God' in the second book of his treatise *Against Apion*, paragraph 193, leaves the existence of rival Temples, for example the Jewish Temple at Heliopolis in Egypt described in his other works, out of the picture.⁴⁹

As regards Josephus' representation of the Palestinian Jewish schools of the later Second Temple period, we can equally discern an apologetic element in his description of their tenets, for he conveys them in the language of Hellenistic culture. Josephus had an agenda in presenting the Jewish schools in his main digressions as philosophical schools with recognisable issues for his readers, who lived in a Hellenised Roman world, inviting comparisons with debates in Hellenistic philosophy.⁵⁰ Josephus occasionally even explicitly compares certain Jewish schools with schools of Hellenistic philosophy. Thus, the fifteenth book of his *Jewish Antiquities* notes the following about the Essenes: "this is a group which follows a way of life introduced to the Greeks by Pythagoras".⁵¹ In his autobiographical *Life*, Josephus further writes that the school of the Pharisees "is nearly resembling that which the Greeks call the Stoic school".⁵²

Josephus' comparison of the Palestinian Jewish schools with schools of Hellenistic philosophy was not a complete invention of Josephus. In fact this comparative approach constitutes the rhetorical appeal by Josephus to a *topos* in Hellenistic culture in which the Jewish religion was associated with philosophy. Thus, in the *Letter of Aristeeas*, paragraph 31, we find a description of the Jewish Law as 'very philosophical and genuine', φιλοσοφώτερα καὶ ἀκέραιος. We may infer from the context that this apologetic description reflects an attitude shared by various writers, poets and historians who were favourably disposed to Judaism.

Josephus' passing references to boundary lines between the Jewish schools, in view of divergent interpretations of purity laws and attitudes to the Temple service, are the more remarkable. Thus, we read in the thirteenth book of Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* about the controversy between Pharisees and Sadducees with regard to the observance of regulations which had been introduced and handed down by former generations (*Ant.* 13.288-298). The Pharisees established these regulations for the people, τῷ δήμῳ (§ 296); the Sadducees, however, did not consider these regulations valid as they were not recorded in the Laws of Moses. These Pharisaic regulations probably concerned the rites of worship, for Josephus also writes in this connection about the influence of the Pharisees among the townsfolk, οἱ δήμοι (*Ant.* 18.15). Josephus further refers briefly to the divergent rituals of purification of the Essenes (*Ant.* 18. 19). Such references bring us closer to the Palestinian Jewish situation, for they directly concern the Jerusalem Temple cult and go beyond the idealised picture of the Jewish schools arranged around philosophical debates about fate and free will.

⁴⁹ *Ag.Ap.* 2.193: Εἷς ναὸς ἐνὸς θεοῦ. Cf. Philo, *Spec.Laws*, 1.67 which also expresses the idea of one temple symbolising monotheism, the service of the one God: ἐπειδὴ εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, καὶ ἱερὸν ἔν εἶναι μόνον. It seems to be inconsistent with this idea or at least paradoxical that Josephus refers to the Temples of Shechem, Garizim and Heliopolis as having been built 'resembling' (παρὰπλήσιον - *Ant.* 13.63), 'after the model of' (εἰκασθέντα - *Ant.* 13.255-256) or 'similar to' (πρὸς - *Ant.* 13.285) the Temple of Jerusalem.

⁵⁰ Cf. *J.W.* 2.166 concluding his digression on the followers of the sects, αἰρετισταί, of Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes (§ 119) as concerning "the Jewish philosophical schools", περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ φιλοσοφούντων. At end of the digression in *Ant.* 18.9-25, Josephus concludes: καὶ φιλοσοφεῖται μὲν Ἰουδαίῳ τὸσάδε.

⁵¹ *Ant.* 15.371. In *J.W.* 2.155-156 Josephus compares Essene conceptions of the afterlife to those of the Greeks.

⁵² *Life* 12. For the influence of Hellenistic philosophy in general and Stoic philosophy in particular in Roman circles, see e.g. A.A. Long, 'Hellenistic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition', in idem, *Hellenistic Philosophy. Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics* (University of California Press: Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1986) 232-237.

3. Josephus on the Palestinian Jewish schools and the literature of Qumran

The critical consideration of Josephus' Hellenistic Jewish representation of the Jewish schools in relation to the Palestinian Jewish situation of the late Second Temple period can be refined by evidence from the Dead Sea scrolls. For the literature of Qumran dates to the Hellenistic and early Roman periods and certain texts bear on non-sectarian circumstances and the relation of the Qumran community to Jewish religious thought and practice of the Second Temple period at large.⁵³

3.1 The Essene hypothesis

The relationship between historical references in the literature of Qumran and the socio-historical realities of late Second Temple Judaism is a complicated matter. The question about the historical context of the Dead Sea Scrolls is bound up with the problem of tracing the identity and origins of the Qumran community. According to a theory followed by many scholars, which is known as the 'Essene hypothesis', there are sufficient similarities between the religious thought and practice of the Essenes, as described in the texts of Philo, Josephus and Pliny the Elder, and that which is expressed in the Dead Sea Scrolls, to relate the Qumran community to the movement of the Essenes.⁵⁴

The question, which has been subject of discussion in support of the Essene hypothesis, is, as Jonathan Campbell puts it, "whether the members of the Qumran group were Essenes proper or an Essene splinter faction".⁵⁵ The identification of the Qumran community with a form of Essenism has been further elaborated by Florentino García Martínez and Adam S. van der Woude in a "Groningen" hypothesis of Qumran origins'.⁵⁶ The starting-point for their hypothesis is the argument that the Dead Sea Scrolls constitute a coherent library which reflect the sectarian thought and practice of the Qumran community.

The arguments in favour of this starting-point at the same time refute other theories, which suppose a different or non-sectarian origin of the scrolls; especially Norman Golb's theory.⁵⁷ The sectarian stance of a whole group of Qumran texts is undeniable. Recent studies

⁵³ For a general survey about the dating of the scrolls, see J.C. VanderKam, 'Methods for Dating the Discoveries', in idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 15-27. Cf. e.g. J.G. Campbell, 'The Qumran Sectarian Writings', in *CHJ III The Early Roman Period*, 798-821 at 801-812.

⁵⁴ For a comparative survey and a discussion of other theories, see J.C. VanderKam, 'The Identification of the Qumran Group', in idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 71-98; Cf. G. Vermes, 'Identification of the Community', in idem, *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (SCM Press: London, 1999) 114-126. Cf. J.G. Campbell's discussion in *CHJ III The Early Roman Period*, 813-821, of the establishment of and further variations on the Qumran-Essene hypothesis from the 1950s onwards and remaining shortcomings.

⁵⁵ Campbell, 'The Qumran Sectarian Writings', 819.

⁵⁶ F. García Martínez, 'Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis', *FO* 25 (1988) 113-136; F. García Martínez & A.S. van der Woude, 'A "Groningen" Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History', *RevQ* 14/4 (1990) 521-541. Cf. A.S. van der Woude, 'Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary', *JJS* 33 (1982) 349-359; F. García Martínez, 'The Origins of the Essene Movement and of the Qumran Sect', in F. García Martínez & J. Trebolle Barrera (eds.), *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ET by W.G.E. Watson; Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1995) 77-96.

⁵⁷ García Martínez & Van der Woude, 'A "Groningen" Hypothesis', 522, 526-536 contains a detailed refutation of Golb's hypothesis "that all the MSS come from different libraries of Jerusalem and that they represent the literature of the Judaism of that time as a whole" (526). This hypothesis has also recently been maintained by N. Golb, 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pre-Tannaitic Judaism', in *CHJ III The Early Roman Period*, 822-851, putting it as a reconsideration of the accumulated evidence, "pointing, on the contrary, to the Jerusalem origin of the scrolls and their composition by various sects, parties and individuals in pre-Tannaitic Judaism" (822).

have also further refined the criteria for the definition of ‘sectarian’ texts and provided a critical appraisal of the Essene hypothesis.⁵⁸

García Martínez and Van der Woude have proposed to trace the origins of the Qumran community back to a split within the Essene movement, which became definitive under John Hyrcanus I (134-104 BCE). The Essene movement at large would, according to this hypothesis, have its origins in the Palestinian apocalyptic tradition around the end of the third or the beginning of the second century BCE.⁵⁹

However, most recent re-evaluations of the archaeology of Qumran by Jodi Magness and of the historical references in the literature of Qumran by Michael O. Wise have proposed a revision of the ‘chronological framework for the traditional form of the Essene hypothesis’.⁶⁰ These recent studies propose a date of separation and settlement in the late second century or early first century BCE.

3.2 Different Essene orders and differentiation of groups in the Damascus Document

In a recent re-evaluation of the evidence for comparison between Qumran and the Essenes, the short-comings of the Essene hypothesis have been pointed out by Lena Cansdale. She has shown differences between the laws and rules of Qumran and the Essenes as described by the ancient authors.⁶¹ Nevertheless, the fact that there were different orders among the Essenes, as we know from Josephus’ long digression in his *Jewish War*,⁶² allows for possible differentiation between Essene settlements in terms of laws and rules.

The *Damascus Document* also comprises allusions to a differentiation among settlements. Only those who have been brought into the covenant, that is, the covenant of the sectarian community, are admonished not to enter the Temple but to offer the offerings according to their declared interpretation.⁶³ This prescription seems to correspond to the paradoxical situation of Essene sacrifice and the Essene exclusion from participation in the regular Temple cult, as described by Josephus in his *Jewish Antiquities*.⁶⁴ On the other hand,

⁵⁸ Cf. J.M. Jokiranta, ‘“Sectarianism” of the Qumran “Sect”: Sociological Notes’, *RevQ* 20 (2001) 223-239 and W. van Peursen, ‘Qumran Origins: Some Remarks on the Essene/Enochic Hypothesis’, *RevQ* 20 (2001) 241-254. J. Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. & Cambridge, U.K., 2002) 39-43 also supports the identification of the community at Qumran with Essenes.

⁵⁹ García Martínez & Van der Woude, ‘A “Groningen” Hypothesis’, 537.

⁶⁰ Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 47-72; M.O. Wise, ‘Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the Floruit of his Movement’, *JBL* 122/1 (2003) 53-87.

⁶¹ L. Cansdale, *Qumran and the Essenes. A Re-Evaluation of the Evidence* (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1997), in particular her chapter 6, ‘Comparison of the Scroll Community with the Essenes’ (58-66).

⁶² *J.W.* 2.159-161 at 160, Ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ἕτερον Ἑσσηνῶν τάγμα.

⁶³ Critical edition in J.M. Baumgarten, *DJD XVIII Qumran Cave 4. XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996); cf. M. Broshi, *The Damascus Document reconsidered* (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society [etc.] 1992) with the Hebrew text of the Damascus Document by E. Qimron. CD-A VI, 11-12, לה רים את הקדשים כפירושיהם ; CD-A VI, 20 כל אשר הובאו בברית לבלתי בוא אל המקדש להאיר מבחו חנם, Cf. the use of ה רים in e.g. Exod 35:24, Num 15:19, 18:19.

⁶⁴ *Ant.* 18.19: εἰς δὲ τὸ ἱερόν ἀναθήματα στέλλοντες θυσίας ἐπιτελοῦσιν διαφορότητι ἀγνεῶν, ἃς νομίζοιεν, καὶ δι’ αὐτὸ εἰργόμενοι τοῦ κοινοῦ τεμενίσματος ἐφ’ αὐτῶν τὰς θυσίας ἐπιτελοῦσιν. Text from the critical edition of B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi Opera IV Antiquitatum Iudaicarum Libri XVI-XX et Vita* (Weidmann: Berlin, 1890) 143. Variant readings of the Epitome, having οὐκ ἐπιτελοῦσιν, and the Latin version, having ‘non celebrant’, could make sense in relation to the regular temple cult, from which the Essenes were barred. However, it cannot be applied to deny the existence of sectarian sacrificial rites, for the phrase ἐφ’ αὐτῶν τὰς θυσίας ἐπιτελοῦσιν at the end of the passage does not have such a negative variant reading.

the *Damascus Document* refers to settlements “in accordance with the rule of the land”, כסרך הארץ, with marriages “in accordance with the custom of the law”, כמנהג התורה.⁶⁵ These were settlements of groups clearly distinct from those of the covenant of the Qumran community. By following the rule of the land and the custom of the law, people of these settlements were expected to take upon themselves a way of life ‘according to the law’, על פי התורה, ‘the regulation of the instructions’, כמשפט היסורים, and ‘the rule of the law’, כסרך התורה.⁶⁶

The allusion to distinct groups, which follow the custom of marriage and reside in camps, corresponds to Josephus' description of one order of the Essenes (*J.W.* 2.160-161). The differentiation of groups reflected in the *Damascus Document* does not appear to me as a total disjunction with the sectarian Qumran community. Column XV of the *Damascus Document* seems to imply the idea that those of the sectarian community of Qumran could also have offspring of their own: “those who enter the covenant, for all Israel for an eternal law, must impose upon their sons who have reached (the age) to go over to the enrolled, by the oath of the covenant”.⁶⁷ The differentiation of groups, as it appears from the *Damascus Document*, seems to be less pronounced than the differences in Josephus' digression between the two described orders of Essenes (*J.W.* 2.119-159 and 160-161). These two orders of Essenes had the respective customs of celibacy combined with the adoption of other men's children and marriage.⁶⁸

There are inconsistencies in the identification of the community of the Scrolls with the celibate order of the Essenes as described by Josephus and Philo, which Cansdale has rightly pointed out.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, the non-participation in the regular Temple cult on the basis of divergent interpretations of purity laws remains an intriguing similarity between the Qumran texts and Josephus' description of the Essenes. On the other hand, the differentiation of groups, as suggested in the *Damascus Document*, appears more complicated than the schematic overview of Josephus about the two orders of Essenes.

A ‘rule for the assembly of the cities of Israel’ and a ‘rule of the assembly of all the camps’ are mentioned in the *Damascus Document*. In connection with the latter rule, four groups are distinguished: priests, levites, Israelites and sojourners.⁷⁰ The differentiation of rules on the one hand and the regulation of dealings between the camps and the congregation (CD-A XIII, 12-21) on the other do at least suggest an interrelationship between the Jewish groups and bring the secluded Qumran community into the discussion of the Palestinian-Jewish situation of Jewish schools.

3.3 References to Jewish groups in the literature of Qumran

The references to other Jewish groups in the Dead Sea Scrolls are rather elusive than descriptive. Some texts, the genres of rules and sectarian commentaries on the Bible among others, record historical figures, groups and events beyond the secluded community of

⁶⁵ CD-A VII, 6-7; cf. CD-B XIX, 2-3.

⁶⁶ This threefold reference to precepts from the law is found both in CD-A VII, 7-8 and CD-B XIX, 4.

⁶⁷ CD-A XV, 5-6. English translation from F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study edition I (1Q1-4Q273)* (Brill: Leiden [etc.] / Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich., & Cambridge, U.K., 2000) 563. The Hebrew text reads: הבה בברית לכל ישראל לחוק עולם את בניהם אשר יגיעו לעבור על הפקודים בשבועת הברית יקימו עליהם.

⁶⁸ Cf. *J.W.* 2.120-121 to 2.160-161. See also *Ant.* 18.21.

⁶⁹ Cansdale, *Qumran and the Essenes*, 58-66.

⁷⁰ CD-A XII, 19; XIV, 3-6.

Qumran.⁷¹ Unlike a few names of historical figures in the *Pesher to Nahum*, a text which we will subsequently discuss, Jewish groups outside Qumran are not named in a clearly recognizable way. Current Hebrew terms for Pharisees and Sadducees, פרושים and צדוקים in rabbinic literature, do not appear in the literature of Qumran.

However, we do find a strong emphasis on priestly lineage in the sectarian *Rule of the Community*, where the terms ‘sons of Aaron’, בני אהרון, and ‘sons of Zadok’, בני צדוק, levites, הלויים, and priests, הכוהנים, occur.⁷² The prominence of the expression ‘sons of Zadok the priests’ in particular has led Jacob Liver to identify and situate the leadership of the Qumran community as opposed to the Hasmonean priestly establishment.⁷³ More recently, Robert Kugler has challenged the consensus about such supposed connections between literary references to the priesthood and the socio-historical realities of the Qumran community’s breakaway from the Temple establishment. Kugler criticises the consensus in view of the fact that the recensional history of the *Damascus Document* and the redactional histories of the *Rule of the Community* (1QS, 4QS^a) and the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) – an emerging field of study – do not seem to support such unequivocal connections.⁷⁴

Nevertheless, other texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls, such as Nahum Pesher (4QpNah) and the recently published text ‘Some of the Works of the Law’ (4QMMT), have been studied by scholars in the light of connections to the historical picture of three Jewish schools by Josephus and the reconstruction of a sectarian historiography. Both David Flusser and Ben Zion Wacholder, supporting the Essene hypothesis, have identified the sectarian references to Judah, Ephraim and Manasseh, mainly in Nahum Pesher, with the Essenes, Pharisees and Sadducees respectively.⁷⁵ Ben Zion Wacholder has pointed to the necessity of locating the history of the Qumran community in the Palestinian-Jewish historical context: “The historiography of the sect was bound up in that of their opponents. A clear view of the ascension of their adversaries opens the scene of sectarian origins”.⁷⁶ Discussing the items of controversy in 4QMMT, Otto Betz has argued in favour of the identification of the Qumran community with the Essenes because of their breakaway from a priestly establishment.⁷⁷

In 4QMMT, the issues of controversy comprise the performance of purification rituals, the offering of sacrifices and the holiness of the priestly lineage. These issues are all related to the Temple cult of Jerusalem. Because the concern for the purity of the Temple, טהרת המקדש (4QMMT B 54), was at the heart of the sectarian separation (cf. 4QMMT C 7-8) and the

⁷¹ E.g. the *Damascus Document* (4Q266-273, 5Q12, 6Q15), the Halakhic Letter (= *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*, 4QMMT; 4Q394-399), the *Pesher to Habakkuk* (1QPHab), the Nahum Pesher (4QpNah = 4Q169), and the *Psalms Pesher* (4Q171). Cf. the recent interpretative survey of the historical references in the literature of Qumran by M.O. Wise, ‘Dating the Teacher of Righteousness’, 53-87.

⁷² 1QS I, 18-19.22; II, 1.4.11.19-20; V, 2.9.21; VI, 8; IX, 7.14.

⁷³ J. Liver, ‘The “Sons of Zadok the Priests” in the Dead Sea Sect’, *RevQ* 6/1 (1967) 3-30.

⁷⁴ R. Kugler, ‘Priesthood at Qumran’, in P.W. Flint & J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls after fifty years. A Comprehensive Assessment II* (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1999) 93-116.

⁷⁵ Cf. e.g. D. Flusser, ‘Pharisäer, Sadduzäer und Essener im Pescher Nahum’, in K.E. Grözinger *et al.* (eds.), *Qumran Wege der Forschung* 410 (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft: Darmstadt, 1981) 121-166; B.Z. Wacholder, ‘Historiography of Qumran: The Sons of Zadok and their Enemies’, in F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson (eds.), *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (Sheffield AP: Sheffield, 1998) 347-377, there 347 and 353, discussing evidence from 4Q398 (4QMMT^a) Frags. 11-13, 2-4.

⁷⁶ B.Z. Wacholder, ‘Historiography of Qumran’, 348.

⁷⁷ O. Betz, ‘The Qumran Halakhah Text *Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Tôrah* (4QMMT) and Sadducean, Essene, and Early Pharisaic Tradition’, in D.R.G. Beattie & M.J. McNamara (eds.), *The Aramaic Bible. Targums in their Historical Context* (Sheffield AP: Sheffield, 1994) 176-202, *contra* L.H. Schiffman’s comparison of halakhot in 4QMMT with Sadducean views in the Pharisaic-Sadducean controversy about purity-laws found in rabbinic literature.

controversy with opponents, 4QMMT yields important evidence about intra-Jewish divergence in views on ritual practice, holiness and purity. In relation to other texts from the literature of Qumran, especially the *Rule of the Community*, the *Damascus Document* and the pesharim, 4QMMT determines the position of the Qumran community in its controversy with other Jewish groups who played a dominant role in the Temple cult and the priestly supervision of the people of Israel (cf. 4QMMT B 12-13). Thus, the discussion of the literature of Qumran brings new evidence into our survey of attitudes of Jewish groups towards the Temple, as part of the larger spectrum of Jewish views on the Temple.⁷⁸

4. The Jewish schools and the Temple in the Maccabean era

4.1 The historical context of Josephus' systematic accounts of the Jewish schools

The attitudes of Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes towards the Temple, as described by Josephus, can only be properly understood when a historical survey has been given of their rise and origins. For the history of these Jewish schools is bound up with their divergent interpretations of purity laws and concomitant practice, while the divergent views on purification rites of the Essenes had even resulted in their exclusion from the regular Temple cult. The developments which came to determine the positions of the respective Jewish schools in relation to the temple cult in the late Second Temple period concern us here.

Josephus informs us about the Essene exclusion from the regular temple cult only in the eighteenth book of his *Jewish Antiquities*, at the point of his historical narrative, where he gives an account of Quirinius' assessment of Judaeen property and the rebellion led by Judas the Galilean.⁷⁹ Significantly, both the long digression in the second book of the *Jewish War* and the shorter digression in the eighteenth book of the *Jewish Antiquities* are directly preceded by references to the rebellion of Judas the Galilean (*J.W.* 2.118; *Ant.* 18.4-10). These digressions are not ahistorical, but they are connected to the historical context of the early Roman period, and they provide a picture of the Jewish schools as they had developed by then. This picture, therefore, relates to the early Roman period, and the traditions and practices mentioned by Josephus concerning the Jewish schools at that time do not necessarily all apply to earlier periods. Examples of historical developments concerning the position and activity of the Jewish schools, which can be discerned in Josephus' works, are given below.

The largely secluded character of Essene settlements, separated from the regular Temple cult, may have developed only in the late Hellenistic and the early Roman periods. Earlier references to Essenes in Josephus' chronology suggest a rather variable situation of the Essenes. Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 13.171-173 suggest that the Essenes and the Sadducees held opposite views in the debate about fate and free will. The presence of Essenes in the Temple is further recorded by Josephus at the time of the reign of Aristobulus I from 104 to 103 BCE (*J.W.* 2.78; *Ant.* 13.311). Moreover, the Essenes appear to have had a favoured status under the reign of Herod the Great from 37 to 4 BCE (*Ant.* 15.371-379).

The representation in the eighteenth book of the *Jewish Antiquities*, §§ 12-15 and 17, of a dominant position of the Pharisees in determining the performance of all prayers and sacred rites of worship with their exposition of the Law, is equally a product of the late Second Temple period. Historical descriptions of the Pharisees earlier in the chronology of Josephus' works do not point to the established status of a leading school, but to controversies

⁷⁸ The standpoint of the Qumran community towards the Temple will be discussed more extensively in chap. 2.

⁷⁹ *Ant.* 18.1-10; about the rebellion led by Judas the Galilean, see also *J.W.* 2.118 and Acts 5:37.

and a struggle for power from which the Pharisaic position would eventually emerge as the more influential. Thus, Josephus describes the controversy between the Pharisees and the Sadducees under the reign of John Hyrcanus I from 134 to 104 BCE (*Ant.* 13.288-298). The Pharisaic call for retaliation for the slaughter of eight hundred victims under Alexander Jannaeus' rule from 103 to 76 BCE seems to point to Pharisaic involvement in opposition to Jannaeus (*Ant.* 13.380 and 410f.). Josephus also writes about the growing influence of the Pharisees under Alexandra's rule from 76 to 67 BCE (*J.W.* 1.110-112).

4.2 The rise of the Jewish schools in the Maccabean era

There is a scholarly consensus about the idea that the rise of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes in their developed form as Jewish schools can be traced back to the first half of the second century BCE, the era of the Maccabean revolt against foreign dominion by Hellenistic rulers.⁸⁰ The main evidence on which this consensus rests, is the occurrence of the Jewish schools in Josephus' chronological framework. The diversity of Jewish schools in Israel is first attested in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*, during the period of Jonathan's leadership both as a military commander and a high-priest (152-142 BCE), at the time when he renewed the alliances with the Romans and the Spartans.⁸¹

Josephus opens his short digression in the *Jewish Antiquities* 13.171-173 on the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes with the words "at that time", κατὰ δὲ τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον. As Jonathan addresses the Spartans in the position of high priest in the letter quoted by Josephus (§ 166), the date after which the Jewish schools became established can be approximately related to the time of Jonathan's appointment to the high-priesthood. It can be inferred from 1 Macc 10:21, that Jonathan was assigned to the office of high-priest by 152 BCE. Thus, the earliest evidence of the existence of the three Jewish schools can at least be dated back to the middle of the second century BCE.

The question of the origins of the three Jewish schools has led Albert I. Baumgarten to distinguish between antecedents, forerunners and full fledged forms of sectarian movements in the Second Temple period. Having made this distinction, Baumgarten categorises the dissension among Jerusalem Jews at the time of Nehemiah as a vague antecedent and the Enoch literature and the book of Jubilees as forerunners. On the other hand, on the basis of the pluriform existence of groups and the secession of at least one group from the establishment, he concludes that "ancient Jewish sectarianism can only be considered fully formed from the Maccabean era onwards".⁸² This method for identifying sectarianism in its fully fledged form could be criticised: the postulation of such general criteria implies that the basic outline of Josephus' description of the Jewish schools already fits into the picture, without further having to comply with the criteria. Nevertheless, Baumgarten has convincingly pointed to corroborating rabbinic evidence from *m. 'Abot* 1 and *'Abot de Rabbi Nathan* chapter 5 for dating the establishment of the Jewish schools back to the middle of the second century BCE.⁸³

It may be added that the total absence of the terms Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes in 1 and 2 Maccabees makes the case for the established existence of the three Jewish schools

⁸⁰ E. Schürer, *The history of the Jewish people in the age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)* II (rev.ed.; T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1979) 388, 585-586. See, more recently, Baumgarten, *The flourishing of Jewish sects*, 18-25.

⁸¹ *Ant.* 13.163-165 (the alliance with the Romans) and 13.165-170 (the alliance with the Spartans).

⁸² Baumgarten, *The flourishing of Jewish sects*, 23-25.

⁸³ Baumgarten, *The flourishing of Jewish sects*, 21.

before the Maccabean revolt less likely. Furthermore, the phrase 'of the most ancient times', ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου in the *Jewish Antiquities* 18.11 should not be interpreted as suggesting that the three Jewish schools existed "from the most ancient times",⁸⁴ but rather in conjunction with what follows, "the ancestral traditions", τὰ πάτρια. Thus interpreted, the sentence in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* can be read as follows: "The Jews had three philosophies, pertaining to their ancestral traditions [which existed] from very ancient times". In other words, the emphasis is on the claim of the three Jewish schools that they continue the ancestral tradition in their teachings. The claim of antiquity was linked with the traditions handed down by the Jewish schools; not with the Jewish schools themselves. The interpretation of the ancestral traditions by the Jewish schools was a contemporary matter.

Although the three Jewish schools probably made the claim of the antiquity of the ancestral tradition, we may learn about the less remote origins of the three Jewish schools in relation to each other from Josephus' description of the controversy between the Pharisees and the Sadducees in the *Jewish Antiquities* 13.288-298. The controversy concerns the "regulations instituted by them [i.e. the Pharisees] for the people", τὰ τε ὑπ' αὐτῶν κατασταθέντα νόμιμα τῷ δήμῳ (*Ant.* 13.296). These regulations, handed down by former generations, were not recognised by the Sadducees for the reason that they were not recorded in the Laws of Moses (*Ant.* 13.297).⁸⁵

The regulations were part of the Pharisaic claim that their ancestral traditions were ancient. The institution of the regulations for the people was, however, the interpretive work of the Pharisees. The occurrence of the Greek verbs καθιστάναι, 'to institute' or 'to set down', and παραδίδόναι, 'to pass on', in relation to the Pharisaic regulations for the people, reflects the early stages of this Jewish school, which had gained the confidence of the people to set down regulations for them.

The dispute between the Pharisees and the Sadducees probably came down to a clash between the realm of influence of the priestly establishment and the growing popular influence of the Pharisees. This conflict of realms of influence is also indicated by the occasion which gave rise to the controversy: the false pretext of proposing Hyrcanus to give up the high-priesthood and to be satisfied with governing the people only (*Ant.* 13.291-292f.). The Pharisaic and Sadducean schools are often characterised as parties which had an essentially lay character and which counted high-priestly families among their ranks respectively.⁸⁶ The controversy between the Pharisees and the Sadducees therefore points to the recent development of overlapping realms of influence of these Jewish schools, which gave rise to conflicts.

Josephus' passage about the Pharisaic-Sadducean controversy therefore corroborates the dating of the establishment of the Jewish schools to the mid second century BCE rather than to the remote past of ancestral tradition. Beyond the chronology which can be inferred

⁸⁴ *Contra* Baumgarten, *The flourishing of Jewish sects*, 20.

⁸⁵ See G. Stemberger, 'The Sadducees', in *CHJ III The Early Roman Period* 428-443, 436 on the difference between Pharisees and Sadducees, not consisting of the reliance or non-reliance on extra-biblical traditions but of "the authority attributed to these traditions". Even though Stemberger discusses 'Sadducean halakha' on the basis of Rabbinic literature (437-440), he also notes its 'one-sided picture' of the Sadducees (439).

⁸⁶ Cf. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People* II, 404 f. See further, however, J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period* (ET by F.H. and C.H. Cave, M.E. Dahl; Fortress: Philadelphia, 1969) 257-258 about the Pharisaic movement having its origin in the Temple and being led by a priestly faction, but later being joined by the laity as "it sought to raise to the level of a general norm the practice of purity laws even among non-priestly folk" (257).

from evidence in Josephus' historical works and in the books of the Maccabees, the proto-history of the Jewish schools is a matter of speculation and hypothesis.⁸⁷

4.3 Differences between the Jewish schools pertaining to temple worship and religiosity

The differences between the Jewish schools most probably pertained to matters which were both human and divine, that is philosophical and theological. For one thing, Josephus writes in his *Jewish Antiquities* about the rise of different Jewish schools because of dissension in human affairs, *περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων* (*Ant.* 13.171). These human affairs concern the place attributed to fate and fortune, responsibility and destiny in human life according to the philosophy of the Pharisees, Essenes and Sadducees (*Ant.* 13.172-173). Perhaps the dissension about human affairs was also related in a way to the political context of power and the alliance with foreign nations. This would account for Josephus' insertion of a digression about these Jewish schools, after his narration of the diplomatic renewal of alliances.

On the other hand, Josephus refers to beliefs about righteousness and the purpose to please God which are attributed to the Pharisees (*Ant.* 13.289). This implies that theological matters were also a point of difference between the Jewish schools. At the end of his more elaborate account in the *Jewish War* 2.119-166, Josephus further implies dissension about theological matters in his description of the three main schools. In his juxtaposition of the ideas of Pharisees and Sadducees, he refers not only to what according to the respective schools can be attributed to fate, εἰμαρμένη, but also to God, θεῶ (*J.W.* 2.162-165).

As we have already pointed out in the foregoing section, an important point in Josephus' survey of differences between the Pharisees and the Sadducees is the introduction by the Pharisees of ancestral traditions, unwritten laws, which were rejected by the Sadducees, since they had not been recorded in the Laws of Moses (*Ant.* 13.297).⁸⁸ As the Pharisees eventually gained a reputation as the "most accurate interpreters of the laws" (*J.W.* 2.162),⁸⁹ the teachings of the Pharisees probably concerned particular interpretations of the Law, which were not accepted by the Sadducees and rejected as unwritten laws. It is important to note that this gradual expansion of the Pharisaic realm of influence in the first century BCE is also reflected in Josephus' description of their stronger commitment to religious observances and their greater ability to explain the laws accurately in comparison to others (*J.W.* 1.110).⁹⁰

According to early rabbinic literature, the conflicts between the Pharisees and the Sadducees mainly concerned the interpretation of purity laws, that is, regulations determining ritual cleanness and uncleanness.⁹¹ One passage of the Mishnah, *m. Parah* 3:7, mentions a

⁸⁷ Cf. R.T. Beckwith, 'The Pre-History and Relationships of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes: A Tentative Reconstruction', *RevQ* 11 (1982) 3-46. For a critical discussion of the 'Hasidic hypothesis', which identifies the Ἰσιδάοι in 1 Macc 2:42, 7:13 and 2 Macc 14:6 as the precursors to both the Essenes and the Pharisees, see P.R. Davies, 'Hasidim in the Maccabean Period', in idem, *Sects and Scrolls. Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (Scholars Press: Atlanta, Ga., 1996) 5-21. Davies concludes with a broad definition of *Hasidim* to be conservative Jews, concerned to preserve their religion, as opposed to rather Hellenistic-minded Jews.

⁸⁸ Josephus describes the teachings of unwritten laws by Pharisees in various ways as νόμιμα τινα παρέδοσαν τῷ δήμῳ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς and τὰ [νόμιμα] δ' ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων in *Ant.* 13.297, and τῶν νομίμων [...] ὧν εἰσηνεγκαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι κατὰ τὴν πατρίαν παράδοσιν in *Ant.* 13.408.

⁸⁹ οἱ μετὰ ἀκριβείας δοκοῦντες ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα. Text from B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi Opera* VI, 185.

⁹⁰ Παραφύονται δὲ αὐτῆς εἰς τὴν ἐξουσίαν Φαρισαῖοι, σύνταγμα τι Ἰουδαίων δοκοῦν εὐσεβέστερον εἶναι τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τοὺς νόμους ἀκριβέστερον ἀφηγεῖσθαι. Text from B. Niese, *op.cit.*

⁹¹ Cf. *m.Yad.* 4:6, 7; *m. Parah* 3:7.

terse polemic against the Sadducees about the application of purity regulations concerning the burning of the Red Heifer. This polemic conveys the heated debate which surrounded various aspects of the purity laws of the Jerusalem Temple cult. Some of the precepts of the Law in 4QMMT also concern the purity of the Red Heifer as a sin-offering.⁹² Thus, conflicting views on the application of purity laws, which regulated the Temple service, were among the reasons for the breach between the Qumran community and the regular Jewish Temple cult.

The perspective of the Pharisees on certain issues of ritual purity, mentioned in early rabbinic literature,⁹³ was most probably an integral part of the ancestral traditions which Josephus notes in his description of the tenets of the Pharisees. We may infer from Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 13.288 that the realm of influence of the Pharisees could reach the public opinion about royal power and the high-priesthood. Debates about purity regulations of the Temple cult proper were probably not restricted to priestly classes, but extended to the lay expert circles of the Pharisees. The Jewish body politic, in which the Pharisees would eventually have a place together with the Sadducees, was the Sanhedrin, presided by the high priest.⁹⁴ The interaction between scriptural interpretation and views on purity and holiness is an important point in the study of the historically grown difference of Jewish schools in their attitudes to the Temple cult.

4.4 The Temple cult and the crisis of Hellenisation in the Maccabean era

The rise of the Jewish schools in the Maccabean era may be explained as a pluriform Jewish response to the crisis of Hellenisation, which had been forced through by the oppressive regime of the Seleucid ruler Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-163 BCE). In 1 Maccabees 1:10-15, the beginning of the 'lawlessness', ἀνομία, and 'ungodliness', ἀσεβεία, with regard to the observance of the Jewish Law is attributed to concessions to Gentile custom at this time.⁹⁵ The friction between the Hellenistic influence and the Jewish religious rites was caused by the initial division among the Israelites themselves about Gentile customs. Antiochus IV Epiphanes, however, imposed Hellenisation through aggressive means. The Temple of Jerusalem was desecrated and a decree was issued which instituted violence against people who observed the Jewish Law (1 Macc 1:20-64).

In the context of war and military campaigns led by Mattathias and his son, Judas Maccabaeus, the antagonism between pro-Hellenistic groups on the one hand and the movement which fought for the preservation of Jewish tradition on the other undoubtedly sharpened and deepened. By the time of Jonathan's leadership (161-143/142 BCE), the Israelites had established and consolidated their autonomy through power politics and diplomacy. It is in this period of time, that Josephus notes the existence of the different schools of Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes in his digression in the thirteenth book of his *Jewish Antiquities* (Ant. 13.171-173).

The revolt of the Maccabees against the oppression of Antiochus IV Epiphanes resulted in a military victory and the rededication of the Temple. In the words of the author of 1 Maccabees, this rededication removed 'the reproach of the Gentiles', ὁ ὀνειδισμὸς ἐθνῶν (1 Macc 4:58). Songs and hymns accompanied the rededication of the altar in the Temple, a

⁹² 4QMMT B 13-17 פרת החטאת טהרת פרת החטאת.

⁹³ E.g. *m. Hag.* 2:7; *m. Toh.* 4:12; *m. Yad.* 4:6-7.

⁹⁴ For detailed discussion of the sources about this matter, see E. Schürer, 'The Composition of the Sanhedrin', in idem, *The History of the Jewish People* II, 210-218.

⁹⁵ 1 Macc 1:10-15 at v. 11 Ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐξηλθον ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ υἱοὶ παράνομοι. Cf. 1 Macc 3:3-9.15.20; 6:21 mentioning τινες τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ.

rededication which was celebrated for eight days by the people and led by the priests according to 1 Maccabees 4:42-58. According to 1 Maccabees 4:56 the offerings at the occasion of this rededication consisted of burnt offerings, ὀλοκαυτώματα, and a sacrifice of deliverance and praise, θυσία σωτηρίου καὶ αἰνέσεως. These offerings appear to be in line with the customs for a time of separation, as laid down in the law for the Nazirite in Numbers 6:13-14,⁹⁶ and with the sacrificial law about peace offerings in Leviticus 7:11-36.⁹⁷ It is important to note that the Qumran sectarian imagination of an eschatological Temple also includes the idea of the offering of ‘works of thanksgiving’, ἡδονή.⁹⁸

The offering of sacrifices (θυσίαι) and votive offerings (ἀναθήματα) was regulated by Jewish custom,⁹⁹ but also involved politics, as is testified by the offerings presented by foreign rulers to the Temple of Jerusalem throughout the Second Temple Period.¹⁰⁰ Sacrifices were also offered in the Jerusalem Temple on behalf of foreign rulers.¹⁰¹ In the case of a burnt offering for a Hellenistic warlord like Nicanor (1 Macc 7:33), however, the war between Hellenistic rulers and the Maccabees apparently made such a symbolical offering a vanity. The politics of good relations with the Gentiles would give rise to antagonisms and factions within the religious and political establishment of Judaea in times of oppression by Gentiles and abandonment of the Jewish Law. On the subject of the desecration of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes, fragments of contemporary poems have been found in 1 Maccabees 1:36-40 and 2:7-13. In these poems the profanation by the Gentiles is an important theme.

During the reign of king Demetrius I Soter (162-150 BCE), certain pro-Hellenistic factions in Israel joined the Gentiles and the high-priesthood itself became an object of political strife.¹⁰² Under these circumstances of strife for religious and political power by Hellenising parties, the interference of a foreign power with their factionalism was brought in. These factions, led by Alcimus, who was aiming at the high-priesthood, are represented from the Maccabean perspective as ‘all lawless and impious men from of Israel’ (1 Macc 7:5).

At this point, a diplomatic delegation was formed by Judas Maccabaeus and sent to Rome in order to strike up an alliance and friendship with this rising power (1 Macc 8:17). The motive for this diplomacy is stated in a very pronounced way in the Greek of 1 Macc 8:18: τοῦ ἄραι τὸν ζυγὸν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν, ὅτι εἶδον τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καταδουλομένους τὸν Ἰσραὴλ δουλείᾳ, which can be translated as follows, “to remove the yoke from themselves, because they saw that kingdom of the Greeks was reducing Israel to complete slavery”. The Maccabees, however, defeated Nicanor, king Demetrius’ general, in battle, before a direct military threat of the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem could be realised (1 Macc 7:33-50).

⁹⁶ Cf. references to a burnt-offering, ὀλοκαύτωσις, and a peace-offering, σωτήριον, in LXX Num 6:14.

⁹⁷ Cf. LXX Leviticus 7:13 about the ‘peace offering for thanksgiving’, ἡ θυσία αἰνέσεως σωτηρίου.

⁹⁸ 4QFlorilegium = 4QMidrEschat^{ab}, Frag. 1, Col. I, 21, 2, lines 6-7. Ed.pr. J.M. Allegro & A.A. Anderson, *DJD V Qumran Cave 4. I (4Q158-4Q186)* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1969) 53-57, pls. XIX-XX.

⁹⁹ Cf. *Ant.* 11.336 sacrifice to God κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ὑφήγησιν and in *Ag.Ap.* 2.48 ὡς ἡμῖν νόμιμόν ἐστιν.

¹⁰⁰ E.g. *Ant.* 11.7 (contributions on behalf of the Persian king Cyrus); *Ant.* 11.32-336 (Alexander the Great); *Ag.Ap.* 2.48 (Ptolemy III Euergetes (247-222 BCE)); 2 Macc 3:2-3 (Seleucus, king of Asia and other kings); *Ant.* 13.242-243 (Antiochus VII Sidetes (139-129 BCE)); *Ant.* 16.14 (Marcus Agrippa); *Ant.* 18.122 (Vitellius, 37 CE). Cf. ‘Gentile Participation in Worship at Jerusalem’ in Schürer, *The history of the Jewish people II*, 309-313.

¹⁰¹ E.g. *Letter of Aristeas*, 45; 1 Macc 7:33.

¹⁰² 1 Macc 7:1.5.9.12-23 about Alcimus’ political strife for and treacherous gain of the high-priesthood.

After the death of Judas Maccabaeus (161 BCE), renewed oppression by Seleucid power and internal pro-Seleucid factions threatened to overshadow Israel's autonomy.¹⁰³ Under the political and priestly leadership of Jonathan from 161 to 142 BCE,¹⁰⁴ and of Simon the son of Mattathias (142-134 BCE),¹⁰⁵ a delicate balance was struck between diplomacy and warfare. The Maccabean policy protected the observance of the Jewish Law from abrogation and the services of the Temple from direct external threats of destruction or desecration and.

The reality of continuous diplomatic and military warfare to shake off the yoke of the “kingdom of the Greeks”, τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων, is also alluded to in sectarian historiography, which can be read in the margins of Qumran commentary on Scripture. The Nahum Pesher (4QpNah frags. 3+4, col. 1, lines 2-3) refers to the names of Antiochus and Demetrius among the “kings of Yavan”, that is, kings of Greece, in the following context:¹⁰⁶

[פשרו על דמי]טרוס מלך יון אשר בקש לבוא ירושלים בעצת דורשי החלקות
 [ולוא בוא כי לוא נתן אל את ירושלים] ביד מלכי יון מאנתיכוס עד עמוד מושלי כתיים
 “[Its interpretation concerns Deme]trius, king of Yavan, who sought to enter Jerusalem on the advice of those who care for flatteries, [but he did not enter for God had not given Jerusalem] in the hand of the kings of Yavan from Antiochus up to the appearance of the commanders of the Kittim”.

The names of Antiochus and Demetrius mentioned in this passage could be those of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and Demetrius I Soter. The terms Yavan (יון) and Kittim (כת(י)ים) are found in the so-called biblical “table of the nations” in Genesis 10 (Gen 10:2.4). These terms served as an ethnic designation for Greece and Rome respectively.¹⁰⁷ It is important for our historical perspective that these names occur in the *Nahum Pesher* 3-4, II, 12 in a column which also contains a polemical reference to the “priests of Jerusalem” (v. 11). The references may serve as chronological markers for reconstructing (at least one side of) the conflicts among the Palestinian Jewish schools with regard to the Jerusalem Temple cult.

The Qumran *Pesher to Habakkuk*, provides an eschatological perspective on the “last priests of Jerusalem” who amassed wealth unlawfully by plundering the nations and who were eventually being plundered in turn by the army of the Kittim (1QpHab IX, 3-7). The ‘Wicked Priest’, הכוהן הרשע, is in this same Pesher accused of abominable deeds of impurity, מעשי תועבות, and of having defiled the Temple of God, ויטמא את מקדש אל (1QpHab XII, 7-9). As may be inferred from the *Pesher to Habakkuk* IX, 9-12, the sectarian community was led by the Teacher of Righteousness into its breakaway from the regular Temple cult because of the corruption of the high priesthood by the ‘Wicked Priest’.

The authors of the editio princeps of the 4QMMT have put forward a hypothesis dating the changes which gave rise to the breakaway of the Qumran community to the period

¹⁰³ 1 Macc 9:23-27, there 23 Καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὴν τελευταίαν Ἰουδοῦ ἐξέκυψαν οἱ ἄνομοι ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ὄριοις Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἀνέτειλαν πάντες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀδικίαν. Cf. *Ant.* 13.2-3 relating the same events in similar terms of godless people among the Jews deserting (αὐτομολεῖν) to the enemy.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. 1 Macc 10:1-21; *Ant.* 13.39-46, 119 about Jonathan's appointment to the office of high-priest by king Alexander Balas in 152 BCE.

¹⁰⁵ 1 Macc 13:3-6, 14:29; *Ant.* 13.198-200. Cf. 1 Macc 14:41-42.46-47.

¹⁰⁶ Ed.pr. Allegro & Anderson, DJD V. Cf. the use of יוקתן in Isa 30:10; Ps 12:3-4; Dan 11:32.

¹⁰⁷ See *Ant.* 1.124 (ἀπὸ δὲ Ἰουάνου Ἰωνία καὶ πάντες Ἕλληνας γεγονάσι) and 127-128, which relates the “Kittim” to “all islands and the greater part of the coastlands” (νῆσοί τε πᾶσαι καὶ τὰ πλείω τῶν παρὰ θάλατταν). Cf. Schürer, *The history of the Jewish people* I (1973) 241 n. 30: “Today there is quasi-unanimity in identifying the victorious Kittim of Qumran literature with the Romans”.

of 160-152 BCE, that is, the period leading up to Jonathan's election to the high priesthood.¹⁰⁸ According to this hypothesis, the deposition of the "Teacher of Righteousness" as high-priest took place in this period. Columns IX and XI of the *Pesher to Habakkuk* refer to the 'Wicked Priest' as having been delivered into the hands of the enemies to humiliate him and as being one whose disgrace exceeded his glory (1QpHab IX, 9-12; XI, 12-14). This may be an identification of the 'Wicked Priest' with a historical person who combined the offices of high priest and military commander, but who in the end was disgraced in captivity. Be this as it may, the sectarian historiography in the margins of the Qumran pesharim convey chronological markers of situations of conflict and escalation with regard to Jerusalem and its Temple cult from the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

5. The Divide between the Jewish schools in the Hasmonean period

While the existence of the schools of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes is attested by Josephus at the time of Jonathan's leadership (161-142 BCE), opposition against the combination of political and priestly leadership in the same hands emerged from the side of the Pharisees at the time of the rule of John Hyrcanus I (135-104 BCE). In addition, controversies between Pharisees and Sadducees were kindled because of Hyrcanus' abrogation of the unwritten laws introduced by the Pharisees, but rejected by the Sadducees (*Ant.* 13.288-298). Josephus writes that the Jews in general, but most of all the Pharisees were resentful towards Hyrcanus. This is apparent from Josephus' description of Hyrcanus as showing himself an apostate disciple to the Pharisees (*Ant.* 13.288, 296).

The Essenes are mentioned cursorily by Josephus at the end of this section on the Pharisaic-Sadducean controversy in his *Jewish Antiquities* 13.288-298. He directs the reader to his digression in the second book of the *Jewish War*. The fact that the position of the Essenes is left unrelated to the Pharisaic-Sadducean controversy could indicate the definite separation of the Essenes from the Jewish body politic and the regular Temple cult by that time. According to Josephus' digression in the eighteenth book of his *Jewish Antiquities*, the Essenes lived in congregations with their own priests because of their divergent views on purity laws. Their eventual withdrawal from full participation in the Temple cult, however, did not preclude their sending of votive offerings to the Jerusalem Temple.¹⁰⁹

Further indications about divisions among the Jewish schools in the Hasmonean period may be taken from the Dead Sea Scrolls. The aforementioned enmity between the 'Teacher of Righteousness' and the 'Wicked Priest' in the *Pesher to Habakkuk* at least reflects the conflicts among priestly circles concerning views on the legitimate succession in the high-priestly office. These conflicts gave rise to the separation of a movement from the priestly classes which would eventually establish itself as the Qumran community.

In support of the Essene hypothesis, the information about the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest could be interpreted as follows. The Qumran movement originally formed part of the larger movement of Essenes, but led by the Teacher of Righteousness it went into a more radical seclusion in the desert as "place of banishment".¹¹⁰ The banishment of the Qumran community as a group around a deposed high priest would explain their seclusion which was more radical than the separation of the larger movement of

¹⁰⁸ E. Qimron & J. Strugnell, *DJD X Qumran Cave 4. V Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (MMT)* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994) 117-120.

¹⁰⁹ *Ant.* 18.18-19, 22; *J.W.* 2.124.

¹¹⁰ 1QpHab XI, 4-6 concerning the Teacher of Righteousness, מורה הצדק, who was persecuted by the Wicked Priest, הכהן הרשע, in his place of banishment.

Essenes. The movement of the Teacher of Righteousness probably posed the more serious challenge to the new priestly establishment of the Jerusalem Temple cult. The eschatology of two Messiahs, of Aaron and of Israel, reflected in the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule of the Community*, is probably not without a sectarian reaction against the reality of the day, in which priestly and military leadership were both in the hands of the Maccabean rulers.¹¹¹

While the breakaway of the Essenes and the Qumran community from the Temple cult constituted sectarian reactions against the priestly establishment, it is telling for the division about the priestly leadership that a provocation against Hyrcanus' high-priesthood caused Hyrcanus to abrogate the Pharisaic regulations. Although Hyrcanus quieted the faction against his high-priesthood (*Ant.* 13.299), the legitimacy of the tenure of the position of high-priest by Jewish political rulers was more openly questioned after Hyrcanus' rule. Certain parties were probably offended by the claim to hereditary possession of the high-priestly office which the Hasmonean royal dynasty founded by Aristobulus I (104-103 BCE) made. Josephus writes in his digression on the succession of high priests at the end of his *Jewish Antiquities* (*Ant.* 20.224-251, there § 241), that Aristobulus I was the first to hold both the office of kingship and high priesthood. It may be gathered from *Jewish Antiquities* 20.237-238 and from a different tradition in the *Jewish Antiquities* 13.46 and 1 Macc 10:21 that there had been a serious interruption in the tenure of the high priesthood during the Maccabean era.

The opponents of the Hasmonaean lineage expressed their indignation in the more flagrant way to Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE), declaring him unfit to hold the high-priestly office and to sacrifice.¹¹² Jannaeus suppressed the revolt against him with much bloodshed and the hatred against Jannaeus' regime was widespread among the Pharisees.¹¹³ It was most probably due to the pressure of the Pharisees that after the death of Alexander Jannaeus the high-priesthood and the government of the country were no longer united in the hands of a Hasmonean ruler. Under the rule of queen Alexandra (76-67 BCE), the Pharisees were given free reign to do as they liked in all matters.¹¹⁴ Their traditions and regulations, having been abrogated by John Hyrcanus I, were restored (*Ant.* 13.408).

The Hasmonean period ended in civil war led by Aristobulus II against Antipater and Hyrcanus II (*Ant.* 14.8-28). The march of Pompey to Jerusalem in 63 BCE marked the end of the Hellenistic Period and the beginning of an increasing Roman hegemony over Israel. Although the Temple service continued, the sanctuary was profaned by Pompey.¹¹⁵ Roman hegemony entailed the loss of autonomy and political compromise. Royal power was given to

¹¹¹ E.g. CD-A XII, 23 - XIII, 1, 21; XIV, 19; CD-B XX, 1; 1QS IX, 11 mentioning משיח (י) אהרון וישראל. Further, while in CD-A XIV, 3-6 the priests are enlisted as ranking first among all people in the assembly and according to 1QS V, 2 the priests are entrusted the keeping of the covenant, in CD-A XIV, 6f. the priest at the head of the Many appears to be endowed with more authority than the Inspector over the camps (המבקר אשר) לכל המחנות, XIV, 8-9).

¹¹² *Ant.* 13.291-292 (concerning the offence against Hyrcanus); *Ant.* 13.372 προσεξελοιδόρησαν δ' αὐτὸν ὡς ἐξ αἰχμαλώτων γεγονότα καὶ τῆς τιμῆς καὶ τοῦ θύειν ἀνάξιον.

¹¹³ Cf. *Ant.* 13.400-402, there 402. Josephus here attributes to Jannaeus the consideration that the cause for revolt among the Jewish people against his rule consisted in his hostility to the Pharisees, who had been affronted by him.

¹¹⁴ *Ant.* 13.407-408 Hyrcanus being appointed high priest and Aristobulus II becoming king after Alexandra's death (14.4-7). In the same sentence of Hyrcanus' appointment to the high-priesthood the phrase καὶ πάντα τοῖς Φαρισαίοις ἐπιτρέπει ποιεῖν can be found.

¹¹⁵ *Ant.* 14.71-72 παρενομήθη δὲ οὐ μικρὰ περὶ τὸν ναὸν ἄβατόν τε ὄντα ἐν τῷ πρὶν χρόνῳ καὶ ἀόρατον· παρήλθε γὰρ εἰς τὸ ἐντὸς ὁ Πομπήϊος καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν οὐκ ὀλίγοι, καὶ εἶδον ὅσα μὴ θεμιτὸν ἦν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις ἢ μόνοις τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν.

commoners instead of high priests by birth.¹¹⁶ Against the historical background of the growing Roman hegemony, with its subsequent economic exploitation, the revolutionary movement of the ‘Fourth Philosophy’ had split off from the Pharisees.¹¹⁷ The compromise of the Jewish body politic with Roman power was not only expressed in tribute, but also in ceremonies of honour for Roman rule with offerings in the Temple. The division among the Jewish schools about the Gentile influence on the Temple cult was given a revolutionary impetus by the ‘Fourth Philosophy’, which I will subsequently discuss in comparison to the already existing three Jewish schools.

6. The Palestinian-Jewish schools and the Jerusalem Temple in the Roman period

6.1 The Pharisees and the Temple service

The shorter digression on the Jewish sects in *Jewish Antiquities* 18.9-25, includes passages about the Pharisees and Sadducees in relation to liturgical matters of rites of worship. According to *Ant.* 18.15, the Pharisees determined the liturgy of prayer and worship through their exposition, ὅποσα θεία εὐχῶν τε ἔχεται καὶ ἱερῶν ποιήσεως ἐξηγήσει τῇ ἐκείνων τυγχάνουσιν πρᾶσσόμενα. The Pharisaic exposition was so influential that the Pharisees were considered as the “most accurate interpreters of the laws” in the early Roman period.¹¹⁸

The liturgy of prayer and worship, which is further described in relation to the Sadducean unwilling concession to it (*Ant.* 18.17), most probably concerned the Temple service, in part at least. It is not immediately clear whether the rites of prayer, εὐχαί, concerned the synagogues, which would suggest an anachronistic element in Josephus’ description with regard to the standardization of synagogal liturgy from the decades after 70 CE onwards. If these rites of prayer, however, were related to the Jerusalem Temple service, the idea of Pharisaic influence among the townsfolk is enhanced, for Jerusalem was the holy city and mother city for Diaspora Jews as well.¹¹⁹ In any case, the context for the Pharisaic exposition appears to be their influence among the townsfolk, variously described as οἱ δῆμοι and αἱ πόλεις.

This image of the Pharisees appears to be corroborated by evidence from the synoptic gospels. For example, in Mark 7:3-5, the mentioning of purity laws observed by “the Pharisees and all the Jews” suggests the formative influence of the Pharisaic teachings on the Jewish people, even more because the ‘tradition of the elders’, ἡ παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, is mentioned in this connection. This could well be a Pharisaic ‘paradosis’. Jesus’ polemic against scribes and Pharisees, the longest version of which is in Matthew 23, equally conveys the influence of the Pharisees, though in a polemical context.¹²⁰

The performance of holy services (τὰ ἱερά), also mentioned in Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* 18.15, could be related to the Temple service. This means that the Pharisees may

¹¹⁶ *Ant.* 14.77-78 ἡ βασιλεία πρότερον τοῖς κατὰ γένος ἀρχιερεῦσιν διδομένη, τιμὴ δημοτικῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐγένετο.

¹¹⁷ *Ant.* 18.3-10, 23.

¹¹⁸ *J.W.* 2.162 οἱ μετ’ ἀκριβείας δοκοῦντες ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα; text and translation from H.St.J. Thackeray, *Josephus in nine volumes II The Jewish War, Books I-III* (LCL; Harvard UP, 1967) 384-385.

¹¹⁹ ἱεροπόλις and μητρόπολις in Philo’s treatises *On the Embassy to Gaius* 203, 225, 346 and *Against Flaccus* 46. Cf. *Spec.Laws* 1.66-70. See also Josephus, *J.W.* 2.421 Ἰουδαίους δὲ τὸ ἱερόν καὶ τὴν μητρόπολιν.

¹²⁰ Cf. Matt 23:2-3; verse 34 mentions synagogues and towns, where scribes and Pharisees could probably exert influence with their teachings, but Jesus here refers to biblical history of persecution and killing of prophets, wise men and scribes in a polemical way. Cf. Mark 12:37b-40; Luke 11:39-52, 20:45-47.

have had influence in the popular realm of the regular Temple cult concerning issues of purity laws. This Greek term for holy services is also used by Paul in his First Letter to the Corinthians 9:13, signifying the priestly service of sacrificial offerings for the apologetic purpose of comparison between priestly and apostolic ministry. On the other hand, Josephus uses the term τὰ ἱερά also in the case of citing decrees concerning the religious observances by Jewish communities in the Diaspora (*Ant.* 14.214, 227, 237). This term may denote the Jewish rites in general, but in one case it also stands for offerings for sacrifices (*Ant.* 14.227) and is thus related to the Temple cult which also received offerings from the Diaspora.

The fact that the Pharisees, reputed to be the most accurate interpreters of the laws (*J.W.* 2.162), also determined regulations for offerings with their interpretation, ἐξηγήσεις, of purity laws, attests to the influential position of the Pharisees in relation to the priestly establishment. This influential position of the Pharisees is also reflected in passages from Josephus' *Life* §§ 21 and 190-198, in which Pharisees and chief priests are claimed to form part of the same establishment. Furthermore, in the *Jewish War* 2.411-417, the assembly of principal citizens, the most notable Pharisees and the chief priests appear to produce the priestly experts from among their midst. The Pharisees could even exert influence on the high-priesthood because of their power, and they could bring about the deposition of a high priest in the case of incompetence or abuse.¹²¹

6.2 The Sadducees and the Temple service

The Sadducees, as opposed to the popular sect of the Pharisees, are said to persuade the wealthy alone, τοὺς εὐπόρους μόνον πείθοντες (*Ant.* 13.298). Although during the reign of Hyrcanus, the Pharisaic-Sadducean dispute brought out the controversial status of the unwritten laws of the Pharisees among the Jewish establishment, the Pharisees had a predominant position in the early Roman period. Even though the Sadducees considered the teachings of the Pharisees as unwritten laws which could not have the same status as the written Law of Moses, they had to compromise with the Pharisees. Thus, we read in the eighteenth book of the *Jewish Antiquities*, paragraph 17: "For whenever they assume some office, though they submit unwillingly and perforce, yet submit they do to the formulas of the Pharisees, since otherwise the masses would not tolerate them".¹²² As the formulas of the Pharisees also concerned the Temple service, the Sadducees had to compromise with the Pharisaic regulations in the domain of the communal rites of prayer and worship.

Hippolytus' account of the Jewish sects, which runs parallel to Josephus' long digression in the *Jewish War* 2.119-166, adds information about the Sadducees, which nevertheless appears to be derived from Josephus' works. Hippolytus writes that the Sadducees only devoted themselves to the Law of Moses, not to the prophets, nor to any of the other sages.¹²³ This indication seems to specify what is already stated in *Jewish Antiquities* 13.297: that whatever is not written in the laws of Moses is rejected by the

¹²¹ *Ant.* 20.197-203, there 201 where the group circumscribed as οἱ περὶ τοὺς νόμους ἀκριβεῖς probably fits the picture of the Pharisees (cf. *J.W.* 2.162; *Life* 191).

¹²² *Ant.* 18.17 ὅποτε γὰρ ἐπ' ἀρχὰς παρέλθοιεν, ἀκουσίως μὲν καὶ κατ' ἀνάγκας, προσχωροῦσι δ' οὖν οἷς ὁ Φαρισαῖος λέγει διὰ τὸ μὴ ἄλλως ἀνεκτοὺς γενέσθαι τοῖς πλήθεσιν. Text and translation from L.H. Feldman, *Josephus in nine volumes IX Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII-XX* (LCL; Harvard UP: Cambridge, Mass., 1965) 14-15.

¹²³ *Refutation of All Heresies* IX 29,4 (ed. M. Marcovich (1986)): προφήταις δὲ οὐ προσέχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐτέροις τισὶ σοφοῖς, πλὴν μόνῳ τῷ διὰ Μωσέως (δοθέντι) νόμῳ, μηδὲν ἐρμηνεύοντες. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἂ καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι αἰρετίζουσιν.

Sadducean party. The laws of Moses, in juxtaposition to the books of the prophets and the holy writings, most of all contain regulations for the sacrificial cult. The Sadducean position in disputes with the Pharisees about purity laws thus concerned the interpretation of laws from the Pentateuch.

Even though the Sadducees had to compromise with the Pharisaic regulations, they derived their own influence from, among other things, the fact that they counted high-priestly families among their ranks.¹²⁴ An example is the family of the elder Ananus, awarded the position of high priest by Quirinius from 6 to 15 CE (*Ant.* 18.26), whose five sons were all appointed to the office of high priest (*Ant.* 20.197-200). Josephus writes that the younger Ananus was a follower of the school of the Sadducees, thus intimating the immediate negative connotation of savagery in judgement. The judgement concerned here is the judgement by the sanhedrin, συνέδριον κριτῶν, of James the brother of Jesus. It may, however, be inferred from the procedures of deposition of the high priest, described in the *Jewish Antiquities* 20.201-203, that the high priest did not have the authority to convene the Sanhedrin; a matter which had to be settled by the king or the procurator.¹²⁵

This is another example in which the Sadducees were compromised in their influence, although their representation in the priestly cycles of the Temple service was probably considerable. This may also be concluded from the fact that the priests, the captain of the Temple and the Sadducees οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι are mentioned side by side as the priestly establishment in Acts 4:1.¹²⁶ The differentiation of these groups does also indicate, however, that the Sadducees were not restricted to priestly cycles. They could also take on other roles,¹²⁷ among which was probably scribal activity, though possibly to a lesser extent than among the Pharisees who were reputed to be the most accurate interpreters of the Law.¹²⁸ Josephus' negative picture of the Sadducean authority over the priesthood could be related to his perspective on their appropriation of the high-priesthood in the early Roman period. This appropriation may have seemed illegitimate to Josephus who traced his genealogy back to priestly ancestors of the line of Asamoneus; a lineage whose appointment to the high priesthood was annulled by Herod I.¹²⁹

6.3 The Essenes and the Temple

Josephus' digression in his *Jewish Antiquities* 18.11-25 yields some information about the boundary lines demarcating the Jewish schools as to their respective attitudes to the Temple

¹²⁴ Acts 4:5-6, 5:17. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish people* II, 404: "The New Testament and Josephus testify more than sufficiently to the fact that the High-Priestly families belonged to the Sadducean party".

¹²⁵ Cf. *Ant.* 20.216 about the singers of hymns among the Levites who urged the king to convene the Sanhedrin. Cf. the recent article by J.S. McLaren, 'Ananus, James, and earliest Christianity. Josephus' account of the death of James', *JTS* 52/1 (2001) 1-25 about James as part of and victim to the rival Jerusalemite factions.

¹²⁶ Variant readings of Acts 4:1 have οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι (B C) or οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι (D). Concerning ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 6.294 referring to οἱ τοῦ ἱεροῦ φύλακες and ὁ στρατηγός, *Ant.* 20.131 referring to a revolutionary faction around a high priest and a captain, οἱ περὶ Ἀνανίαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ τὸν στρατηγὸν Ἀνανον.

¹²⁷ Cf. J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 228-232.

¹²⁸ The phrase τινες τῶν γραμματέων τοῦ μέρους τῶν Φαρισαίων in Acts 23:9 appears to suggest that there were also scribes from the part of the Sadducees.

¹²⁹ *Ant.* 20.197-203, 247; *Life* 1-6. Note the case in *Ant.* 20.216-218 concerning a request of the singers of hymns of the Levites to be given equal status to the priests as an example of the grave consequences which, in Josephus' view, were connected with any transgression of the ancestral laws about the Temple cult.

cult. These boundary lines are, however, conveyed in terse language with regard to the Essene secession from the priestly establishment.

The much debated passage in paragraph 19 describes the Essenes' debarment from participation in the regular sacrificial cult in the Temple (τὸ κοινὸν τεμενίσμα).¹³⁰ The motivating factor for the exclusion of the Essenes was their divergent perspective on the performance of rites of purification and sacrifice. Their exclusion from the regular sacrificial cult as a community without Temple did, however, not preclude rituals of sanctification of the Essene settlements from taking place. Josephus' long digression in his second book of the *Jewish War* contains a passage about the Essene rite of purification. Josephus seems to suggest that, in view of exclusion from the regular cult-place, τὸ κοινὸν τεμενίσμα, the Essenes conferred a realm of sanctity on their own settlements. Josephus writes that the Essenes, after having purified themselves, come to the refectory 'as to some sacred shrine', καθάπερ εἰς ἄγιόν τι τέμενος (*J.W.* 2.129).

The divergent performance of purification rites by the Essenes was, of course, related to their interpretation of purity laws. Essenes probably based their different performance of rites of purification on their own characteristic interpretation of purity laws in the Torah. We may gather from Josephus' *Jewish War* 2.159 that there is a link between the reading of the holy books and the performance of divergent forms of purification by the Essenes. According to this passage, certain Essenes are found "busied in holy books, various forms of purification and sayings of the prophets from their early childhood".¹³¹ The relation between the activities of reading and interpreting the 'holy books', βιβλοὶ ἱεραῖ, and the engagement in various forms of purification, διάφοροι ἀγνεῖαι, may inform our reading of the *Jewish Antiquities* 18.19. The various forms of purification in which these Essenes were engaged may have been related to general Jewish practices of purification, but more probably they were connected to Essene practices based on the Essene interpretation of scriptural purity laws. For *Ant.* 18.19 refers to the Essene divergence in rites of purification with the following words: θυσίας ἐπιτελοῦσιν διαφορότητι ἀγνειῶν.¹³² Contrary to the long digression in the second book of his *Jewish War*, Josephus neglects the study of Scripture among Essenes in his shorter digression in the eighteenth book of his *Jewish Antiquities*.

Purity laws occur in abundance in the books of Leviticus and Numbers, and it is significant that among the precepts of the Torah mentioned in 4QMMT many precepts concern the purity of offerings in the Temple.¹³³ The Qumran community underpinned the authority of its sectarian exhortation about precepts with quotations from the Scripture as prooftexts.¹³⁴ Thus, it can be inferred not only from Josephus' description of the Essenes but also from 4QMMT that profound dividing lines concerning the regular Temple cult divided

¹³⁰ Cf. J. Strugnell, 'Flavius Josephus and the Essenes: *Antiquities* XVIII.18-22', *JBL* 77 (1958) 106-115 at 113-115; J.M. Baumgarten, 'The Essenes and the Temple. A Reappraisal', in idem, *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA; Leiden: Brill, 1977) 57-74; and more recently A.I. Baumgarten, 'Josephus on Essene Sacrifice', *JJS* 45 (1994) 169-183 with more bibliography there on the complicated problem of explaining Essene sacrifice in a situation of their being excluded from the regular Temple cult.

¹³¹ *J.W.* 2.159, βιβλοὶς ἱεραῖς καὶ διαφοροῖς ἀγνεῖαις καὶ προφητῶν ἀποφθέγμασιν ἐμπαιδοτριβοῦμενοι.

¹³² Cf. *J.W.* 2.136, 142 on the holy books of the Essenes as τὰ τῶν παλαιῶν συντάγματα and τὰ τῆς αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν βιβλία; text from volumes II (1927) and IX (1965) of *Josephus in nine volumes* (LCL).

¹³³ E.g. 4QMMT B, 5-8 (the sin-offering, על זבח חטאת), 9-13 (the cereal-offering, על זבח השלמים), 36-38 (the ritual state of sacrificial animals), 55-58 (liquid streams, על המוצקות); cf. literal references to purity regulations next to laws and precepts in B, 52, and the purity of the Temple in B, 54. Reconstructed text from Qimron & Strugnell, *DJD* X.

¹³⁴ For כְּתוּב as quotation-formula in 4QMMT, see G.J. Brooke, 'The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT', in M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez & J. Kampen (eds.), *Legal texts and legal issues* (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1997) 1-20.

the Essenes and Qumran from the priestly establishment. These dividing lines separated both the Essenes and Qumran as sectarian communities from the schools of the Pharisees and the Sadducees which belonged to the Palestinian-Jewish body politic.

6.4 A newcomer among the Jewish schools: the ‘Fourth Philosophy’

Extensive discussion of dissensions concerning the Temple cult of Jerusalem is missing from the above mentioned digressions of Josephus on these three Jewish sects. Josephus rather focuses on the philosophical issues. His digression in *Ant.* 18.9-25 adds a so-called ‘fourth school of philosophy’ to the three more established Jewish schools (*Ant.* 18.23-25).¹³⁵

The ‘fourth philosophy’ is described by Josephus as a dangerous movement because of its change of ancestral traditions (ἡ τῶν πατρίων καίνισις καὶ μεταβολή, *Ant.* 18.9). According to Josephus, the ‘fourth philosophy’ would bring about the factions and uprisings of revolutionaries, νεωτερίζοντες, and eventually ruin the cause of the Temple worship (*Ant.* 18.8-10; cf. *J.W.* 2.410).

It is important to note that in condemning this ‘fourth philosophy’, Josephus probably appealed to conventional suspicion of innovative and strange elements in religious movements, which was the case especially in Rome, where a plurality of foreign cults were founded and at times suppressed.¹³⁶ Thus, against the alien character of the ‘fourth philosophy’ (ἡ τετάρτη φιλοσοφία ἐπέισακτος; *Ant.* 18.9), Josephus stresses the antiquity in relation to the ancestral tradition of the three main Jewish sects of the Essenes, Sadducees and Pharisees in his *Jewish Antiquities* 18.11.¹³⁷ Nevertheless, the movement called by the collective noun ‘fourth philosophy’ attracted an abundance of followers according to Josephus (*Ant.* 18.9).

By the time the Jewish war against the Romans broke out, certain priestly circles had started to join the cause of the revolutionary party for theocracy and independence from Roman rule. This revolutionary cause entailed the rejection of every gift and sacrifice from foreigners, including sacrifices offered on behalf of the Romans and the Roman emperor.¹³⁸ The aggressive movement called the ‘fourth philosophy’ brought about the slaughter of fellow citizens (φόνος πολιτικός) and propelled ‘the bloodshed upon them’ (ὁ φόμος ὁ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς; *Ant.* 18.5, 8). It was therefore on the extremist side of the spectrum of views on the Temple.

7. Attitudes to the Temple in Jewish Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Second Temple period

There are various Jewish apocrypha and pseudepigrapha with passages concerning the Temple which are dated to the late Hellenistic period, the second and first centuries BCE, and the early Roman period, the first century CE up to 70 CE. These texts may reflect some

¹³⁵ On this ‘fourth philosophy’ started by Judas the Galilean and Saddok, a Pharisee, at the time of Quirinius’ Census (*Ant.* 18.1-4; 6 CE) and eventually led by Judas, see *Ant.* 18.4, 9-10, 23-25; cf. Acts 5:37; *m. Yad.* 4:8.

¹³⁶ Cf. the suppression of Egyptians and Jewish rites in Rome under Tiberius as ‘alien rites’, *externas caerimonias*, and expulsion of (Christian) Jews from Rome under Claudius related by Suetonius in his *Divus Tiberius* 36 and *Divus Claudius* 25. Concerning Rome as haven to Josephus’ labour as author of his voluminous work, see *Ag.Ap.* 1.50f. In the same book he goes at length to persuade his readers about the antiquity of both the Jewish religious tradition and the use of keeping chronicles of antiquity among non-Greek peoples.

¹³⁷ *Ant.* 18.11: Ἰουδαίους φιλοσοφαί τρεῖς ἦσαν ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου τῶν πατρίων.

¹³⁸ *Ant.* 18.23-24; *J.W.* 2.408-409f.

historical aspects of the Palestinian Jewish situation in that period. The texts discussed below contain significant references to the Jerusalem Temple and its priesthood, and in some cases they overlap with the sectarian library of Qumran, especially in the case of *Jubilees*.

It is very difficult to attribute the composition of such texts with any certainty to a particular Jewish school. In older scholarship, the authorship of certain pseudepigraphic texts has been directly attributed to specific Jewish schools. Thus, for example the pre-Christian portions of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and the *Psalms of Solomon* have been attributed to Pharisaic authorship by A.T. Robertson in his study on the Pharisees and Jesus.¹³⁹ In his discussion of the *Testament of Moses*, J. Priest has referred to the argument of R.H. Charles about a Pharisaic origin of this work.¹⁴⁰ The difficulty with such a perspective consists in the fact that criteria for identifying Pharisaic teachings can only be derived from ancient literature with an outsider's perspective on the Pharisees. There are no direct contemporary sources from within the Pharisaic movement about its self-definition. Thus it appears to be an insurmountable task to analyse the pseudepigraphic texts in search of evidence that they present an 'inside view of Pharisaism'. For the term 'Pharisees' is neither mentioned in any of the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, nor is it used as a self-designation.

In more recent scholarship such a highly specific identification has been abandoned because of the evidence of the complexity of Second Temple Judaism. James H. Charlesworth has written in the introduction to the two-volume 'Old Testament Pseudepigrapha' that the "pseudepigrapha are an important source for understanding the social dimensions of Early Judaism". He confirms the idea of R.H. Charles about the importance of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha for tracing religious developments between 200 BCE and 100 CE.¹⁴¹ Taking into account the uncounted gradations of form and content in Palestinian Judaism, Peter J. Tomson has alleged that the pseudepigrapha "can be roughly placed in the amorphous area between the periphery of the Essenes and the nucleus of the Pharisees".¹⁴²

Certain pseudepigrapha contain a negative picture of the contemporary Jerusalem priesthood. The historical divisions between the Jewish schools apparent from Josephus' works may in this respect be compared with the pseudepigraphic evidence. There were severe conflicts between the Pharisees and the Sadducees during the Hasmonaean period, in particular during the rule of John Hyrcanus and Jannaeus, concerning the priesthood. The separation of the Essenes from the regular Temple cult is another important factor in the emergence of diverging attitudes to ritual practices and to the priestly establishment. These historical circumstances played a part in the social setting of the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha.

¹³⁹ A.T. Robertson, *The Pharisees and Jesus. The Stone Lectures for 1915-1916 delivered at the Princeton Theological Seminary* (Duckworth: London, 1920) 9 writes on the possibility to "get an inside view of the Pharisaism of the time and to compare it with the pictures in Josephus and the New Testament". He further reads the anti-Pharisaic polemic in the Gospels as 'evidence' of 'formalism and hypocrisy as charge upon the Pharisees as a class' (23).

¹⁴⁰ J. Priest, 'Testament of Moses (First Century A.D.)', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *OTP I Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (Doubleday: New York (etc.), 1983) 921.

¹⁴¹ Charlesworth (ed.), *OTP I*, xxix.

¹⁴² P.J. Tomson, 'If this be from Heaven ...'. *Jesus and the New Testament Authors in their Relationship to Judaism* (The Biblical Seminar 76; Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 2001) 61-64 at 63.

7.1 Testaments

a. *The Testament of Levi*

The *Testament of Levi* is among the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, dated to the second century BCE, of which the composition stands in a “broad and free tradition” according to H.C. Kee.¹⁴³ In *T. Levi* 8, a vision attributed to Levi distinguishes between three offices in the posterity of Levi: a great first lot, a priestly role for the second lot, and a new name for the third lot. The reason for the new name of this third lot is the fact that “from Judah a king will arise and shall found a new priesthood in accord with the gentile model and for the nations”.¹⁴⁴ This description of a king from Judah could imply the house of David who instituted the priestly service in Jerusalem and king Solomon who built the first Temple.

Chapter nine of *T. Levi* refers to the law of the priesthood. The digression on this law emphasises the observance of the purification rites of the Temple cult in view of the impending defilement of the Temple in the later period, probably the contemporary Hellenistic period. Thus *T. Levi* 9:9 reads: “Be on guard against the spirit of promiscuity, for it is constantly active and through your descendants it is about to defile the sanctuary”.¹⁴⁵ Chapter ten explicitly identifies the sanctuary to which the purification rites and the impending defilement apply as the Temple of Jerusalem.

The corruption of the contemporary priesthood is the subject in chapter fourteen, where, among other things, the impieties of the chief priests (14:2), the plunder of the Lord’s offerings (14:5), sexual immorality (14:6) and conceit contrary to the commands of God (14:7), are analysed. In consequence of this we read at the beginning of chapter fifteen (15:1): “Therefore the sanctuary which the Lord chose shall become desolate through your uncleanness, and you will be captives in all the nations”. It is important to note that in a poetic fragment in 1 Maccabees 1:36-40, there verse 39, the sanctuary is also called desolate, but in 1 Maccabees this fact is attributed to lawless man who led Israel astray. In the *Testament of Levi*, the priesthood appears to receive the blame.

Chapter sixteen outlines a period of seventy weeks in which the priesthood is profaned and the sacrificial altars are defiled. Chapter seventeen refers to seven jubilees, to each of which a priesthood is assigned, but which show an apparent development of degeneration. Chapter eighteen provides a visionary perspective on the vengeance of the Lord which causes the priesthood to lapse and raise a new priest. The figure of the new priest is sanctified by heaven according to *T. Levi* 18:6: “The heavens will be opened, and from the temple of glory sanctification will come upon him, with a fatherly voice, as from Abraham to Isaac”.¹⁴⁶ The description of the new priest appears to have messianic overtones: “In his priesthood sin shall cease and lawless men shall rest from their evil deeds, and righteous men shall find rest in him” (18:9).¹⁴⁷ The ultimate responsibility for the integrity of the priesthood, however, lies

¹⁴³ H.C.Kee, ‘Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Second Century B.C.)’, in *OTP* I, 775-781 at 777 thus accounting for the loose relation between an originally Greek document and Hebrew and Aramaic testaments; cf. the Qumran texts 4Q540-541, possibly containing an Apocryphon of Levi. See the recent critical edition of the Aramaic *T. Levi* from the Cairo Genizah collection by É. Puech, ‘Le Testament de Lévi en araméen de la Geniza du Caire’, *RevQ* 20/4 (2002) 512-556.

¹⁴⁴ Translation from Kee, ‘Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs’, 791.

¹⁴⁵ Translation from Kee, ‘Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs’, 791-792.

¹⁴⁶ Translation from Kee, ‘Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs’, 795.

¹⁴⁷ Translation from Kee, ‘Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs’, 795. Cf. 4Q174 frags. 1 col. 1, 21, 2, ll. 7-9 concerning the rest which the sons of light obtain from all the sons of Belial.

with the descendants of Levi, as we read in *T. Levi* 19:1: "Choose for yourselves light or darkness, the Law of the Lord or the works of Beliar".¹⁴⁸

The contrast between light and darkness, the Law of the Lord and the works of Beliar corresponds with Qumran sectarian thought, in which the 'sons of light' and the 'sons of darkness', the 'deeds of God' and the 'dominion of Belial' are also contrasted to each other (cf. 1QS I, 9-10, 21-24; cf. 1QM I, 1-5). The defilement of the contemporary Jerusalem Temple is a shared perspective in the *Testament of Levi* and the literature of Qumran. However, the visionary perspective of the *Testament of Levi* on the figure of the new priest and the open ending on the subject of the ultimate responsibility of the descendants of Levi rather appears to contrast with the sectarian perspective of the Qumran community. The *War Scroll* (1QM), column I, 2-3 calls the sons of Levi, Judah and Benjamin the excluded sons of light, exiled in the desert. This extreme consequence of exile does not appear in the *Testament of Levi*. Thus, this pseudepigraphic text shows affinity with Essene and Qumran sectarian thought with regard to the criticism of the contemporary Temple cult, yet it does not appear to share the perspective of exclusion from the regular Temple cult and exile.

b. The Testament of Moses

The composition of the *Testament of Moses*, also known as the *Assumption of Moses*, has been dated to the first decades of the first century CE, before the destruction of the Temple, according to a scholarly consensus. Its provenance is situated in Israel.¹⁴⁹ G.W.E. Nickelsburg has described how this text recounts the narrative of Deuteronomy 31-34.¹⁵⁰

In the first chapter, 1:17-18, the Jerusalem Temple appears to be described in deuteronomic terms as the "place which (God) has chosen from the beginning of the creation of the world, (a place) where his name may be called upon".¹⁵¹ *T. Mos.* 2:4-9 refers to the building of the first Temple and the settlement of two holy tribes, but also to idolatry and violation of the covenant. The destruction of this Temple and the exile is related in 3:1-3.

Chapter 6 relates of the perversion of a king, "who will not be of a priestly family" and follows the priests who perform "great impiety in the Holy of Holies" (6:2).¹⁵² This king is often identified as king Herod the Great (37-4 BCE) in scholarly literature.¹⁵³ Thus, the perspective of the *Testament of Moses*, while being less versatile than the *Testament of Levi*, is also negative about the Hasmonean priests.

¹⁴⁸ Translation from Kee, 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', in *OTP* I, 795.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 80-83, 212-214; J. Priest, 'Testament of Moses (First Century A.D.)', in *OTP* I, 920-921.

¹⁵⁰ Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 80-81. Cf. Nickelsburg (ed.), *Studies on the Testament of Moses* (Cambridge, 1973).

¹⁵¹ Translation from Priest, 'Testament of Moses', 927. Cf. Deut 31:10-11, 24-26.

¹⁵² Translation from Priest, 'Testament of Moses', 930.

¹⁵³ Priest, 'Testament of Moses', 930 n. 6 b; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 213.

7.2 Expansions on Scripture

a. *The Letter of Aristeas*

The *Letter of Aristeas* is based on the tradition of the authoritative Greek translation of the Law of Moses, the Pentateuch; a translation which came to be known as the Septuagint. From the perspective of the Jewish diaspora in Egypt, this Greek translation is authorised by the religious leadership of the Jerusalem priesthood. Thus, we read in paragraph 39 of the *Letter of Aristeas* that elderly experts from various tribes were selected by the high priest Eleazar of the Jerusalem Temple. An extensive account of the Alexandrian delegation, headed by Andreas and Aristeas (§ 40), reflects the apologetic purpose of the *Letter of Aristeas*.

This letters contains no hint of criticism of the contemporary cult of the Jerusalem Temple. It should, however, be noted that the *Letter of Aristeas* presents an ideal picture of the early Hellenistic period.¹⁵⁴ It therefore does not touch on the developments in the Maccabean era and the polemic against the priestly establishment in the later Hasmonaean period. The account of the *Letter of Aristeas* is situated during the reign of the Hellenistic king Ptolemy II (285-247 BCE). Nevertheless, the composition of the *Letter of Aristeas* has been dated by a majority of scholars approximately between 150 and 100 BCE.¹⁵⁵

Various passages of the *Letter of Aristeas* refer to the Jerusalem Temple cult and to Jewish purity laws. Paragraphs 19 and 37 respectively comprise symbolical and concrete references to a thank offering to the ‘Most High God’. Paragraph 33 mentions the fact that among the gifts of king Ptolemy was ‘currency for sacrifices’, νομισμα εἰς θυσίας. The account of the journey of the Alexandrian delegation to Jerusalem includes a description of the view on the Temple upon approaching Jerusalem (*Let. Aris.* 83-84). Paragraphs 113-115 further contain a description of the lay-out of the land of Jerusalem and its environment. Paragraph 88 mentions an abundance of sacrifice in the Jerusalem Temple during the festival days in the course of the description of the sacrificial cult. Paragraph 89 refers to the supply of water for cleansing the large amounts of blood from sacrifices. In an ideal picture of the ministering of the priests, ἡ λειτουργία τῶν ἱερέων, the atmosphere of order and silence is mentioned repeatedly (§§ 92, 95). Paragraph 106 alludes to a main road from which people engaged in ordinary occupations keep away for the sake of the separation of ‘those involved in purification rites’, οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγνεύαις ὄντες, from defiling objects.

Apart from these concrete descriptions of the historical realities of the Jerusalem Temple cult, the *Letter of Aristeas* contains an apologetic exposition about Jewish laws of purity. Paragraphs 128-132 present an exposition about Jewish legislation concerning purity and impurity, cleanliness and uncleanness, which apply to modes of life and relationships. Paragraph 139 notes that the Jewish law directs the Jewish people to the purity of body and soul from false beliefs and the worship of the one God. Paragraphs 140-142 provide the apologetic perspective that the Jewish observances of food laws do not exist because of a primary concern with meat and drink, but that the laws aim to prevent a contact with bad influences. Apart from the food laws, the discussion in paragraphs 162-171 concerns defiling human acts and relationships. The moral argument underlying Jewish ritual purity and impurity is summarised in paragraph 169: “the whole underlying rationale is directed toward righteousness and righteous human relationships”.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 26-37.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. R.J.H. Shutt, ‘Letter of Aristeas (Third Century B.C.-First Century A.D.)’, in *OTP* II, 7-34 at 8-9; for the Greek text of the *Letter of Aristeas*, cf. H.St.J. Thackeray, ‘Appendix. The *Letter of Aristeas*’, in H.B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1914) 533-606.

¹⁵⁶ Translation from Shutt, ‘Letter of Aristeas’, 24.

b. Jubilees

The book of *Jubilees* has been dated between 161-140 B.C.E., partly on the basis of evidence from Qumran, while its composition is situated in Israel. The only complete text of *Jubilees* is the Ethiopic text.¹⁵⁷ The many fragments of *Jubilees* and *Jubilees*-like works which have been identified among the literature of Qumran (1Q17, 1Q18, 2Q19, 2Q20, 3Q5, 4Q216-224, 4Q176a/b, 4Q486, 11Q12), has led scholars to reconsider the context of *Jubilees*.¹⁵⁸ Apparently, the book of *Jubilees* gave expression to a renewed perspective on the covenant of Moses which fitted in with the sectarian thought of the Qumran community.

The idea of the Temple has a cosmic and predestinarian setting in the book of *Jubilees*. Thus, *Jubilees* 1:27-28 expresses the idea that the angel of the presence foretells Moses the building of the Temple. Interestingly, Zion and Jerusalem are mentioned side by side in references to their future holiness. The idea of the creation of the "sanctuary of the Lord" in Jerusalem upon Mount Zion is further voiced in *Jubilees* 1:29. The reference to "angels of sanctification" among the ministring angels in *Jubilees* 2:2 appears to evoke heavenly temple imagery. The blessing of Levi in *Jubilees* 31:14 is further accompanied by words which reflect heavenly temple imagery, "to serve in his sanctuary as the angels of the presence and the holy ones".¹⁵⁹ This heavenly temple imagery was a Jewish literary *topos*, as becomes clear from the comparable evidence of Philo and the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (cf. chapter 2 about the latter text).

A statement related to Noah in *Jubilees* 8:19 corroborates the impression that temple imagery and the creation of heaven and earth are interrelated: "And he knew that the garden of Eden was the holy of holies and the dwelling of the Lord. And Mount Sinai (was) in the midst of the desert and Mount Zion (was) in the midst of the navel of the earth. The three of these were created as holy places, one facing the other".¹⁶⁰

Jubilees 30:7-17 gives a specification of laws about forbidden sexual and marital relations for Israelites after a retelling of the biblical story about the retribution by Levi and Simeon of the shame of Dinah. *Jubilees* 30:15, puts those who "cause defilement" (by prohibited marriage with foreigners), those who "defile the sanctuary of the Lord", and those who "profane his holy name" on one par with each other. This harsh condemnation of defilement by mixed marriages with Gentiles seems to reflect the perspective of the author of *Jubilees* in an age when Hellenisation had come into crisis.

In relation to the feast of Passover and to the sabbath respectively, *Jubilees* 49:16-17.19-21 and 50:10-11 stipulate regulations concerning the sacrifices and offerings in the Temple. These regulations underline the centrality of the Jerusalem Temple cult in the perspective of *Jubilees*. The priesthood is also accorded an important place in Israelite identity, as is revealed by *Jubilees* 33:20 in which the holy people of Israel is equated with a 'nation of inheritance', a 'nation of priests' and a 'royal nation'.

¹⁵⁷ O.S. Wintermute, 'Jubilees (Second Century B.C.)', in *OTP* II, 43-44.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. C.M. Carmichael, 'The Story of Joseph and the *Book of Jubilees*', in T.H. Lim *et al.* (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 2000) 143-158 at 143, referring to a suggestion of Wacholder to 'reclassify *Jubilees* as a sectarian document rather than as part of the pseudepigrapha corpus'; to the contrary, C. Hempel, 'The Place of the *Book of Jubilees* at Qumran and beyond', in *Ibidem*, 187-196 at 195, concluding that "though *Jubilees* is not sectarian, it is clearly a literary pillar of the (Qumran) library".

¹⁵⁹ Translation from Wintermute, 'Jubilees', 115.

¹⁶⁰ Translation from Wintermute, 'Jubilees', 73.

c. Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities

Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* (*Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, hence *L.A.B.*) have been dated by D.J. Harrington to the first century CE, before the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 CE, for a number of reasons which are partly related to the attitude to the Jerusalem Temple: "the attitude toward the Temple and sacrifice (e.g. 32:3)", "the expression 'unto this day' in 22:8 suggests that the Temple still stands", and "the silence about the destruction of the Temple would be strange if indeed the Temple had been destroyed".¹⁶¹ According to C.T.R. Hayward, however, it is debatable whether this work has been composed before 70 CE or instead during the last decades of the first century CE, in view of the evidence of *L.A.B.* 19:7. Nevertheless, Hayward also concedes that most of the traditions incorporated in Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* antedate 70 CE.¹⁶²

In the *Biblical Antiquities* 19:10, the future Temple is among the vision about the land of promise shown to Moses: "And he showed him the measurements of the sanctuary and the number of sacrifices and the signs by which they are to interpret the heaven".¹⁶³ The narrative of Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* runs up to the death of Saul in chapter 65 and does not contain further explicit references to the contemporary Temple cult of the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

7.3 Apocrypha and pseudepigrapha related to Solomon

a. The Psalms of Solomon

The *Psalms of Solomon* have been dated to the first century BCE and the provenance of this work is related to Jerusalem.¹⁶⁴ The profanation of the Jerusalem Temple is a recurring theme in the *Psalms of Solomon*, and is probably related to the historical context of the Hellenistic period. Thus, *Ps. Sol.* 1:8 reads: "Their lawless actions surpassed the Gentiles before them; they completely profaned the sanctuary of the Lord".¹⁶⁵ The expressed profanation of the Temple may in this context convey a negative perspective on the contemporary priestly establishment. This impression is corroborated by *Ps. Sol.* 2, specifically concerned with Jerusalem. Here the profanation of the place of sacrifice by Gentiles (*Ps. Sol.* 2:1) is a matter for which the 'sons of Jerusalem', who defiled the sanctuary of the Lord, are implicitly blamed (*Ps. Sol.* 2:2).¹⁶⁶ *Ps. Sol.* 2 also says about the 'sons of Jerusalem' that they "were profaning the offerings of God with lawless acts".¹⁶⁷ The contempt and derision displayed by the Gentiles with regard to Jerusalem is further spelled out in *Ps. Sol.* 2.

Among the totality of eighteen Psalms, the profanation of the Temple is also the subject of discussion in some other Psalms. In *Ps. Sol.* 8:11-13, we read: "They stole from the

¹⁶¹ D.J. Harrington, 'Pseudo-Philo (First Century A.D.)', in *OTP* II, 299.

¹⁶² Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 154 f.

¹⁶³ Translation from Harrington, 'Pseudo-Philo', 328.

¹⁶⁴ R.B. Wright, 'Psalms of Solomon (First Century B.C.)', in *OTP* II, 640-642; cf. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 203-212, however, subscribing to the traditional but dated view that the *Psalms of Solomon* would originate from Pharisaic circles on the basis of theological items.

¹⁶⁵ Translation from Wright, 'Psalms of Solomon', 651.

¹⁶⁶ Wright, 'Psalms of Solomon', 652 n. 2d: "In the context of vs. 3, the Temple and the services, the "sons of Jerusalem" may be the priests who attend the sanctuary and the rites".

¹⁶⁷ Translation from Wright, 'Psalms of Solomon', 652.

sanctuary of God as if there were no redeeming heir. They walked on the place of sacrifice of the Lord, (coming) from all kinds of uncleanness; and (coming) with menstrual blood (on them), they defiled the sacrifices as if they were common meat. There was no sin they left undone in which they did not surpass the gentiles”¹⁶⁸. This polemical statement about the surpassing of the Gentiles in sins repeats *Ps. Sol.* 1:8. We may, therefore, suspect a consistent polemic against the contemporary priestly establishment in the *Psalms of Solomon*. The defilement of Jerusalem and the Temple is further mentioned in *Ps. Sol.* 8:22.

Ps. Sol. 10:7-8 stresses the mercy of God which brings salvation upon the house of Israel, and *Ps. Sol.* 11:1 anticipates on this salvation and points to the Jerusalem Temple in the following way: “Sound in Zion the signal trumpet of the sanctuary; announce in Jerusalem the voice of one bringing good news, for God has been merciful to Israel in watching over them”.¹⁶⁹ Although a polemic against the priestly establishment appears to be voiced in the *Psalms of Solomon*, this is not a polemic against the Jerusalem Temple *per se*.

b. The Wisdom of Solomon

The apocryphal *Wisdom of Solomon* is part of the Septuagint and belongs to the genre of wisdom literature. A version of Solomon's prayer for wisdom, which already figures in 1 Kings 3:6-9 and 2 Chronicles 1:8-10, is incorporated in Wis 7:1-14 and 8:17-9:18. The apocryphal expansion on this prayer also alludes to the dedication of the Temple. Wis 9:8 mentions God's command to build “a temple on thy holy mountain, and an altar in the city of thy habitation, a copy of the holy tent which thou didst prepare from the beginning”.¹⁷⁰ In his prayer for wisdom, Solomon entreats God to send divine wisdom from the “holy heavens, from the throne of thy glory” (Wis 9:10), and “thy holy Spirit from on high” (Wis 9:17). Although the prayer for wisdom is the central theme, this prayer is probably also related to the dedication of the Temple.

As the Temple, ναός, is called a copy of the holy tent, μίμημα σκηνης ἁγίας (9:8), which God prepared from the beginning, it reflects something divine. This image of a ‘holy tent’, related to the image of the Temple, is contrasted to the image of an earthly tent, τὸ γεῶδες σκῆνος, with which the perishable body is associated (Wis 9:15). The image of the Temple given in chapter 9 may be identified with the revelation of God's wisdom and the sending of God's holy Spirit (Wis 9:17). Interestingly, the link between the revelation of divine wisdom and the dedication of the Temple by Solomon is also made in 2 Maccabees 2:9 which reads: “It was also made clear that being possessed of wisdom Solomon offered sacrifices for the dedication and completion of the temple”.¹⁷¹

8. Issues concerning the Jerusalem Temple cult contemporary to Paul

8.1 The offering of the Gentiles in a Palestinian Jewish context

In the second book of Josephus' *Jewish War*, we find an important passage about the escalation of intra-Jewish confrontations concerning the relation of the Jerusalem Temple cult

¹⁶⁸ Translation from Wright, ‘Psalms of Solomon’, 659.

¹⁶⁹ Translation from Wright, ‘Psalms of Solomon’, 661.

¹⁷⁰ Translation from RSV.

¹⁷¹ Translation from RSV. The Greek text reads: διεσαφεῖτο δὲ καὶ ὡς σοφίαν ἔχων ἀνήνεγκεν θυσίαν ἐγκαινισμοῦ καὶ τῆς τελειώσεως τοῦ ἱεροῦ. It may be inferred from the last part of 2 Macc 2:8 that Solomon is the subject of 2 Macc 2:9.

to the rule of foreigners, that is, Roman rule (*J.W.* 2.408-422). A confrontation between a pro-Roman establishment and a revolutionary party, οἱ νεωτερίζοντες, joined by priests (*J.W.* 2.410) was the starting-point for the events leading up to the Jewish war (66-70 CE) according to Josephus (*J.W.* 2.417).

Distinguished Pharisees are mentioned, together with notables and chief priests defending the ancestral tradition which accepted the sacrifices of foreigners against an extremist party who would reject those sacrifices.¹⁷² The revolutionaries, however, eventually forced through their rejection of the political compromise, as expressed in dedicatory offerings to Caesar and the Romans, to the ideal of theocracy (cf. *J.W.* 2.412-416; *Ant.* 18.23f.). Josephus writes that the foundations of support for a pro-Roman Temple cult were crumbling: “even the Temple ministers failed to come to their support and were instrumental in bringing about the war”.¹⁷³

Although these aggravated confrontations were unprecedented, it may be assumed that the issues of the position of gift and sacrifice from foreigners, Gentiles (*J.W.* 2.409) or their worship (*J.W.* 2.414) were part of older disputes and crises. Contemporary poems from the Maccabean era, included in 1 Maccabees 2:7-13 and 3:3-9, blamed the profanation and the threat of destruction of the sanctuary on the Gentiles. 1 Macc 3:45 describes the consequence of profanation of the sanctuary by the Gentiles who took it as their lodging-place, κατάλυμα τοῦς ἔθνεσιν, with the following phrases: “joy was raised from Jacob, and the flute and the harp ceased to play”. Even though this could be regarded as Maccabean propaganda which only voiced the anti-Hellenist cause against the oppression of Antiochus Epiphanes and other hostile rulers, there are indications of long-standing negative sentiments about foreign influences on the Jerusalem Temple cult.

As regards the literature of Qumran, the sacrifice of the Gentiles appears to be described in a negative context in 4QMMT B, 3-9. The *Pesher to Habakkuk*, which conveys the sectarian perspective on the defilement of the contemporary Temple cult in various ways, characterises the nations, הגויים, who serve stone and wood as worshippers of idols (1QpHab XIII, 1-3). In the eschatological perspective of the *Pesher to Habakkuk*, the contemporary Temple cult appears to be contrasted to the ‘true service’, עבודת האמת (1QpHab VII, 11-12).

In the early Roman period, the influence of Gentile customs in Jerusalem was an issue which probably influenced the viewpoint of traditional factions among the Jewish schools on Gentile offerings. Under the kingship of Herod (37-4 BCE), foreign practices were introduced in Jerusalem, which disturbed the Jews for whom it was an impiety “to change their established ways for foreign practices”. Josephus writes about Herod’s violation of the ancestral customs, most of all through the introduction of images, as setting the precedent for neglect of piety among the masses.¹⁷⁴ Although the pagan ornaments and images were removed by Herod, it formed the impetus for the emergence of pagan images. The Roman procurator Pontius Pilate again attempted to introduce images in Jerusalem (*Ant.* 18.55-59).

The division among the Pharisees about the Gentile influence on the Temple cult may be inferred from the fact that the revolutionary movement of the ‘fourth philosophy’, except for its aggressive zeal for theocracy and independence, probably took its root from theocratic elements within the Pharisaic party (cf. *Ant.* 18.23). The politically charged question whether it was lawful to pay taxes to Caesar or not, which is posed to Jesus on behalf of the Pharisees according to Mark and Matthew,¹⁷⁵ is described in the synoptic Gospels as a trap to try to get

¹⁷² *J.W.* 2.408-417.

¹⁷³ *J.W.* 2.417. Transl. from Thackeray, *Josephus in nine volumes* II, 487.

¹⁷⁴ *Ant.* 15.267-277, there 275 ἀσεβὲς δὲ ξενικοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἐξαλλάττειν τοὺς ἔθισμούς.

¹⁷⁵ Mark 12:13-17; Matt 22:15-22. Luke 20:19-26 attributes this question to the scribes and the chief priests.

Jesus arrested. This question could however also reflect the division among the Pharisees themselves about the compromise of temple taxation and tribute to Roman rule.

8.2 The purity of the Temple and purity laws

8.2.1 Purity laws concerning the Temple cult

There were prescribed rites for the offering of sacrifices in the Jerusalem Temple. Aspects of these rites were a matter of dispute between the schools of Hillel and Shammai according to early Rabbinic literature (*m. Zebah* 2:4, 4:1). Deviations from the prescribed rites could invalidate the whole offering of the sacrifice or they could convey uncleanness. *m. Tamid* 1.2.4, 3:9 and *m. Middoth* 3:1.4 give prescriptions for the cleanness of the altar in the Jerusalem Temple.

Among the literature of Qumran, 4QMMT B gives an outline of 'some of the precepts of the Torah' which relate to the way various sacrifices should be offered in the sectarian perspective. The Essenes, who were barred from full participation in the Temple cult (*Ant.* 18.19), also had a divergent perspective on purification, διαφορότης ἀγνειῶν.

The importance of ritual purification surrounding the Jerusalem Temple cult is equally conveyed by a passage in the Acts 21:17-26, according to which Paul would have been urged to purify himself (ἀγνίξειν) together with four men under the Nazirite vow before entering the Temple. The concept of purification from impurity or sin, though detached from the ritual dimension of the Temple cult, is also present in Paul's letters (e.g. 1 Cor 6:11, 2 Cor 7:1).

8.2.2 Food laws

Another issue related to the purity of the Temple concerns food laws. The Qumran text 4QMMT B 62-64 conveys a notion of 'sacred food', that is, portions for the priests of the Jerusalem Temple cult. Various treatises from early rabbinic literature deal with the subject of food laws concerning the Temple cult, stipulating cases of food-uncleanness (cf. e.g. *m. Hal.* 1:8; *m. Me'il.* 4:5; *m. Tehar.* 1:1). However, the subject of food-uncleanness is also extended to the lay realm outside the context of the Temple cult (e.g. *m. Hul.* 4:7, 9:1.7; *m. Kel.* 8:10).

Pure food contrasts with the notion of defiling food, which occurs for example in 4 Maccabees, a work included in the Septuagint which has a philosophical framework to its narrative about the Maccabean period. The refusal to eat 'defiling foods', μισραὶ τροφαί, is here related to an unwillingness to transgress the Jewish law (4 Macc 4:26, 5:3.25-27). Food offered to idols, εἰδωλόθυτα, is also counted among defiling foods (4 Macc 5:2). The subject of food offered to idols is equally dealt with by Paul in his First Letter to the Corinthians (e.g. 1 Cor 8:1.4.7.10). Within a passage which begins with a general exhortation to shun the worship of idols (1 Cor 10:14-22), Paul again discusses food offered to idols in 1 Cor 10:19.

9. Summary

In this historical survey about Jewish attitudes to the Jerusalem Temple from the Maccabees to Paul's time, I have first shown how, in spite of the general acclaim of the Temple and the ongoing Jewish Temple religiosity, frictions also existed about the Temple. During the Hellenistic period there existed rival temples. The fact that Jewish attitudes to the Temple were far from homogeneous is substantiated by a survey of the Palestinian-Jewish situation.

Our attention has focused on the question of how the dividing lines among the Jewish sects, whose existence is attested from the middle of the second century BCE by Josephus, relate to their respective attitudes to the Jerusalem Temple cult. As Josephus' description of the Essenes, Pharisees and Sadducees mostly occurs in digressions, beside his chronological account of events, the picture of this historically grown spectrum of attitudes to the Temple remains fragmentary. Nevertheless, the divergent purification rites of the Essenes and the disputes between Pharisees and Sadducees concerning purity laws are examples of the problematic status of issues which surrounded the worship cult.

In the Hasmonean period, the attitude of the Pharisees to the Jerusalem Temple was probably coloured by the prevalent Sadducean influence on the priestly establishment and on the secular rule of John Hyrcanus I and Jannaeus. When the influence of the Pharisees grew and was consolidated from the late Hasmonean period onwards, the position of the Pharisees probably became increasingly related to the priestly establishment. In the early Roman period the Pharisees were part of the Jerusalem religious establishment (cf. *J.W.* 2. 411; *Life* 21, 190-191, 194, 196-198). Their popular influence even came to overshadow the position of the Sadducees, as they specified the sacred rites by their exposition (*Ant.* 18.15, 17). The attitude of the Sadducees to the Temple is associated with the priestly establishment in Josephus' works and the New Testament, but the Sadducean position was compromised by the popular influence of the Pharisees, according to Josephus.

The attitude of the Essenes to the Temple is described by Josephus as a predominant attitude of non-participation towards the regular cult of the Jerusalem Temple. Josephus relates the cause of the Essene exclusion from the regular Temple cult to their divergent rites of purification. This divergence in ritual practices, however, rather seems to be the outcome of the Essene breakaway from the Temple cult. Josephus, from his apologetic perspective toward a Hellenistic audience, only offers a glimpse of the Palestinian Jewish situation before 70 CE. This situation was characterised by a greater extent of divergence and polemic concerning the Jerusalem Temple cult. The Essene exclusion from the Temple cult was one exponent of this divergence, whereas the literature of Qumran and Jewish apocrypha and pseudepigrapha attest to the more widespread existence of divergence and criticism or outright polemic against the contemporary priestly establishment.

The attitude of the 'fourth philosophy' to the Temple was determined by the revolutionary character of this movement which turned vehemently against any foreign share in the Jerusalem Temple cult. The halting of cultic tribute to Roman rule by the revolutionaries is designated by Josephus as the incident which laid the foundation for war against the Romans (*J.W.* 2.409f.; cf. *J.W.* 6.99-110).

A survey of Jewish apocrypha and pseudepigrapha of the Second Temple period with regard to the picture of the Jerusalem Temple suggests that the Jerusalem Temple was very central to the Jewish worship cult. Nevertheless, a heavy polemic against the contemporary priestly establishment presents itself in the *Testament of Levi*, the *Testament of Moses* and the *Psalms of Solomon*. This polemic is related to the historical circumstances of severe divergence about the priesthood between the Jewish schools in the Hasmonean period. With regard to temple imagery, *Jubilees* comprises an interrelation between the image of the Temple and God's creation of heaven and earth. In the sapiential text the *Wisdom of Solomon*, the apocryphal expansion on Solomon's prayer for wisdom also contains elements of Solomon's prayer of the dedication of the Temple. Thus, an implicit relation can be discerned between the building of the Temple in Solomon's prayer for wisdom and Solomon's entreaty to God to send his holy Spirit.

The issues of moral purity, polemic against the contemporary Temple establishment, and the status of Gentile offerings, which play a part in contemporary Jewish attitudes to the Temple, are an important historical background to Paul's cultic imagery. Certain issues like

Paul and God's Temple

the offering of the Gentiles, purification and food laws, which were related to the ritual practices of the Temple cult and the holiness of the Israelite people, also found their way into Paul's letters.

CHAPTER 2

THE LITERATURE OF QUMRAN ABOUT THE TEMPLE

In this chapter, I present a thematically arranged discussion of texts from the literature of Qumran, focusing on issues which are related to the Temple. Legal texts connected to the early development and history of the Qumran community will first be discussed. Second, my discussion will turn to the architectural descriptions of a visionary Temple, as opposed to the historical Temple, in the *Temple Scroll* and the composition *New Jerusalem*. Third, texts implicating the Qumran community in the idea of an eschatological Temple will be discussed. Although the main body of the above mentioned Qumran texts allows for a thematic presentation, I will also deal with a combination of legal, visionary and eschatological aspects, wherever applicable. Passages which convey metaphorical levels of thinking about the Temple will be elucidated. Fourth, I will deal with a genre of texts, liturgical and poetical, which could have an indirect bearing on our understanding of the Qumran community's standpoint on the Temple and its cult.

My selection of Qumran texts is based on their importance within the whole of Qumran literature and the significance of the Temple in these texts. The aspects of the Qumran texts which are important for the general historical framework of Jewish attitudes to the Temple have already been discussed in chapter one. Finally, I will survey to what extent it is possible to discern a temple theology in the literature of Qumran, and what place issues of intertextuality and the use of Scripture have in this connection.

1. Purity laws and separation from the Temple cult

1.1 4QMMT

1.1.1 *The composite text and suggested contexts*

The much anticipated publication of the Qumran text from cave 4, which was named the 'Halakhic Letter' before,¹ was undertaken by E. Qimron and J. Strugnell in 1994 who gave it its definite title 'Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah' (MMT).² The title 'Halakhic Letter' of the unpublished text relates to the halakhot or legal issues which are found in the main halakhic section B of the composite text, as reconstructed by Qimron and Strugnell. The title of the publication in 1994 is a transcription from the Hebrew מקצת מעשי התורה, 'some of the works of the Torah'; a phrase which occurs at the end of the composite text in section C.

The reconstructed edition of six main manuscripts (4Q394-4Q399 or 4QMMT^{a-f}) is arranged in a tripartite text with sections A, B and C. Section A relates of calendar issues of religious festivals, while sections B (82 lines) and C (32 lines) form the main body of the

¹ E. Qimron & J. Strugnell, 'An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran', *Israel Museum Journal* 4 (1985) 9-12. Cf. O. Betz, 'The Qumran Halakhah Text Miqsat Ma'asê Ha-Tôrâh (4QMMT) and Sadducean, Essene, and Early Pharisaic Tradition', in D.R.G. Beattie & M.J. McNamara (eds.), *The Aramaic Bible. Targums in their Historical Context* (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1994) 'The Publication, Content, and Problems of 4QMMT', 176-179.

² Ed.pr. E. Qimron & J. Strugnell, *DJD X Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat ma'ase ha-Torah* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1994).

letter about the sectarian interpretation of some of the works of the Law. Section B is usually designated as the halakhic part, while section C is defined as the hortatory part.³ It is important to note that (the beginning of) section A is preserved very incompletely, small fragments of only one manuscript, 4Q394, being extant.⁴ However, the end of section C is preserved in fragments 14-17 of 4Q398 and column II of 4Q399, where in both cases the blank space after the last word of C 32 appears to indicate that no further text follows.⁵ Thus, the title of 4QMMT, *מקצת מעשי התורה*, is derived from C 27, but the beginning of the letter can hardly be reconstructed. As a result, the question about the addressees should be approached on the basis of the main body of the text.

Indications of a dispute about legal issues, communicated to addressees with the purpose of persuasion to the sectarian viewpoint, are found in sections B and C. The juxtaposition in section B between 'we', *אנחנו*, and 'they', *הם*, (e.g. in B 5-13), articulates a dispute about the regulation of legal matters, introduced in B 1 with the words *אלה מקצת דברינו*. The communication between 'we' and 'you' in sections B and C, and the exhortations at the end of the composite text, in part C, provide the reasons to identify the composite text as a letter. At the same time, the relation between sections B and C is problematic. In section B, a second person masculine plural, *אתם* (e.g. B 68, 80) is addressed, while in section C both a second person masculine singular (e.g. C 10, 28-30) and plural, (C 8), are addressed. In C 27 and 31-32 the second person masculine singular is addressed together with *עמך*, 'your people', and *ישראל*, Israel, respectively. These divergent forms of address complicate the question about the addressees and the context of 4QMMT.

Scholarly discussion of 4QMMT has focused on the use of Scripture,⁶ the relation of MMT's legal issues to rabbinic halakha,⁷ the relation of the sectarian legal perspective to the Palestinian Jewish schools of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes,⁸ the significance of 4QMMT for the (pre-)history of the Qumran community in relation to the larger Jewish

³ Cf. J. Kampen & M.J. Bernstein, 'Introduction', in idem (eds.), *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (SBLSymS 2; Scholars Press: Atlanta, Georgia, 1996) 1-7.

⁴ Cf. the reconsideration of fragments, associated with 4QMMT section A 1-18 and published as 4Q394 frags. 1-2, I-V, expressing doubt about their relation to 4QMMT as a whole and rather comparing it with 4Q327, by J. Strugnell, 'MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition', in E. Ulrich & J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (University of Notre Dame Press: Notre Dame, Indiana, 1994) 57-73, there 61-62; DJD X, 203-206; L.H. Schiffman, 'The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts', in Kampen & Bernstein (eds.), *Reading 4QMMT*, 81-98 at 82-86; J.C. VanderKam, 'The Calendar, 4Q327, and 4Q394', in M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez & J. Kampen (eds.), *Legal Texts & Legal Issues*. (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1997) 179-194.

⁵ PAM 42.368, Mus.Inv. 157c and PAM 41.823, Mus.Inv.292; plate VIII of DJD X. 4Q398 frags. 14-17, line 8 after *ולישראל* a blank space for the rest of the line; 4Q399 col. II, line 5, after *ל[י]שראל* a blank space for the rest of the line and 6 lines in addition, the total of lines, 11, corresponding to that indicated by the preserved bottom-right of column I.

⁶ Cf. e.g. M.J. Bernstein, 'The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations', in Kampen & Bernstein (eds.), *Reading 4QMMT*, 29-51; G.J. Brooke, 'The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT', in Bernstein *et al.* (eds.), *Legal Texts & Legal Issues*, 67-88.

⁷ E.g. Y. Sussmann, 'The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Preliminary Talmudic Observations on Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah', in Strugnell & Qimron, DJD X, 179-200; Y. Elman, 'Some Remarks on 4QMMT and the Rabbinic Tradition: or, When Is a Parallel Not a Parallel?', in *Reading 4QMMT*, 99-128.

⁸ L.H. Schiffman, 'The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls Sect', in H. Shanks (ed.), *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York 1992) 35-41 and idem, 'The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts', in *Reading 4QMMT*, 85, 87. Note the criticism of the 'Sadducean hypothesis' by O. Betz, 'The Qumran Halakhah Text Miqsat Ma'asê Ha-Tôrâh (4QMMT) and Sadducean, Essene, and Early Pharisaic Tradition', 176-202, and by L.L. Grabbe, '4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society', in Bernstein *et al.* (eds.), *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 89-108.

context,⁹ and on its significance for the Jewish context of the New Testament (in particular the correspondence between מעשי התורה in MMT and Paul's ἔργα νόμου in Galatians).¹⁰

Many scholarly studies of 4QMMT are concerned to place the text in a specific historical context. At the same time, basic problems of identification of the addressees of 4QMMT are acknowledged in the argumentation in favour of hypotheses about the sectarian community's supposed Essene or Sadducean origins. The structure of the composite text itself has also been the subject of recent redactional and rhetorical studies by M. Pérez Fernández and C.J. Sharp.¹¹ A rhetorical-critical approach applied to 4QMMT may give firmer ground to the analysis of the argumentation in MMT C and the identification of the involved parties.

1.1.2 *The rhetoric of separation in 4QMMT and its addressees*

The consensus about the extramural identity of the addressee(s) of the 4QMMT has recently become subject of discussion. S.D. Fraade associates the addressees of 4QMMT instead with candidates and neophytes on the basis of a rhetorical analysis of 4QMMT as intramural parenthesis and on the basis of a comparison with 1QS III, 21-25. Fraade further argues that nothing in the texts necessitates the idea that the letter should be understood in the context of extramural polemic.¹² This hypothesis about the intramural addressees of 4QMMT is also favoured by Maxine L. Grossman who pleads for reading 4QMMT in the context of an ideological tradition within the Qumran community.¹³

Fraade's hypothesis reveals that the identification of the genre and addressees of 4QMMT needs to rest on sound argumentation rather than on presuppositions which provide a poor basis for the study of the historical context to MMT. It is nevertheless also necessary to re-evaluate the identification of MMT's addressees with candidates and neophytes of the Qumran community. The type of persuasion used in 4QMMT may provide one entry to the identification of the addressees. In connection with this, it should be noted that MMT C does not appear to prescribe complete identification with the secluded situation of the community. The issue of persuasion in 4QMMT probably concerns deeds which support the Qumran legal perspective, *at least in part* (C 30), and which counterbalance the widespread transgressions which forced the Qumran community's separation (C 7-8).

If 4QMMT is a 'foundation document' specifically addressing neophytes, it should be possible to find similarities with other sectarian texts which comprise passages about neophytes. In this light, however, it is significant that for example the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document* address those 'who enter the covenant', that is, neophytes, in a very different way. The aspects of subjection to the authority of the men of the Community, shared

⁹ Cf. F. García Martínez, '4QMMT in a Qumran Context', H. Eshel, '4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period', and D.R. Schwartz, 'MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees', in *Reading 4QMMT*, 15-27, 53-65, and 67-80.

¹⁰ J. Kampen, '4QMMT and New Testament Studies', in *Reading 4QMMT*, 129-144; cf. J.D.G. Dunn, '4QMMT and Galatians', *NTS* 43 (1997) 147-153; M. Bachmann, '4QMMT und Galaterbrief, מעשי התורה und ἔργα νόμου', *ZNW* 89 (1998) 91-113; M.G. Abegg, Jr., '4QMMT, Paul, and "Works of the Law"', in P.W. Flint (ed.), *The Bible at Qumran. Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. & Cambridge, U.K., 2001) 203-216.

¹¹ M. Pérez Fernández, '4QMMT: Redactional Study', *RevQ* 18 (1997) 191-205 and C.J. Sharp, 'Phinehan Zeal and Rhetorical Strategy in 4QMMT', in *RevQ* 18 (1997) 207-222.

¹² S.D. Fraade, 'To whom it may concern: 4QMMT and its addressee(s)', *RevQ* 19 (2000) 507-526. Cf. his more recent article 'Rhetoric and Hermeneutics in Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah (4QMMT): The Case of the Blessings and the Curses', *DSD* 10 (2003) 150-161 which builds on the same 'intramural' hypothesis.

¹³ M.L. Grossman, 'Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History', *RevQ* 20 (2001) 3-22; see also eadem, *Reading for History in the Damascus Document. A Methodological Study* (STDJ 45; Brill: Leiden, 2002) 57-87 at 82.

property and a binding oath, which are among other things described in 1QS column V, do not correspond with the apologetic statement in 4QMMT C 8-9 about the sectarian (pre-)Qumran community. The role of the 'Inspector', המבקר, in teaching neophytes in the *Damascus Document* (CD-A XV, 5-17) and an analogous role of the 'Instructor', המשכיל, in the *Community Rule* (1QS IX, 12-19) does not seem to correspond with the general parenthesis in 4QMMT C 26-27 and 31-32. Shelomo Morag has further noted that the language and literary style of 4QMMT differ to such an extent from 'Classical Qumran works' like the *Community Rule* that its author can hardly belong to one and the same circle.¹⁴ This makes the idea of a tradition of intramural paraenesis shared by both the *Community Rule* and 4QMMT less likely.

In my view, 4QMMT presents the separation of the Qumran community not as an example of identification for the addressees, but as a necessity from irreconcilable divergences. The addressees of 4QMMT are informed that the sectarian community, on whose behalf the letter is written, has separated from the multitude of the people, מרוב העם,¹⁵ on account of abomination, התועבה, related in the context of violence and fornication, החמס והזנות, ruining places (C, 5-7). Deuteronomy 7:26 is quoted in C, 6 concerning the prohibition to bring an abomination into the house, which in this biblical context stands for bringing carved idols into the house (cf. Deut 7:25). The following line, C 8, further emphasises the separation of the sectarian community with a phrase which summarily describes the object of segregation: מהתערב בדברים האלה ומלבוא עמהם [לגב אלה], "from being involved in these affairs, and from participating wi[th] them in these things".¹⁶ The sectarian community urges the addressees to understand the book of Moses, the books of the prophets and of David and the events from generation to generation (C, 10-11). These are recorded as scriptural authority for the sectarian viewpoint about the matters of transgression and abomination.

The point of which the addressees need to be persuaded concerns the credibility of the sectarian separation from the people. Thus C 8-9 reads: "And you [know that no] treachery or deceit or evil can be found in our hand".¹⁷ The reader is rather to believe that this treachery, deceit and evil is perpetrated among the people by forbidden unions between priests and laity (cf. B 48-49, 75-82) and through other abominations (C 4-7). In spite of the sectarian separation, the authors of 4QMMT are concerned to communicate their viewpoint about priestly service in the Temple (cf. B, 9-13). Therefore, it does not seem likely that the point of persuasion is the readers' identification with the separation of the sectarian community.

The rhetoric of persuasion in 4QMMT is expressed, among others, through phrases of position and appeal, 'we are of the opinion that', אנחנו אומרים ש, found in B, 54-55 and 64-65, and 'you know that', אתם יודעים,¹⁸ found in B, 80 and C, 7. Another expression of sectarian position, אנחנו חושבים ש, 'we think that' is found in B, 29 and 36. The appeal to the knowledge and conscience of the addressee is further voiced through the request to remember David, who figures as an exemplary person in C, 25, זכור [את] דויד שהוא איש חסדים, and

¹⁴ S. Morag, 'סגנון ולשון במגילת מקצת מעשי התורה - האם כתב 'מורה הצדק' איגרת זאת?' [Language and Style in Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah – Did Moreh Ha-Sedeq Write This Document?], *Tarbiz* 65 (1995-1996) 210-223 + V-VII (English Summary).

¹⁵ Note that [מרוב העם] is the DJD X editors' reconstruction of the text. This reading, however, rather than another published alternative (מרוב העדה) appears to be consistent with the negative reference to the people, העם, in B 75 and with the exhortation in C 27 which does not address an עדה either, but 'you and your people'.

¹⁶ Text and translation from Qimron & Strugnell, *DJD X*, 58-59.

¹⁷ Translation from *DJD X*, 59.

¹⁸ Cf. the comparable rhetorical phrase in Greek, οἴδατε ὄτι.

through the exhortation to consider the foregoing matters, *הבן בכל אלה*, in C, 28. The appeal to the addressee is accompanied by a recognition of the fact that he is prudent and has knowledge of the Law: *עמך ערמה ומדע תורה* (C, 28).

Finally, the addressee is assured that finding truth in *some* of the sectarian words (במצאך מקצת דברינו כן) and acting accordingly for his own good and that of Israel will be “reckoned to you as justice”, *נחשבה לך לצדקה* (C, 31).¹⁹ The expected joy at the end of time (C 30) implicates the addressee(s) in the sectarian eschatological perspective on the blessings and the curses written in the book of Moses (cf. C 12-26). This perspective contrasts the wicked scheming and the counsel of Belial, *מחשבת רעה ועצת בליעל*, from which the addressees should keep far off (C 29), with the ‘seekers of the Torah’ (C 24).

The biblical history of the kings of Israel, which is presented to the addressee(s) as a mirror, concerns, however, the curses from the time of king Jeroboam to the time of king Zedekiah, the period of the exile (C 18-19). Thus, the text implicitly relates of idolatrous practices and the appointment of priests from among the people (cf. 1 Kings 12:28:33; 13:33-34 about Jeroboam), the desecration of the Temple, the captivity of Jerusalem and the king of Judah (2 Kings 24:10-17.18-20 about Zedekiah). On the other hand, part of the blessings appear to be related to the time of the building of the Temple under king Solomon (C 18).

The sectarian separation can also be understood in light of this eschatological perspective as a separation from the multitude of the people ‘from participating with them in these things’, that is, the regular Temple cult, until the return to Israel at the end of time (cf. C 12-16 and 21). The addressees are encouraged to search the Torah and to find proof for the correctness of some of the sectarian practices, while they are dissuaded from supporting the priestly establishment and the people against the sectarian standpoint. The expected deeds for the welfare of the addressee(s) and of Israel (C 31-32) are put in the perspective of the biblical history of Israel, but not in the perspective of a new covenant in which the addressee(s) is/are expected to enter.

1.1.3 *Halakhot pertaining to the Temple cult in 4QMMT*

4QMMT expresses an explicit sectarian viewpoint on the issue of the purity of the Temple, *טהרת המקדש* (B, 54). The exhortation ‘to be full of reverence for the Temple’, *להיות יראים*, *ממקדש* (B, 49), relates to the sectarian view on purity laws regulating the Temple service. The sectarian interpretation of ritual purity laws in MMT B introduces each issue with the phrase ‘concerning’, *על*. Thus, subsequently discussed issues such as the offering of the wheat of the Gentiles, *תרומת דגן הגויים* (B, 3), the sacrifice of the sin-offering, *זבח החטאת* (B, 5), the sacrifice of the Gentiles, *זבח הגויים* (B, 8), the cereal-offering of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings, *מנחת זבח השלמים* (B, 9), the purity of the heifer of the sin-offering, *טהרת פרת החטאת* (B, 13), evoke the elaborate system of purification rites of the Temple cult.

Among the issues of ritual purity, the sacrifice of Gentiles appears to be the object of polemic in B, 11-12. The reconstructed text of section B has a negative sectarian regulation against the wheat offering of the Gentiles mentioned in B, 7-8: [ואין לאכול] מדגן [הג]ויים [ואין] לבוא למקדש, “and not to eat from the wheat of the Gentiles and not to bring it to the Temple”.

4QMMT B, 79-82 counters intermarriage of priests with others than those prescribed among levitical instructions for priests (Lev 21:1-24) most polemically, associating this with defilement through fornications, *זנות*, in which part of the priests and the people,

¹⁹ See Genesis 15:6. The Greek version of this expression in Paul’s Letters (Rom 4:3; Gal 3:6), is *ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην*. Cf. M.G. Abegg, Jr., ‘4QMMT, Paul, and “Works of the Law”’, 207-213.

מקצת הכהנים והעם, are involved.²⁰ The exhortation that the priests should not lead the people astray figures twice in the halakhic part B of 4QMMT (B 11-13, 26-27). Thus, the negative reference to forbidden unions between priests and the people at the conclusion of part B, 79-82, appears to carry more weight as a polemic against certain priestly circles which had a great influence on the contemporary Temple cult. These circles, instead of watching over the ritual practices in order to keep the people from sin, even followed the practice of forbidden marriage with the people (4QMMT B 75-75; 79-82). The sectarian perspective reflected by MMT B harshly criticises the priesthood as corrupted and merely following the way of the people. Accordingly, the sectarian community eventually separated from the regular Temple cult whose situation was perceived as irreconcilable with its own moral and ritual standards.

1.1.4 *The eschatological perspective of 4QMMT on the Jerusalem Temple and Israel*

Apart from the evidence of concrete halakhot about the Temple cult, 4QMMT also comprises an eschatological perspective. In my view, the eschatological perspective on the blessings and curses of the Torah in MMT C is related to the sectarian view on the Jerusalem Temple and Israel in MMT B-C as a logical transition in the argumentation. I will demonstrate below how this transition takes place.

The hortative section C applies the occurrence of the blessings and curses ‘that are written in the book of Moses’ partly to the contemporary age (C 20-21; see also C 12-16, 18). The complete fulfilment of the curses and blessings is said to take place at the end of days, באחרית הימים (C 14 and 21; cf. באחרית העת in C 30). The blessings and curses relate to faithfulness and transgression of the Torah of Moses respectively. MMT C 6-7 refers to what is written in the book of Moses about abomination, and is followed by the statement about the sectarian community’s separation (C 7-8). C 10 again appeals to the book of Moses, but this time supplements it with the books of Prophets and the writings of David and exhorts the addressee(s) to understand them well. MMT C 18-19 mentions the Israelite kings, and king David in particular, as examples for the addressee(s) (cf. C 23, 25-26).

The subject of transgressions, for which the kings of Israel and the seekers of the Torah in general are forgiven, is probably connected to the abomination and ‘these things’ mentioned in C 6-8. In fact, ‘these things’ stand for the transgressions against legal regulations as defined from the sectarian point of view in the halakhic part B. Therefore, the blessings and the curses related to faithfulness and transgressions of the Torah concern the subject of purity and impurity. Many of the legal issues concern offerings in the Temple and the purity of the Temple itself. The eschatological perspective on blessings and curses in part C is implicitly linked with the halakhic perspective on purity and impurity, the purity of the Temple and the holiness of Israel in part B. The separation of the sectarian community implies a breakaway from the regular Temple cult which is associated with defilement and implicitly with the desecration and destruction which had befallen to it by the time of captivity and exile. The eschatological perspective on the return to Israel (וזה הוא אחרית) [אל], also implies a restoration and rededication of the Temple in view of the sectarian halakhic practices.²¹

²⁰ 4QMMT B 80-82, in 4Q396 Col. IV, 8-11. Cf. Philo, *Spec. Laws*. 1.101-104 concerning the special law (Deut 23:18) for the priesthood to abstain from every contact or exchange with harlots.

²¹ García Martínez, ‘4QMMT in a Qumran Context’, 15-27, 20-23, in his discussion of באחרית הימים in MMT C 18-24 and in other Qumran texts, has noted that the exact eschatological content remains unsure because of the uncertain identification of those in Israel who ‘will return to the law’. His conclusion that באחרית הימים in MMT represents the “first stage of an idea which in its more developed form is characteristic of the ideology of the Qumran group” (22) corresponds with the argument of Qimron & Strugnell, *DJD* X 120 about “the primitiveness of MMT’s theology vis-à-vis the standard sectarian theology of Qumran”.

1.2 The Damascus Document

1.2.1 *The text and composition of the Damascus Document*

The *Damascus Document* was first found among Genizah manuscripts of Cairo, of which fragments were published by Solomon Schechter in 1910, initially entitled 'Fragments of a Zadokite Work'. Subsequent scholarship on the *Damascus Document* has developed a consensus view about the twofold structure of the text.²² The Genizah fragments comprise two manuscripts, CD-A and CD-B. Columns I-VIII of ms. A and column XIX, 1-33 of ms. B are generally considered to be the first part of the composition, called the 'Admonition'. Column XIX, 1-33 can be compared to columns VII-VIII, 19 as an alternative recension.²³ The second part of the *Damascus Document*, columns XV-XVI and IX-XIV, comprises 'Laws'.

The scholarly perspective on the composition of this second part has come to be determined by a critical comparison between Qumran fragments of the *Damascus Document* and the Cairo Genizah manuscripts of the *Damascus Document*. The first Qumran fragments of the *Damascus Document*, found in caves 5 and 6, 5Q12 (5QD) and 6Q15 (6QD) respectively, were published by M. Baillet, J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux in 1962.²⁴ The majority of Qumran fragments of the *Damascus Document*, however, come from cave 4 and have been published by J.M. Baumgarten in 1996.²⁵

J.M. Baumgarten has reconsidered the textual study of the *Damascus Document* on the basis of earlier studies of J.T. Milik and the detailed examination of 4Q fragments. According to Baumgarten, the sequence of the text of this second part, a corpus of laws, starts with a number of supplements in the 4Q fragments and is followed by columns XV-XVI and then by columns IX-XIV of the Genizah text.²⁶ The reconsideration of the text of the second part, which contains the corpus of laws, has also invigorated the study of legal issues in the *Damascus Document*. Recent scholarship has paid more attention to the interrelationship between the laws in the *Damascus Document* and the use of Scripture concerning biblical law.²⁷

²² On the early interpretation of the Genizah manuscripts of the *Damascus Document*, see the article by S.C. Reif, 'The Damascus Document from the Cairo Genizah: Its Discovery, Early Study and Historical Significance', in J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon & A. Pinnick (eds.), *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery* (SJDJ 34; Brill: Leiden [etc.], 2000) 109-131. For a survey of scholarship from 1910 up to the 1970s, see P.R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* (JSOTSS 25; Sheffield, 1983) 3-47. Cf. S.E. Fassberg, 'The Linguistic Study of the Damascus Document: A Historical Perspective', in Baumgarten *et al.* (eds.), *The Damascus Document*, 53-67.

²³ Cf. P.R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 3.

²⁴ Baillet, Milik & De Vaux, *DJD III Let 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1962).

²⁵ J.M. Baumgarten, *DJD XVIII Qumran Cave 4. XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1996).

²⁶ J.M. Baumgarten, 'The Laws of the *Damascus Document* in Current Research', in M. Broshi (ed.), *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (The Israel Exploration Society, the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum; Jerusalem 1992) 51-62, there 52-54, listing 8 items as supplements before column XV; Baumgarten, *DJD XVIII*, 1-5, esp. Table 2 (4-5), listing twelve items as supplements before Column XV, while the 'Catalogue of Transgressors' is listed in Table 1 as a supplement belonging at the end of the *Admonition*.

²⁷ J.G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20* (Walter de Gruyter: Berlin & New York, 1995). C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document. Sources, Traditions, and Redaction* (Leiden: Brill, 1998). Cf. the articles of J.M. Baumgarten, 'The Laws of the Damascus Document between Bible and Mishnah', and of C. Hempel, 'The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT', in Baumgarten *et al.* (eds.), *The Damascus Document*, 17-26 and 69-84.

The 4Q fragments may, however, also throw a new light on the first part of the *Damascus Document*, the Admonition. J.M. Baumgarten's argument in the 1996 edition of the 4Q fragments about the centrality of the Laws in the *Damascus Document* has recently been criticised by P.R. Davies, as playing down the place of the Admonition as a mere 'introduction to the Laws'.²⁸ Thus, fragments 1 a-b and 2 column I of 4Q266 and fragment 1 of 4Q268 contain a piece of text which precedes column I of the Genizah ms. A of the *Damascus Document*. In 4Q266 fragment 1 a-b, lines 4 and 17 respectively mention the removal of the 'boundary' and slander against the statutes and precepts of God, which are important polemical themes in the *Admonition*.²⁹ In 4Q266 frg. 2, col. I, and 4Q268, frg. 1, five and eight lines respectively precede the text which corresponds to the beginning of the first column of Genizah manuscript A. The preceding lines of these two fragments, which partly overlap, focus on a divine revelation of hidden things to 'those who examine his precepts and walk the way blamelessly' (4Q266 2 I, 4; 4Q268 frag. 1, 6-7).

The *Admonition* includes many important passages concerning sectarian views about the Temple, like CD-A I, 3-8; III, 18-IV, 10; IV, 12-19; IV, 19-V, 19; and VI, 11-VII, 6. The 4Q fragments, which correspond to the Genizah text, show a close textual correspondence,³⁰ so that we may rely on the Genizah text in cases where no parallel 4Q fragments can be compared to a particular passage. In the case of the above mentioned five important passages about the Temple, we have six 4Q fragments and four fragments of 6Q15 which partly correspond to CD-A column I, 3-8, columns IV, 19-V, 19, and columns VI, 11-VII, 6.³¹ The passages in the *Admonition* which convey the sectarian view on the Temple may also reveal further details about the historical self-perception of the sectarian community.

1.2.2 Sectarian self-definition of the Qumran community and differentiation of rules

The (pre-)Qumran sectarian movement failed to persuade other influential parties of the sectarian standpoint in the legal dispute about the purity regulations of the Temple cult. The sectarian perspective on communal separation mentions violent conflicts and persecution as the point which marked the seclusion of the Qumran community into the desert. Thus, the *Qumran Peshet to Habakkuk* recalls the persecution of the 'Teacher of Righteousness' to the 'place of his exile' (1QpHab XI, 4-6).³² We may infer from CD-A I, 10-12 that the 'Teacher

²⁸ P.R. Davies, 'Reflections on DJD XVIII', in R.A. Kugler and E.M. Schuller (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls at fifty* (Scholars Press: Atlanta, Ga., 1999) 151-165 at 153-155. Cf. the earlier discussion of the relationship of the Laws to the Admonition in light of the 4Q fragments of the *Damascus Document* by M.A. Knibb, 'The Place of the Damascus Document', in M.O. Wise et al. (eds.), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran site. Present realities and future prospects* (New York, 1994) 149-162 at 151-155.

²⁹ Concerning the removal of the boundary, see CD-A I, 16; IV, 12; V, 20; XIX, 15-16. Concerning slander against the statutes and precepts of God, see CD-A V, 11-13; XIX, 5-6, 32.

³⁰ E.g. compare 4Q266 3, II, 5-13; 4Q267 fr. 2, 1-13 as well as 6Q15 fr. 3, 1-5 to CD-A V, 17-VI, 6; compare 4Q266 2, II to CD-A I, 21-II, 21. Baumgarten, *DJD XVIII*, 6 has noted: "The 4Q manuscripts tend to enhance the general reliability of the text extant in the Genizah versions of CD (..) the 4Q manuscript readings turn out to be, by and large, quite compatible with those of Text A". Cf. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 48-49, and idem, 'The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document', in Baumgarten et al. (eds.), *The Damascus Document*, 27-43 at 30: "The fragments from Caves 4, 5 and 6 confirm that D texts form a major part of the Qumran archive and that the text of Cairo ms. A is reasonably reliable".

³¹ 4Q266 frag. 2, col. I; frag. 3 col. II; 4Q267 frag. 2; 4Q268 frag. 1; 4Q266 frag. 3, col. II; 4Q269 frag. 4, col. II; 6Q15 frags. 1, 2, 3 and 4.

³² Cf. 4QMMT C 7-8; 1QpHab XI, 4-6 alludes to a persecution of the 'Teacher of Righteousness', מורה הצדק, up to the 'place of his exile', אבית גלותו. Cf. 1QpHab XII, 7-10 about the defilement of the Temple by the 'Wicked Priest' who perpetrated acts of abomination in Jerusalem, הקריה היא ירושלם אשר פעל בה הכוהן הרשע, מעשי תועבות ויטמא את מקדש אל וחמס ארץ המה ערי יהודה אשר גזל הון אביונים

of Righteousness', מורה צדק, had a formative influence on the development of the sectarian community. In the *War Scroll*, column I, 2, the sons of Levi, Judah and Benjamin are called the 'exiled of the desert'. Line 3 refers to the 'exiled sons of light'. As the term 'sons of light' appears to be a self-coinage of members of the sectarian covenant (cf. 1QS I, 9; III, 20-26), the association with the exile of the sons of Levi, Judah and Benjamin suggests the Judean setting of the Qumran community.

The opponents of the sectarian community are extensively characterised in CD-A I, 12-21, and II, 1, as, among other designations, a 'congregation of traitors', עדת בוגדים (CD-A I, 12) to whom the curses of the covenant apply, and as seekers of 'easy interpretations', חלקות (CD-A I, 18).³³ CD-A VIII, 8-9 gives a negative representation of those who 'did not keep apart from the people and have rebelled with insolence, walking on the path of the wicked ones'. This negative image probably also reflects the self-definition of the sectarian community in its separation from the majority of the people (cf. 4QMMT C 7). This idea is further corroborated by the fact that in the same column, VIII line 16, the 'converts of Israel', שבי ישראל – in columns III, 19 - IV, 2, related to faithful priests – are those 'who have turned aside from the way of the people'.

Nevertheless, this seclusion and 'separation from the majority of the people' did not mean a breakaway in terms of complete isolation from the ways of the land of Israel. For one thing, the existence of certain interrelations can be inferred, first of all, from the inclusion in the literature of Qumran of the *Damascus Document* with its community rules for related movements in Israel, probably groups of Essenes.³⁴ Manuscript B of the *Damascus Document* distinguishes between the 'rule of the land', סרך הארץ, and the 'rule of the Law', סרך התורה (CD-B XIX, 2-4; cf. CD-A VII-VIII). The rule of the land is in accordance with the custom of the law, מנהג התורה, on account of its antiquity, אשר היה מקדם, whereas the rule of the Law is rooted in the regulation of the teachings.³⁵ This differentiation, followed by the exhortation against contempt of commandments and statutes, which in the end-time would lead to God's punishment of the wicked (XIX, 5-6), is indicative of the sectarian self-definition. CD-A XII, 19-22 and XII,22–XIII, 7 further contain an exposition of the 'rule for the dwelling-place of the cities of Israel' and of the 'rule of the dwelling-place of the camps'.

In a more radical way than this differentiation, CD-B XX, 8-25 stresses the separate identity of the sectarian community by contrasting the 'house of the law', בית התורה, to the 'house of Peleg', or 'house of disunion', בית פלג. CD-B XX, 23-24 associates the 'house of Peleg' with the defilement of the Temple and the return to the way of the people (ויטמאו את המקדש ושבנו עוד אל דרך העם בדברים מעטים). It is significant for our idea of sectarian self-definition that the same column characterises the way of life of 'those who entered the covenant' in the following manner. They remain steadfast in the regulations of the Law, listen to the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness, קול מורה צדק (XX, 32; cf. line 28) and do not reject the 'just regulations', חקי הצדק (XX, 32-33). The contrast between the 'house of the law' and the 'house of Peleg' is not that between those who entered the covenant and those outside the covenant, but between those who transgressed the Law and those who adhered to it (XX, 25-28).

³³ Cf. 1QH^a X, 15, 32; 4Q163 (4Qpap pIsa^a) frag. 23, col. II, 10; 4Q169 (4QpNah) frag. 3-4, col. I, 2 and 7, col. II, 2 and 4, col. III, 3 and 7; 4Q177 (4QCatena A) frag. 9, line 4 (= col. II, 12) for the frequent designation of 'seekers of easy interpretations', דורשי החלקות, as polemic against the opponents of the sectarian community. Note that the 'congregation of seekers of easy interpretations', עדת ד[ורשי] החלקות, is situated in Jerusalem according to 4Q163 (4Qpap pIsa^a) frag. 23, col. II, 10-11 (PAM 41.213).

³⁴ For discussion of the tenability of a modified form of the Essene hypothesis, see the previous chapter one.

³⁵ כמשפט יסורים in CD-A VII, 8 and כמשפט יסורים in CD-B XIX, 4. About this variation among other divergences, see Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20, 153-156*.

The 'house of Peleg' could stand polemically for the contemporary priestly establishment. This may be derived from the fact that the transgressions of the Law by the 'house of Peleg' are related to the defilement of the Temple and to a return to 'the way of the people in some things', [דרך העם בדברים מעטינים] (XX, 23). *4QNahum Peshar* 3-4, IV, 1, associates the house of Peleg with the 'wicked ones of Judah' and with Manasseh.³⁶ Manasseh's reign over Judah is characterised in 2 Kings 21:1-18 and 2 Chronicles 33:1-20 as a seduction of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to idolatry according to the practices of the nations. This evidence corroborates the impression that the 'house of Peleg' or 'house of disunion' is a polemical label for the priestly establishment which went along with a Judean ruler who overstepped the Law and brought about the profanation of the Temple cult.

1.2.3 Polemic against the contemporary Temple cult in the Damascus Document

The prophetic tradition of cult criticism is radicalised in the literature of the Qumran community which had separated from the contemporary Temple cult. The priority of the moral way of life in accordance with God's commandments precludes participation in the contemporary cult of the Jerusalem Temple according to the sectarian view. This sectarian view considers the contemporary Temple cult as immoral and defiled.

CD-A VI, 11-14 motivates the sectarian non-participation in the sacrificial cult of the Jerusalem Temple with a quotation from Malachi 1:10. In the contemporary era, which is viewed as an 'age of wickedness' (CD-A VI, 14), the members of the covenants "shall not enter the Temple to kindle his altar in vain", לבלתי בוא אל המקדש להאיר מזבחו חנם (CD-A VI, 13).³⁷ The passage of Malachi in which Mal 1:10 occurs voices a sharp polemic against Judah and the priests of the Jerusalem Temple, aiming to put an end to vain worship and to reform the priesthood in presenting a right worship cult which is pleasing to God (Mal 1:6-9, 2:10-12, 3:1-4). The sectarian interpretation of prophetic cult criticism has turned away from the contemporary Temple establishment as the legitimate representation of the priestly covenant.³⁸ This is implied by the association of wicked wealth with the wealth of the Temple (CD-A VI, 15-16) and by the fact that the defilement of the Temple (CD-A IV, 18) is mentioned.

CD-A XI, 17-21 reaffirms the sectarian idea of non-participation in the contemporary Temple cult which was viewed as profaned. In this case a quotation from Proverbs 15:8 serves as proof-text: "the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination, but the prayer of the just is like an agreeable offering". Significantly, the symbolism of the prayer of the just as an agreeable offering, כמנחת רצון, is the sectarian rendering of the last part of Prov 15:8. For the Masoretic text reads instead: "the prayer of the upright is his desire", ותפלת ירשים רצונו.³⁹

³⁶ Cf. G.L. Doudna, *4Q Peshar Nahum. A Critical Edition* (Sheffield AP: Sheffield, 2001) 212-213, 536-541 who argues for the reading ויר בית פלג which is compared with later rabbinic discussion of 'the Generation of the Separation'; cf. pp. 647-649 where Doudna identifies Manasseh with the Wicked Priest.

³⁷ Hebrew text from E. Qimron, 'The Text of CDC', in M. Broshi (ed.), *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem, 1992) 20-21; ET from García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition I*, 559.

³⁸ *Contra* P.R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 134-140 who interprets CD-A VI, 11-14 in light of laws contained in columns IX, XI and XII as evidence of conditional participation in the Temple cult. His interpretation (138-139), however, depends on a translation of this passage which takes אם לא in CD-A VII, 14 as a negative condition, but this translation of אם לא as 'unless' is disputable. It could rather be translated as 'certainly', like in sentences constituting an oath.

³⁹ Among the biblical scrolls of the literature of Qumran, 4QProv^b (4Q103) includes the Hebrew text of Proverbs 15:8 very fragmentarily. LXX Proverbs 15:8 εὐχαὶ δὲ κατευσθύνων δεκταὶ παρ' αὐτῷ corresponds closely to the MT. P.R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 134-140 who argues in favour of the idea of the "community's

1.2.4 *Covenant and Temple in the Damascus Document*

a. *The role of Temple and priesthood in the covenant of the forefathers*

As I have already briefly discussed above, the historical self-perception of the sectarian community is bound up with its perspective on the Temple. In this section, I will discuss the relation between covenant and Temple in the *Damascus Document*, in which the sectarian view on the Jerusalem Temple and Israel has an important place.

In CD-A I, 3-5, we read about the sectarian perspective on the destruction of the First Temple and the subsequent exilic and post-exilic situation: “For when they were unfaithful in forsaking Him, He hid his face from Israel and from his sanctuary and delivered them up to the sword. But when He remembered the covenant with the forefathers, He saved a remnant for Israel and did not deliver them up to destruction”.⁴⁰ It can be inferred from the context that Israel’s unfaithfulness was probably rooted in impurity and profanation of the worship cult in the sectarian perspective. CD-A I, 13-14 quotes Hosea 4:16 which compares Israel’s stubbornness with a stubborn heifer, while CD-A II, 1, mentions the ‘unclean deeds’, מעשיהם לנדה, of the congregation of traitors who led Israel astray. The iniquities of Israel are thus related to the profanation of the Temple cult by uncleanness and immorality.

A recurring element in the interpretation of God’s wrath against Israel is the ‘removal of the boundary’ of the forefathers which brings about the vengeance of the covenant through curses. This point is mentioned in CD-A I, 16 (ולסיע גבול אשר גבלו ראשנים בנחלתם). According to a 4Q fragment which precedes the beginning of CD-A, complete destruction will befall those who lift the boundary (4Q266 frag. 1 a-b, lines 3-5). The distance of a boundary is implied in CD-A IV, 12a: “בנתה הגדר רחק הרחק: “The wall has been built, the boundary is far away”.⁴¹ This statement occurs in a context in which a period of atonement has been completed according to God’s covenant with the forefathers. After the completion of this period there will no longer be any joining with the house of Judah (CD-A IV, 9-12).

At the end of a passage about the iniquities of those who act and speak against the statutes of God’s covenant (CD-A IV,19-V,19), we read again about the removal of the boundary by those who made Israel sin ‘in the age of devastation of the land’ (CD-A V 20). CD-B XIX, 15-16 refers to the removal of the boundary through a quotation from Hosea 5:10, and applies this citation to those who entered the covenant but do not remain steadfast in the precepts of the covenant. Because of the relation between the boundary of the inheritance of the forefathers and the covenant, we may conclude that the underlying idea is circumvented by boundaries of a life in accordance with God’s precepts in the land of Israel (cf. CD-A II, 7-9, 17-21; III, 12-16).

From at least one passage, CD-A V 17-20, it becomes clear that the conflict between those who have removed the boundary and those who act according to the exact interpretation of the Law also concerns the Temple cult. Thus, CD-A V, 17-19 contrasts Moses and Aaron to Jannes and his brother. False prophecy which makes Israel stray from following God stems from the latter (CD-A V,20-VI,2), while men with understanding are raised from Aaron and from sages in Israel (CD-A VI, 2-3). As Aaron stands for the priesthood, and as those who have been brought into the covenant are warned not to enter the Temple to kindle God’s altar in vain in the contemporary ‘age of wickedness’ (CD-A VI, 11-14), the underlying conflict concerns also the Temple cult.

continued use of the Temple” (134) does not appear to appreciate the significant difference between the sectarian rendering of Proverbs 15:8 and the Masoretic Text of Proverbs 15:8.

⁴⁰ ET from García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition I*, 551.

⁴¹ Qimron, ‘The Text of CDC’, 16-17; cf. P.R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 242-243.

CD-A III,18-IV,10 reflects the sectarian perspective on the priestly character of the covenant of the forefathers. The preceding passage, CD-A III, 12-16, describes God's establishment of a covenant with Israel for ever. CD-A III, 18 mentions God's atonement for the iniquities of Israel. CD-A III, 19 puts this idea of atonement in the perspective of God's building of a 'firmly established' or 'lasting' house in Israel, בית נאמן בישראל, "such as there has not been since ancient times, not even now", אשר לא עמד כמהו למלפנים ועד הנה.⁴² This 'house' is probably the Temple, for line 20, which attributes eternal life to those who "remained steadfast in it", appears to run parallel to col. IV, 4 in which the sons of Zadok are called the "men of renown, who stand (to serve) at the end of days".

J. Kampen has argued that the 'lasting house', בית נאמן, mentioned in this passage, stands for a future, eschatological Temple and is related to the new covenant.⁴³ However, the new covenant is not mentioned in this connection. CD-A IV, 9-10 rather draws an analogy with the atonement through God's covenant with the forefathers. The interpretation of Ezekiel 44:15 in CD-A III, 20- IV, 4 does relate the priests, the levites and the sons of Zadok to those who stand to serve at the end of days. The 'lasting house', בית נאמן, in CD-A III, 19, can, however, also be understood in conjunction with God's eternal covenant with Israel, mentioned in CD-A III, 12-13 (cf. CD-A III, 2-4). That is, the concept of a 'lasting house' may express the temple-theological thought of continuity in the priestly covenant. The 'lasting house' could represent a metaphorical way of thinking about the Temple, but it is related to the covenant of the forefathers as well.⁴⁴ This covenant of the forefathers is thereby characterised as a priestly covenant.

b. *The pesher on Isaiah 24:17 in CD-A IV, 12-19: The three nets of Belial*

The defilement of the Temple figures prominently in column IV of the *Damascus Document* (CD-A) which gives a sectarian interpretation of Isaiah 24:17 on the three 'nets of Belial', שלושת מצודות בליעל (IV, 12-19). This pesher on Isaiah 24:17 comes after a description of the establishment of God's covenant with the forefathers (הראשנים) to atone for their iniquities, לכפר על עונותיהם (IV, 9-10). The covenant of atonement for iniquities was regulated by the priestly service in the Temple (cf. III, 21 – IV, 4). According to the sectarian viewpoint, however, this priestly covenant was corrupted through the defilement of the Temple, טמא המקדש (CD-A IV, 18).

It is important to note that CD-A IV, 14-15f. attributes the interpretation of Isaiah 24:17 concerning the three nets of Belial to Levi, son of Jacob. Levi is the biblical prototype for the levitical priesthood and also figures in pseudepigraphical literature.⁴⁵ The sectarian exposition about the three nets of Belial may therefore reflect a particular perspective on the priesthood. It should be noted that the *Testament of Levi*, as we have discussed in the previous chapter, also refers to the defilement of the Temple as well as to the contrast between God's covenant and the dominion of Belial.

⁴² Qimron, 'The Text of CDC', 14-15; transl. from García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition* I, 555.

⁴³ J. Kampen, 'The Significance of the Temple in the Manuscripts of the Damascus Document', in Kugler & Schuller (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls at fifty*, 185-197 at 193-195.

⁴⁴ Cf. a discussion of earlier scholarship on this passage by P.R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 90-104; idem, 'The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document', *JJS* 33 (1982) 287-301 at 290, pointing to the contrast between the description of the community as a "house" in CD-A III, 19 and 1 Sam 2:35 where the term designates a priestly dynasty.

⁴⁵ Cf. Num 3:5-13; Deut 18:1-2f. Cf. 4Q213b (*4QAramaic Levi*) 4-6 (=Cairo Genizah *Testament of Levi*, *Bodleian col.* a 15-20).

The three nets of Belial in CD-A IV, 15-18 comprise fornication, הזנות, wealth, ההון, and the defilement of the Temple, טמא המקדש, and the nets are interrelated.⁴⁶ Thus we read in CD-A IV, 18-19: "He who eludes one will be caught in another, and he who is delivered from one will be caught in another". This idea is further elaborated in the subsequent columns V and VI. CD-A V, 6-7 describes the defilement of the Temple due to the transgression of laws on sexual purity. These laws prohibit sexual relations with menstruating women and with blood relations (CD-A V, 7-11).

It is further important to note an analogy between CD-A V lines 6 and 11 respectively: וגם מטמאים הם את המקדש in line 6 and וגם את רוח קדשיהם טמאו in line 11. The defilement of the Temple is due to the transgression of the Law, while the defilement of people's holy spirit is caused by speaking with a blasphemous tongue about the statutes of God's covenant as being unfounded (CD-A V, 12). This analogy may reflect the importance of the concept of the Holy Spirit for the Qumran community in relation to the concept of the Temple.

In CD-A VI, 15-16, the interrelationship between wealth and the defilement of the Temple is the subject of discussion. Thus, after a passage about the vanity of the Temple cult in the age of wickedness (CD-A VI, 11-14), CD-A VI, 15-16 exhorts those who adhere to the sectarian idea of the covenant to abstain from, among other things, 'wicked wealth which defiles, by promise, by vow, or by the wealth of the Temple' (להנזר מהון הרשעה הטמא) (בדר ובחרם ובהון המקדש). The idea of the wealth of the Temple as wicked wealth is a *topos* also in the *Pesher to Habakkuk* which refers to the accumulation of riches from plunder by the last priests of Jerusalem (1QpHab IX, 4-5) and to plunder of the possessions of the poor by the Wicked Priest (1QpHab XII, 7-10).

c. The New Covenant and the Temple in the Damascus Document

CD-A VI, 19 mentions a new covenant, הברית החדשה. This reference to a new covenant is preceded (lines 14-19) and followed (VI, 20 - VII, 4) by regulations for life according to the 'exact interpretation of the law for the age of wickedness', כפרוש התורה לקץ הרשע, (CD-A VI, 14). These regulations comprise a notion of purity involving both body and spirit, as testified by CD-A VII, 3-4: כאשר הבדיל את רוח קדשיו כאשר הבדיל "to keep apart from every uncleanness according to their regulations, without anyone defiling his holy spirit, according to what God kept apart from them".⁴⁷

It is important to note that the two parts of the above sentence are linked by the correspondence between ולהבדיל כמשפטם in the first part and כאשר הבדיל אל להם in the second part. Thus, those who abstain from all forms of uncleanness as defined by God's regulations do also keep their holy spirit free from defilement. This interpretation corresponds also to the above mentioned passage in CD-A V, 11, which refers to the defilement of the holy spirit of those who have spoken with a blasphemous tongue against God's statutes as being unfounded.

The 'new covenant' in CD-A VI, 19 appears to be the covenant which is already mentioned in line 11 of the same column. Thus, those who enter the new covenant by implication refrain from full participation in the Temple cult during 'the age of wickedness'. The new covenant therefore entails a negative perspective on the contemporary Temple cult.

The 'new covenant', ברית החדשה, also occurs in the part of the *Laws* in CD-B XX. Here it stands for a trustworthy arrangement which was established in the land of Damascus

⁴⁶ Cf. H. Kosmala, 'The three nets of Belial. A Study in the Terminology of Qumran and the New Testament', *ASTI* 4 (1965) 91-113.

⁴⁷ Hebrew text by Qimron, 'The text of CDC', 9-49 at 22-23; translation by García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition* I, 561.

(CD-B XX, 12). This new covenant figures in the context of a polemic against those who “spoke falsehood about the just regulations and despised the covenant” (CD-B XX, 11-12). This polemic reflects a negative perspective on the contemporary age, which in lines 15-16 is characterised as the ‘age of wrath of God against Israel’. CD-B XX, 23 relates the ‘age of Israel’s unfaithfulness’ to the defilement of the Temple. The sectarian concept of the new covenant in the *Damascus Document* entails an eschatological perspective on the transformation of the Temple rather than a definite substitution for it.⁴⁸

1.2.5 Offerings for the Temple and sectarian worship in CD-A XI, 17 - XII, 1

Apart from the *Admonition*, the section on *Laws* in the Damascus Document includes regulations concerning the worship cult as prescribed for the sectarian community. The regulations in CD-A XI, 17-21 appear to underline the separation of the sectarian community from the regular Temple cult. Nevertheless, the rule that “no one should offer anything upon the altar on the sabbath, except the sacrifice of the sabbath” (CD-A XI, 17-18),⁴⁹ seems to make an exception for the sacrifice of the sabbath. This exception is motivated by a quotation from Leviticus 23:38 as biblical proof-text in CD-A XI, 18.

CD-A XI, 18-21 stipulates the necessity of non-participation in sacrifices or other kinds of offerings which defile the altar through impurity. Proverbs 15:8 proves this point in CD-A XI, 20-21: “the sacrifice of the wicked ones is an abomination, but the prayer of the just ones is like an agreeable offering”.⁵⁰ The wicked ones implied in this context appear to stand for the contemporary priestly establishment, who allowed the defilement of the Temple to take place in the sectarian perspective. The prayer of the just ones could be related to the sectarian worship.

In a study concerning the ‘house of prostration’, בית השתחורת, in CD-A XI, 22, Annette Steudel has argued that this should be identified with a sectarian place of worship as a ‘duplicate of the Temple’, as compared to the Essene synagogues mentioned in Philo. Steudel further interprets the בית קודש, the holy house, in CD-A XII, 1 in connection with the sectarian place of worship, referring to it as a prayer-service.⁵¹ In light of this interpretation, the quotation from Proverbs 15:8 also gains importance, implying the sectarian non-participation in the regular Temple cult and the prayer as an agreeable offering which constitutes a temporary sectarian substitution for the defiled Temple cult.

2. Visions of the Temple

2.1 The Temple Scroll

2.1.1 The text and its sources

One of the extensive number of preserved scrolls among the finds in eleven caves of Qumran is the *Temple Scroll* with sixty-six columns. 11QT^a was published in three volumes by Y. Yadin in Hebrew in 1977 and in a revised English edition in 1983. In 1996, E. Qimron

⁴⁸ Cf. 1QpHab VII, 9-14 about the sectarian belief in the eventual restoration of the ‘true (Temple) service’.

⁴⁹ ET from García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition* I, 569.

⁵⁰ ET from García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition* I, 571.

⁵¹ A. Steudel, ‘The Houses of Prostration CD XI, 21-XII, 1 – Duplicates of the Temple (1)’, *RevQ* 16 (1993) 49-68.

published a ‘critical edition with extensive reconstructions’. This edition incorporates all textual witnesses, including the preliminary publication of 11QT^b by F. García Martínez in 1992. F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar and A.S. van der Woude published 11QT^b in 1998.⁵²

Although the *Temple Scroll* contains no explicit quotations from Scripture, the description of the Temple as envisaged by this text may well be based on sources. M.O. Wise has distinguished four possible sources to the *Temple Scroll*: the Deuteronomy Source (D), the Temple Source, the Midrash to Deuteronomy (MD), and the Festival Calendar.⁵³ The idea of a Temple Source is of particular interest to our survey. Wise has concluded from his comparative analysis of the description of the Temple in the *Temple Scroll* and in the ‘New Jerusalem Text’⁵⁴ that both texts “come from the same priestly and scribal circles”.⁵⁵

Wise’s hypothesis has received a critical response by F. García Martínez who acknowledges the use of sources by the author of the *Temple Scroll*, but refutes the idea of a non-sectarian provenance of 11QT. Quite the contrary, the analysis by García Martínez reaffirms the idea that the redactional framework of 11QT reflects sectarian ideology and that it conforms with other sectarian Qumran texts.⁵⁶ By pointing to correspondence with other sectarian Qumran texts, E. Eshel has made a case-study which argues for 4QLev^d as a common source for the *Temple Scroll* and 4QMMT.⁵⁷ L.H. Schiffman has recently analysed the use of the expression ‘City of the Sanctuary’, עיר המקדש, in the *Damascus Document*, the *Temple Scroll*, 4QMMT, and 4Q Historical Text (4Q248). He has concluded that the term commonly applies to the Temple precincts rather than Jerusalem at large in Qumran sectarian thought.⁵⁸

The above examples of scholarly analyses make a strong case for 11QT’s place in Qumran sectarian thought. Nevertheless, this may not preclude general connections with non-sectarian temple theology as far as the covenant between God and the people of Israel is concerned. Considering the presence of certain pseudepigrapha and other non-sectarian texts in the Qumran library, the Qumran literature cannot have been composed in complete isolation from surrounding Palestinian-Jewish society. As we have seen in our discussion of the *Damascus Document*, there probably were interrelations between different sectarian orders and their settlements, including the Qumran community.

⁵² Y. Yadin, *Megillat ham-miqdash – The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, The Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Shrine of the Book, Hebrew 1977, rev.ed. in English 1983, JDS). E. Qimron, *The Temple Scroll. A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Ben Gurion University of the Negev Press, 1996) 5 n.12 about the preliminary publication of 11QT^b. ‘11Q20 (11QT^b) 11QTemple^b’ in F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, A.S. van der Woude, *DJD XXIII Qumran Cave 11. II: 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1998) 357-409, pls. XLI-XLVII.

⁵³ M.O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago: Chicago, 1990) there p. 64 assigns 11QT^a III,1-XIII,8, XXX,3-XXXI,9a, XXXI,10-XXXIV,12a, XXXIV,15-XXXV,9a, XXXV,10-XXXIX,5a, XXXIX,11b-XL,5, XL,7-XLVIII,12a, XLIV,1-XLV,7a, XLVI,1-11a, and XLVI,13-XLVII,2 to the ‘Temple Source’.

⁵⁴ See on this text my section 2.2 below.

⁵⁵ Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll*, 64-84 at 84, favours the priority of the New Jerusalem text as the source material for the Temple Source.

⁵⁶ F. García Martínez, ‘Source et rédaction du Rouleau du Temple’, *Henoah* 13 (1991) 219-230.

⁵⁷ E. Eshel, ‘4QLev^d: A possible source for the Temple Scroll and *Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah*’, *DSD* 2 (1995) 1-13.

⁵⁸ L.H. Schiffman, ‘*Ir Ha-Miqdash* and its meaning in the Temple Scroll and other Qumran texts’, in A. Houtman, M.J.H.M. Poorthuis, and J. Schwartz (eds.), *Sanctity of time and space in tradition and modernity* (Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 1; Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1998) 95-109.

2.1.2 *The vision of the Temple in the Temple Scroll*

It is to be doubted whether the detailed description of the Temple in the *Temple Scroll* is directly derived from the historical situation of the Jerusalem Temple as it actually existed. In a recent comparative study between the description of the Jerusalem Temple in Josephus and in the *Temple Scroll*, L.H. Schiffman has shown that the Herodian Temple, as described by Josephus, is by no means related to the architectural vision of the Temple in the *Temple Scroll*.⁵⁹ A. Shemesh has argued that the *Temple Scroll* reflects a sectarian concept of holiness determined by non-participation in the contemporary Temple cult and a self-perception as a holy community.⁶⁰ M.O. Wise has advanced the argument of an eschatological vision in the *Temple Scroll*.⁶¹ The subsequent sections will give an impression of the diversity in the perspective of the *Temple Scroll* on the Temple and the Temple cult.

2.1.3 *Temple architecture and Temple cult in the Temple Scroll*

What has been preserved of 11QT^a, starts with column II, which contains exhortations against idolatry. Idolatry is here described as covenants with nations adjoining Israel and taking over effigies of idols. The words *אל קנא הוא* [אלוהיכה] in 11QT^a II, 12 may be reminiscent of the decalogue of the covenant in Exodus 20. The subsequent columns give a visionary description of the architecture of the Temple, with details of size and measures. Columns XIII-XXIX provide detailed descriptions of offerings and sacrifices to be offered on the altar of the Temple. Columns XXX to XLII discuss the architecture of the interior of the Temple and its gates. Columns XLII-LIII draw the attention to purity rules and to regulations concerning religious festivals. Columns LIV-LXVI consist of discussions of legal issues, including false prophesy, cases with witnesses, laws relating to the Israelite kingdom and the right of the first-born.

2.1.4 *The Temple and the theology of God's presence in the Temple Scroll*

At various places in 11QT^a, XXIX, 7, XLV, 12-14, XLVI, 3-4.10-12, XLVII, 17-18, and LI, 7-8, the idea of God's dwelling in the midst of the people of Israel is directly related to his sanctification of the Temple. In these passages the typical expression of God's indwelling presence is *אני שוכן בתוך*.⁶² Accordingly, certain passages stipulate the prohibition to profane or defile the Temple (XXXV, 7-8; XLVII, 17-18). In column LIX, 13, the expression of God's covenant with Israel, *והמה יהיו לי לעם והייתי להמה לאלוהים*, has a basis in Scripture corresponding almost exactly with the Masoretic text of Ezekiel 37:27. Thus, the *Temple Scroll*, which comprises a visionary description of the architecture of the Temple, expresses a theology of God's presence.

In conjunction with the theology of God's presence, 11QT^a LI, 6-7f. provides an implicit perspective of the giving of the Torah to Moses on Mt. Sinai: *ולוא יטמאו בהמה אשר*

⁵⁹ L.H. Schiffman, 'Descriptions of the Jerusalem Temple in Josephus and the *Temple Scroll*', in D. Goodblatt, A. Pinnick, and D.R. Schwartz (eds.), *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 2001) 69-82. Cf. idem, 'Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safrai (eds.), *The Centrality of Jerusalem. Historical Perspectives* (Kok Pharos: Kampen, 1996) 73-88.

⁶⁰ A. Shemesh, 'The holiness according to the *Temple Scroll*', *RevQ* 19 (2000) 369-382.

⁶¹ M.O. Wise, 'The Eschatological Vision of the *Temple Scroll*', *JNES* 49 (1990) 155-172.

⁶² Cf. Paul's Greek *οἰκεῖν ἐν* (1 Cor 3:16) and *ἐνοικεῖν ἐν* (2 Cor 6:16) in connection with his temple imagery.

אני מגיד לכה בהר הזה ולוא יטמאו, “And they shall not defile themselves with those things which I am telling you about on this mountain in order that they shall not become unclean”. The perspective of legislation from Mt. Sinai is also present in 11QT^a LIV, 16-17; LV, 13-14; LVI, 12-13f. This legislation aims to safeguard the purity and holiness of the Israelites and the land of Israel. 11QT^a XLVIII, 11-13 and LI, 19–LII, 3 respectively deal with contrasts with Gentile practices concerning the burial of the dead and proper sacrifice as opposed to idolatry.

2.1.5 *The eschatological perspective on the Temple in 11QT^a XXIX*

The idea of creation and the building of the Temple are related in the text of 11QT^a XXIX, 7-10, as reconstructed by E. Qimron: ועד ואקדשה [את מ]קדשי בכבודי אשר לעולם ושכנתי 8 אתמה לעולם 7 והיו לי לעם ואנוכי אהיה להם לעולם ושכנתי 8 אתמה לעולם ועד ואקדשה [את מ]קדשי בכבודי אשר לעולם ושכנתי 9 עליו את כבודי עד יום הבריה אשר אברא אני את מקדשי 10 להכינו לי כול הימים כברית אשר כרתי עם יעקוב בבית אל “And they shall be my people and I will be for them for ever and I shall dwell with them for ever and always. I shall sanctify my [te]mple with my glory, for I shall make my glory reside over it until the day of creation, when I shall create my temple, establishing it for myself for all days, according to the covenant which I made with Jacob at Bethel”.⁶³

In this passage, the ‘day of creation’ comes after the period during which God makes his glory reside over the Temple. The subsequent creation of God’s Temple for all days seems to be an allusion to the idea of an eschatological Temple.⁶⁴ The emphasis on continuity with the past, the covenant with Jacob at Bethel, forms the foundation for the idea of God’s eternal residence among his people. This foundation of the covenant with Jacob also constitutes the starting point for the idea of an eschatological Temple.

The connection between temple imagery and creation theology in 11QT^a XXIX also figures in contemporary Palestinian-Jewish literature and other Qumran texts. *Jubilees* 1:27-28⁶⁵ conveys the analogy between creation and the building of the Temple in the following way: “And he said to the angel of the presence: “Write to Moses from the first creation until my sanctuary is built in their midst forever and ever”. The phrase “until my sanctuary is built in their midst forever and ever” appears to run parallel to the last part of *Jub.* 1:26 which reads “until I shall descend and dwell with them in all the ages of eternity”.⁶⁶ The time of the ‘first creation’ is here juxtaposed to the building of the Temple which is represented as a subsequent stage in a process of ongoing creation. The idea of a first creation and a subsequent creation is more explicit in 4Q225 (4QpsJub^a) frag. 1, l. 7: הבריה עד יום הבריה. Here, the ‘day of creation’ follows the first creation in time.

The ‘day of creation’ is related to the building of the Temple in 11QT^a XXIX, 9, while the same is implied in *Jub.* 1:27-28. This perspective on the Temple corresponds to the central place attributed to the Temple cult in the worship of God. An analogy between the act of separating, להבדיל, in the creation story of Genesis (Gen 1:4.6.14.18) and the levitical perspective on separating holy and unholy, clean and unclean (Lev 10:10), points to a possible creation-theological perspective on the Temple. Since this passage mentions the creation of a Temple after the sanctification of the Temple, the creation probably concerns a vision of a restored Temple in the endtime.

⁶³ Text from Qimron, *The Temple Scroll*, 44 יום הבריה is Qimron’s reading against Yadin’s reading יום הברכה; translation from García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition 2*, 1251.

⁶⁴ Cf. J. Kampen, ‘The Eschatological Temple(s) of 11QT’, in J.C. Reeves & J. Kampen (eds.), *Pursuing the Text*. FS Ben Zion Wacholder (JSOTSup 184; Sheffield AP: Sheffield, 1994) 85-97 at 95-97 for discussion of column XXIX of the Temple Scroll, also adopting the reading ‘day of creation’ of Qimron.

⁶⁵ This passage is also partly preserved in 4Q216 IV, 6-8: ... [הפנים להכתיב 7 [אש ...] ריבנה מקדשי 6-8].

⁶⁶ ET from Wintermute, ‘Jubilees’, 35-142 at 54.

2.2 The New Jerusalem Text

2.2.1 Fragments of an Aramaic composition

Detailed descriptions of the architecture of the Temple are also found in fragments of an Aramaic text, which contains a description of the New Jerusalem. The fragments which are identified with certainty come from caves 1 (1Q32),⁶⁷ 2 (2Q24),⁶⁸ 4 (4Q554, 4Q554a, 4Q555),⁶⁹ 5 (5Q15),⁷⁰ and 11 (11Q18).⁷¹ An uncertain identification is 4Q232. Because of the very fragmentary nature of the evidence, which overlaps with little material, the question of positing the relation between fragments is an extremely difficult one.⁷²

M. Chyutin has attempted a reconstruction of the composite text and called it the *New Jerusalem Scroll*.⁷³ His reconstruction has, however, been severely criticised by L.T. Stuckenbruck, who, despite granting Chyutin's work coverage of an 'interesting area of research', rejects the idea of reconstructing a 'scroll' with 'columns' from the very scant evidence of a conflation of fragments.⁷⁴

2.2.2 The vision of the Temple and its worship service in the New Jerusalem composition

The vision of the Temple in the Qumran composition *New Jerusalem*⁷⁵ is described from the perspective of a first person singular, as can be inferred from 2Q24 frags. 1 and 4; 4Q554 frag. 1, col. II, 12, 15, col. III, 20; 11Q18 frags. 18, 19, and 20. The vision appears to lead readers from the outer gates of the city Jerusalem into the interior of the Temple complex.⁷⁶ Only column II, 18 of 4Q554 frag. 1 mentions the Temple, מִקְדָּשׁ. Column III, lines 16-19

⁶⁷ Edited by D. Barthélemy, O.P. and J.T. Milik, *DJD I Qumran Cave I* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1955) 134-135, pl. XXXI.

⁶⁸ Edited by M. Baillet, J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux, O.P., *DJD III Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1962) 84-89, pl. XVI.

⁶⁹ *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library* on CD-ROM (©1984-1999 Word Cruncher Publishing Technologies Inc.; Brigham Young University / Academic Publishers Brill) PAM 43.564, 43.589, 43.594. Publication of these fragments by E. Puech are in press as volume XXXVII of *DJD*.

⁷⁰ Edited by Baillet, Milik and De Vaux, O.P., *DJD III*, 184-193, pls. XL-XLI.

⁷¹ Edited by F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar and A.S. van der Woude, *DJD XXIII Qumran Cave 11. II 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1998) 305-355, pls. XXXV-XL, LIII. Cf. F. García Martínez, 'More fragments of 11QNJ', in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds.), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1999) 186-198.

⁷² See e.g. about 11Q18 (*11QNew Jerusalem ar*) García Martínez, Tigchelaar and Van der Woude, *DJD XXIII*, 307: "Since reconstruction of the scroll, or the rearrangement of the fragments in a more plausible order, has been impossible, the presentation of the fragments below agrees, with small exceptions, with the order of the fragments on the museum plates".

⁷³ M. Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran. A Comprehensive Reconstruction* (JSPSup 25; Sheffield, 1997) 147-162 with plates of the Qumran fragments and bibliography. Cf. 10-12 comparing the literary style of the *New Jerusalem* text with Gen 6:14-17, Exod 25-27, 1 Kgs 6-7, 2 Chron 3-4, and Ezekiel.

⁷⁴ Review by L.T. Stuckenbruck, *JTS* n.s. 50 (1999) 658-664. Cf. e.g. J.M. Squirrell, *VT* 50 (2000) 411: "Although nothing from the first two columns is extant, Chyutin suggests that they contained a description of the interior of the Temple and its dimensions".

⁷⁵ See F. García Martínez, 'The »New Jerusalem« and the Future Temple of the Manuscripts from Qumran', in idem, *Qumran and Apocalyptic. Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9; Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1992) 180-213 for a detailed argument in favour of the Qumran origin of the *NJ*.

⁷⁶ Cf. '18. 11QNew Jerusalem', in *DJD XXIII*, 308.

describe an entrance vestibule with an outer door and a door to the side of the inner wall. Line 22 refers to a pillar [within] the space. A comparison with the visionary description of the Temple complex with its outer and inner courts in Ezekiel chapter 40-48,⁷⁷ suggests that the to a pillar in 4Q554 1, III, 22 points to a location within the Temple complex (cf. Ezek 42:6).

In the vision of the Temple the sacrificial cult is expressed in various fragments. 11Q18 is not limited to an architectural description, but also discusses certain sacrificial items, such as thank-offerings and Passover sacrifices, תודות ופסחים (11Q18 16, II – 17, I, 1-2). The qualification of a ‘pleasant offering’, קורבן רעוא, figures in 2Q24 fr. 4, line 2. The holiness of the Temple is further emphasised in 11Q18 fr. 19, line 3: ק[דיש הוא היכלא , ויקרא רב]א, “holy is the Temple, and great is the dignity”.

How should the composition *New Jerusalem* be understood in relation to sectarian viewpoints on the purity of the Temple as expressed in other Qumran texts? The above-mentioned analogy with the visionary description in Ezekiel 40-48 may be helpful to approach this question. Ezekiel 43:10-12 relates the vision of the restored Temple and land to the necessity of Israel’s repentance of their iniquities. The *New Jerusalem* text comprises no such clear rationale of the visionary description of the New Jerusalem and its Temple.

We may, however, search the fragments of *New Jerusalem* for implicit indications of a rationale. 2Q24 fr. 8, line 5 contains an emphasis on atonement. 4Q554 2, III (?), 20, states the following, after an enumeration of powerful kingdoms: עד ערך די ויבאשון לזרעך, “they shall harm your descendants until the moment that”.⁷⁸ Various fragments of 11Q18 (frgs. 15, 16, II-17, I, 20, and 25-30) appear to outline regulations for the priestly service in the Temple cult from the perspective of a visionary journey into the New Jerusalem. 11Q18 fr. 25, line 1 mentions sacrifices of Israel, קודשי ישראל. The above mentioned passages appear to make clear that the punishment and atonement for the iniquities of Israel are an important issue in the description of the New Jerusalem and the Temple, as ideally envisaged in the sectarian perspective. The Qumran description of a New Jerusalem may therefore entail a transformation of the post-exilic theme of restoration of the Temple of Jerusalem.

The vision of the New Jerusalem and the Temple may correspond with other passages in Qumran texts which describe a future Temple which is in certain cases even specified as an eschatological Temple (cf. the next section 3).⁷⁹

3. The eschatological Temple

3.1 The Eschatological Midrash

3.1.1 *The text*

The document published by J.M. Allegro under the original title *4QFlorilegium*,⁸⁰ named after the collection of scriptural verses found in it, most explicitly unfolds the Qumran sectarian idea of an eschatological Temple. Because of the method of biblical interpretation

⁷⁷ Cf. F. García Martínez, ‘The »New Jerusalem« and the Future Temple’, 180-213 at 193 about *NJ*’s description of the New Jerusalem “following the literary scheme of the so-called Torah of Ezekiel (Ezekiel 40-48)”.

⁷⁸ Text and translation from García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition 2*, 1110-1111.

⁷⁹ Cf. García Martínez, ‘The »New Jerusalem« and the Future Temple’, 209-211 argues, on the basis of the idea that both *NJ* and 1QM describe a ‘final War’, that *NJ* envisions a final Temple as in 4Q174 and 11QT.

⁸⁰ ‘4Q174 (4QFlor) *4QFlorilegium*’ in J.M. Allegro, *DJD V Qumran Cave 4. I (4Q158-4Q186)* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1969) 53-57, pls. XIX-XX.

applied in this text, it has also been named *Eschatological Midrash*.⁸¹ A. Steudel has recently argued that 4Q174 (*4QFlorilegium*) and 4Q177 should be understood as two parts of the same literary work. Her conclusion is based on a material reconstruction of the two texts, on the place of the 'Davidic' Psalter determining the structure of both texts, on similarities between the use and interpretation of Scripture in both texts, and shared terminology in both texts which occurs very rarely in other Qumran texts.⁸² In the following section, I will, however, mainly discuss 4Q174, which is most significant for the subject of the eschatological Temple.

3.1.2 *Midrash and eschatological Temple in 4Q174*

The idea of the Qumran community as an eschatological Temple has been studied in an article by D. Dimant.⁸³ Recently, M.O. Wise and G.J. Brooke have examined the hermeneutical interrelationship between traditions about Eden and Adam and the *מקדש אדם* in fragment 1, column 1, 21, 2, line 6 of the *Eschatological Midrash* (4Q174).⁸⁴ In this section, I will discuss some aspects of the midrash in 4Q174 which are related to the idea of the eschatological Temple. I will further stress the significance of intertextuality.

In lines 1-5 the idea of the eschatological Temple is expressed as a place where God's holy ones are and where no Ammonite or Moabite, bastard or foreigner or proselyte shall enter.⁸⁵ This eschatological Temple stands in contrast to the past in which the Temple of Israel was pulled down 'on account of their sins', *בחסאתמה* (lines 5-6). Those who pulled down the Temple in the past are called *זרים* (line 5), a biblical Hebrew term which stands for strangers who do not belong to the community and which is a qualification of transgression. The sectarian perspective of 4Q174 emphasises the fact that it was due to Israel's sins in the past that the Temple was profaned and destroyed by strangers.

There is a notable contrast between *מקדש יהוה*, the 'Temple of the Lord' in line 3, and *מקדש ישראל*, the 'Temple of Israel' in line 6. The first Temple relates to God's eternal rule, whereas the latter relates to Israel's sins. This contrast may be understood in view of the sectarian perspective on the contemporary Temple cult as defiled and corrupted. The 'Temple of the Lord' stands for the eschatological Temple in the sectarian interpretation of Exodus 15:17-18 in lines 2-3 of this fragment of 4Q174. The contrast between 'Temple of the Lord' and 'Temple of Israel' is further interesting in that it distinguishes between the Temple from the human, Israelite point of view and the Temple from God's point of view.

The idea of the eschatological Temple is hermeneutically related to the 'branch of David', *צמח דויד*, which arises with the Interpreter of the Law in the last days (lines 11-12). This becomes clear from the fact that lines 1-2 quote 2 Samuel 7:10 and interpret the passage as referring to the house established in the last days for him, that is, the eschatological Temple. The quotation from 2 Samuel 7:10 is further conflated with a quotation from Psalm 89:23 about the end of afflictions brought about by enemies; a perspective in Psalms which concerns the reign of king David. On the other hand, lines 10-11 interpret a quotation from 2

⁸¹ G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSS 29; Sheffield, 1985) 80-174 analyses the text as a Midrash on the basis of a form-critical study. Cf. the textual study of A. Steudel, *Der Midrash zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b})* (STDJ 13; Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1994).

⁸² Steudel, *Der Midrash zur Eschatologie*, 5-151.

⁸³ D. Dimant, '4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple', in A. Caquot *et al.* (eds.), *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage à V. Nikiprovetzky* (Leuven-Paris: Peeters, 1986) 165-189.

⁸⁴ M.O. Wise, '4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam', *RevQ* 15/57-58 (1991) 103-132; G.J. Brooke, 'Miqdash Adam, Eden, and the Qumran Community', in Ego *et al.* (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*, 285-301.

⁸⁵ Cf. 4QMMT B 39-46 which refers to the Ammonite, the Moabite, the mamzer, "[and him whose testicles] have been crushed [and him] whose male member [has been cut off]"; ET from Qimron & Strugnell, *DJD* X, 51.

Samuel 7:12-14 about the building of a house as an allusion to the messianic 'branch of David'. The eschatological reference to both the 'branch of David' and the Interpreter of the Law appears to correspond to the Qumran messianism in other texts. Thus, the *Rule of the Community* and the *Damascus Document* mention the eschatological role of two Messiahs, those of Aaron and Israel (cf. 1QS IX, 11; CD-A XIV, 19).⁸⁶ This messianism probably concerns priestly atonement for the iniquities of Israel because of Aaron's priesthood.

Line 7 quotes 2 Samuel 7:11: וְהַנִּיחוּ תִי לְכָה מִכּוֹל אוֹיְבֵיכָה, "and I will give you rest from all your enemies". This quotation connects the interpretation of 2 Sam 7:10 as the eschatological Temple and the reading of 2 Sam 7:12-14 as the 'branch of David'. For the interpretation of 2 Sam 7:11 concerns the rest of the 'sons of light' from the wicked plans of the 'sons of Belial' in the end-time (lines 7-9). This 'rest from all your enemies' appears to be the condition for the fulfillment of the Messianic end-time in which the building of the eschatological Temple is envisaged.

A case of intertextuality can be identified in line 9 of 4Q174 fragment 1 column I, 21, 2. Here the phrase למַעַן יִתְפָּשׂוּ בְלִיעֵל בְּמִשְׁגַּת אֵשׁ, "in order that they will be trapped by Belial on account of their guilty mistake", concerns the evil plot of Belial against the 'sons of light'. The *Damascus Document* mentions the nets of Belial, "with which Belial traps Israel", מִצּוּדוֹת בְּלִיעֵל (CD-A IV, 15-16). The plot of Belial to have the sons of light entrapped in guilty error in 4Q174 would place the sons of light on a par with the sins of Israel which led to the destruction of the Temple in the past (lines 5-6). This corresponds with the idea that the nets of Belial aim to entrap Israel. The idea of a contemporary age of wickedness, in which the plot of Belial aims to seduce those who are faithful to the covenant, underlie both texts. However, in 4Q174, the interpretation of 2 Sam 7:11 also refers to the period just before the Messianic end-time, in which an end will be put to the plot of Belial, and during which the sons of light are freed from the sons of Belial, their enemies.

As has been discussed above, the sectarian perspective on an eschatological Temple is hermeneutically related to the rise of the 'branch of David', which has a connection with Qumran messianism. Parallel to the promise that the Temple shall not again be laid waste by foreigners (lines 5-6), we read in lines 12-13 about the erection of the 'hut of David which has fallen' in order to save Israel, לְהוֹשִׁיעַ אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל. The perspective of the end-time, to which the eschatological Temple is related, appears to be determined by an emphasis on the return to justice of the elected of Israel and to a rejection of wickedness and idolatry. This emphasis is expressed by the employment of quotations from Psalm 1:1, Isaiah 8:11 and Ezekiel 44:10 in lines 14-17 of this fragment. Those who shall enter the eschatological Temple are God's holy ones (line 4), a term which probably also designated the elect ones of Israel in line 19, from the sectarian perspective. The implicit link between the idea of the eschatological Temple and Davidic Messianism could convey a perspective of hope about the restoration of the profaned Temple within a firmly established kingdom.

Bertil Gärtner has referred to the connection between the midrash on the erection of the 'fallen hut of David' from 2 Sam 7:13 and Amos 9:11 in 4Q174 fragment 1, column I, 21, 2, lines 12-13 on the one hand, and the *Damascus Document* column VII, 14 ff., where this prophecy of Amos is related to the sectarian community on the other. Gärtner has stated that this text from CD-A provides "a valuable background to the exposition of 4QFlor."⁸⁷ Both texts refer to the role of the Interpreter of the Law. However, Gärtner fails to see that column VII of the *Damascus Document*, where the quotation from Amos 9:11 occurs, rather appears to contain a sectarian description of the situation after the 'first visitation' (CD-A VII, 21-

⁸⁶ Cf. discussion of eschatology and messianism in 4Q174 by Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 197-205.

⁸⁷ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 41.

VIII, 2), that is, after the destruction of the First Temple. CD-A VII, 18-19 claims that the Interpreter of the Law will come to Damascus, whereas 4Q174 1, I, 21, 2 states that "he will rise up in Zion in the last days". This difference points to the different roles attributed to the Interpreter of the Law in the contemporary age and in the end-time.

3.1.3 *The 'Temple of man' in 4Q174*

In his discussion of the community as a Temple in the literature of Qumran, Georg Klinzing still expresses doubts about the uncertain designation 'Temple of man', מקדש אדם. He notes that the term מקדש can only refer to the Jerusalem Temple in the literature of Qumran which complicates the interpretation of this term as a self-reference of the community as a Temple.⁸⁸ The building of the 'Temple of man' in 4Q174 1 I, 21, 2, line 6, is presented as God's instruction. This 'Temple of man' appears to have an intermediate place between the 'Temple of Israel' which was desolated in the past because of Israel's sins (ll. 5-6), and the 'Temple of the Lord', that is, the permanent, eschatological Temple (ll. 2-5). The role of the 'Temple of man' may correspond with the self-representation of the sectarian community as a Temple in the *Rule of Community*. 1QS VIII, 6-7 notes the following role: "chosen by the will (of God) to atone for the land and to render the wicked their retribution".⁸⁹ In what follows, I will explain how this relation between the 'Temple of man' and the sectarian community may be understood.

The emphasis on the offering of 'works of thanksgiving' in the 'Temple of man' could be compared to sectarian poetical and liturgical works in which praise and thanksgiving is often stressed (cf. e.g. the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 1QHodayot^a). The 'Temple of man' appears to substitute the priestly functions of the contemporary cult of the Jerusalem Temple. This becomes clear from 4Q174 1, I, 21, 2, line 17, in which the 'sons of Zadok' and the 'men of their council' turn to the council of the community, עצת היחוד. The council of the community stands for the Qumran community, and this term also frequently occurs in passages of the *Rule of the Community* which present the idea of the community as a Temple.

3.2 The Rule of the Community

3.2.1 *The text of the Community Rule*

The so-called 'Manual of Discipline' belongs to the set of seven original scrolls which constituted the earliest finds, brought to public attention in 1948. This scroll, together with the Isaiah scroll, the commentary on Habakkuk and the Genesis Apocryphon, was bought by the metropolitan of St. Mark's Monastery in Jerusalem. The 'Manual of Discipline', discovered from cave 1, was published by M. Burrows in 1951,⁹⁰ but in later scholarship renamed as the *Rule of the Community*. A collection of parallel fragments of the *Rule of the Community* from cave 4, 4Q255-264, has recently been published by Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes.⁹¹

⁸⁸ Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 80-87 at 86. See, however, discussion of evidence from 4Q fragments of the *Community Rule* in section 3.2.3 which could counter this idea of Klinzing.

⁸⁹ ET from García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition I*, 89.

⁹⁰ M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery II Fascicle 2: Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline* (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951). Cf. J.H. Charlesworth et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Rule of the Community. Photographic Multi-Language Edition* (American Faith Institute/World Alliance: Philadelphia / Continuum: New York, 1996).

⁹¹ P.S. Alexander & G. Vermes, *DJD XXVI Qumran Cave 4. XIX Serekh ha-Yahad and two related texts* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1998).

The palaeographical analysis of these fragments has led the editors to conclude that the *Community Rule* comprised at least four recensions, starting from 1QS and ending with 4QS.⁹²

3.2.2 *The Community Rule and the Damascus Document*

In contrast with the *Damascus Document* which also lays down rules for other communities in Israel, the *Rule of the Community* contains sectarian regulations which mainly apply to the Qumran community. The *Community Rule* also gives details about the organisation of this community. Sarianna S. Metso has published a pioneering study of the textual development of the *Community Rule* in 1997.⁹³ In their recent edition of the 4Q fragments of the *Community Rule*, P.S. Alexander and G. Vermes have categorised parallels to the *Serekh ha-Yahad* (S) in non-S texts into three groups. In view of this textual evidence, they have pointed to a relation between the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document*: “Many come from the alternative version of the Penal Code attested in the Damascus Document (D) and in the mixture of S and D material found in 4Q265 (4QSD)”.⁹⁴ Furthermore, P.R. Davies and S.S. Metso have recently advanced ideas about the textual development of the *Rule of the Community* as a revision of and expansion on source material of the *Damascus Document*.⁹⁵

3.2.3 *The Temple as a metaphor of the community in the Community Rule*

The Qumran polemic against the contemporary Temple cult amounted to an appropriation of priestly functions by the sectarian community in its act of self-definition. This appropriation appears to aim at a substitution for the priestly establishment of the contemporary Temple cult. This type of substitution expresses itself through cultic symbolism applicable to the Qumran community. Thus, in the *Rule of the Community* columns VIII and IX, the council of the Qumran community is called, among other things, a ‘holy of holies for Aaron’ (1QS VIII, 5-6; cf. 4QS^c II, 14) and a ‘holy house for Aaron’ (1QS IX, 6; cf. 4QS^d VII, 6).⁹⁶ In both cases, the Qumran community presents itself as the established institution which takes upon itself the priestly functions of the Temple establishment. This idea is corroborated by the cultic symbolism which is found in the context of these columns.

The council of the Qumran community, which is established as a ‘holy house for Israel and a foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron’ (1QS VIII, 5-6), has to meet certain conditions which are described in 1QS VIII, 1-4. Among these conditions are the need ‘to keep faithfulness in the land according to a firm purpose and a broken spirit to atone for iniquity by doing justice and the distress of refining’ (1QS VIII, 3-4). The idea of atonement is repeated in 1QS VIII, 10 after the statement of a ‘covenant of justice’ in 1QS VIII, 9. The priestly function of performing rituals of atonement has thus come to apply to the Qumran community through the symbol of the Temple. The atonement through a ‘broken spirit’,

⁹² Alexander & Vermes, *DJD XXVI*, 7-12 at 12.

⁹³ S.S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Brill: Leiden [etc.] 1997).

⁹⁴ Alexander & Vermes, *DJD XXVI*, 4.

⁹⁵ Cf. the articles of Philip R. Davies, ‘The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document’, and S.S. Metso, ‘The Relationship between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule’, in Baumgarten *et al.* (eds.), *The Damascus Document*, 27-43 at 35-40, and 85-93.

⁹⁶ Note that 1QS IX, 6 reads בית קודש לאהרון, whereas 4QS^d VII, 6 has the reverse order בית אהרון לקודש.

רוח נשברה, implicitly could be associated with the idea expressed in Psalm 51:17 “The sacrifice acceptable to God is a broken spirit”.⁹⁷

1QS IX, 3-5 presents another set of conditions for the establishment of the Qumran community as a holy house, a Temple, and thereby voices the cultic symbolism which marks the sectarian community life in its seclusion from and competition with the contemporary Temple cult: ‘without the flesh of the whole burnt offerings and without the fat of sacrifice, the offering of the lips in accordance with the precept will be like an appeasing aroma of justice and blameless conduct will be like an acceptable freewill offering’ (1QS IX, 4-5). In the direct context of this passage, 1QS IX, 4 again mentions atonement.

The prophetic inspiration of this separation from the ‘dwelling place of the men of injustice’, מושב אנשי העול (1QS VIII, 13; 4QS^a III, 3-4) and of a holy community in Israel is evidently Isaiah 40:3 in 1QS VIII, 14: “In the wilderness, make ready the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God”. The sectarian interpretation of this verse from Isaiah relates this first of all to the study of the law of Moses, but also to a way of life in accordance with revelation from age to age and revelations from the prophets ‘through his holy spirit’, וכאשר גלו הנביאים ברוח קודש (1QS VIII, 16).

The *Rule of the Community* points to the theological idea of a holy community, “God’s community”, יחד אל, which is also called a “community of truth”, יחד אמת, in which people associate with one another through “holy council”, בעצת קודש (1QS II, 22-25). 1QS III, 6-7 conveys the presence of the Holy Spirit, רוח קדושה, the Spirit of the true counsel of God, רוח עצת אמת אל, in this holy community (1QS III, 6-7).⁹⁸

The idea of the community as a Temple in the age before the expected end-time is found in columns VIII and IX of the *Rule of the Community*. In Column VIII, 5-6 mention is made of the establishment of an “everlasting planting-place, a holy house for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron”, בית קודש לישראל וסוד קודש קודשים לאהרון, למטעת עולם. The image of an everlasting planting-place, together with the image of a holy house which follows it, applies to the community council, עצת היחד (line 5). The community council is compared to a holy house for Israel in that it serves to ‘atone for the land and to render the wicked their retribution’ (1QS VIII, 6-7).

The passage on the separation of the men of the Qumran community as ‘holy ones’ (קודש), in 1QS VIII, 11, has recently been compared with fragments of 4Q manuscripts of the *Rule of the Community*. James H. Charlesworth and Brent A. Strawn have proposed a different parallel reading of 1QS VIII, 11 on the basis of a reconstruction of 4QS^c fragment 1, 3.1. This alternative reading has מקדש instead of קודש and thereby implies the separation as a ‘Temple in the midst of the council of the men of the community’.⁹⁹ If this reading of 4QS^c can be accepted, it is important for our understanding of the recensional history of the *Community Rule*. The question arises in what stage of this recensional history the idea of the community as a Temple became explicated by the term מקדש.

In the palaeographical dating of the different manuscripts of the *Community Rule*, based on Cross’ palaeographical typology, 1QS (100-75 BCE) has been seen as paleographically older than 4QS^c (50-25 BCE). Charlesworth and Strawn have argued that

⁹⁷ Translation from RSV. MT Ps 51:19a reads רוח נשברה; LXX Ps 50:19a reads θυσία τῷ θεῷ πνεῦμα συστετριμμένον.

⁹⁸ In this respect I disagree with the idea of E. Schüssler Fiorenza, ‘Cultic Language in Qumran and in the NT’, *CBQ* 38 (1976) 159-177 at 171 n. 35 who claims a disjunction between the idea of the Qumran community as temple, as the place of God’s dwelling, and the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Qumran writings at large. In my view, the temple imagery and the notion of the Holy Spirit are related to each other in 1QS, albeit indirectly.

⁹⁹ J.H. Charlesworth & B.A. Strawn, ‘Reflections on the Text of *Serekh ha-Yahad* found in Cave IV (1)’, *RevQ* 17 (1996) 403-435 at 421-426.

palaeographic results are not conclusive for an answer to the question whether a reading in 4QS or 1QS is earlier or later.¹⁰⁰ Yet, Philip S. Alexander has proposed with regard to the case of S palaeography that “given all the circumstances the dating of the manuscripts should reflect the chronological order of the recensions”.¹⁰¹ If the palaeographical dating also reflects the respective older and younger stages in recensional history in this case, then 4QS^c would reflect a more recent development in the sectarian perspective of the community. Consequently, the sectarian community would first direct its polemic against the contemporary Temple cult from the perspective of separation and exile, and only gradually develop the idea of a more explicit self-designation of the community as a Temple.

In column IX, the idea of a community of holiness is expressed in related ways, comparable to the above mentioned passage in column VIII. That is, 1QS IX, 6 describes that the men of the community shall set apart a “holy house for Aaron in order to form a most holy community and a house of the community for Israel, those who walk in perfection”, בית קודש, בית קודש, בית קודש וביית יחד לישראל ההולכים בתמים (1QS IX, 6).¹⁰² The repetition of the temple imagery in the two columns of 1QS attests to the importance of this idea of the community as a Temple which becomes progressively related to the substitution of various priestly functions of the contemporary Temple cult.

A comparable precondition for the foundation of a holy house figures in both passages. The function of the community council as ‘arbiter of justice’, atoning for Israel’s iniquities and rendering the wicked their retribution, serves as a precondition to the foundation of a holy house for Israel (1QS VIII, 4 ביהות אלה בישראל). 1QS IX, 3-5 formulates a comparable precondition for the establishment of a holy house for Aaron; it is necessary to atone for the guilt of iniquity and the unfaithfulness of sin, and to establish the spirit of holiness according to the rules of the community (1QS IX, 3, ביהות אלה בישראל, and IX, 5, בעת ההיא).

The community of holiness prepares the way for the end-time, which is characterised by the coming of the prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel (1QS VIII, 12-16 and IX, 11). Thus, the idea of the community as a Temple has eschatological overtones in the *Rule of the Community*. In this respect, it corresponds with the idea of the eschatological Temple in the *Eschatological Midrash* (4Q174), as discussed in the previous section. In both texts the eschatological Temple is implicitly related to the Messianic end-time.

The imagery which conveys the idea of the community as a Temple in 1QS VIII, 5-6 deserves close examination. 1QS XI, 8 also combines the images of planting and building.¹⁰³ The image of planting is further related to Israel, as may be inferred from the beginning of column VIII of 1QS, which prescribes the function of the community council as preserving the faithfulness in the land (1QS VIII, 3). The *Damascus Document* connects the image of planting with the possession of the land of Israel (CD-A I, 7-8; 4Q266 2 I, 12; 4Q268 frag. 1, 14-15).

The image of a holy house also occurs in 1QS IX, 6, which has the same context of preconditions for its foundation, as we have seen. The association with Aaron in both passages conveys the idea of the Temple and its Aaronic priesthood. Thus, the authority in the holy community with regard to judgment and goods is attributed to the sons of Aaron (1QS

¹⁰⁰ Charlesworth & Strawn, ‘Reflections on the Text of *Serekh ha-Yahad* found in Cave IV (1)’, 416-419.

¹⁰¹ P.S. Alexander, ‘The Redaction-History of *Serekh ha-Yahad*: a Proposal’, *RevQ* 17 (1996) 437-456 at 448.

¹⁰² Text and translation from García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition* I, 88-91.

¹⁰³ From a comparative perspective, it is important to note that the images of planting and building are used interchangeably here to evoke the idea of the eschatological Temple. The alternation between such images also figures in 1 Cor 3:9-17, where Paul introduces the metaphor of the Temple. The use of evocative images by way of anticipation relates directly to the metaphor of the Temple as we will further discuss in the next chapter.

IX, 7). 1QS XI, 7-9 represents the foundation of the 'building of holiness', מבניית קודש, as the union of the assembly of holy ones to the heavenly beings, בני שמים, brought about by God.¹⁰⁴

The analogy between earthly and heavenly temple imagery also figures in 1QS X, 3-4, where the holy of holies is located in the dominion of light (cf. line 1). The heavenly temple imagery is worked out in the context of a sanctification of the religious calendar in the subsequent lines (1QS X, 4-8).

4. Poetical and liturgical texts and temple imagery

4.1 Temple worship and sectarian worship in poetical and liturgical texts

The poetical representation and liturgy of worship in a number of texts from the literature of Qumran has recently become the subject of scholarly hypotheses about their social life setting¹⁰⁵ and possible relationship to non-sectarian worship and the regular Temple cult.

Daniel K. Falk has argued, on the basis of non-sectarian (pre-)Qumran evidence about the possibility that the origin of institutionalised prayer may be connected with the Temple, against the consensus idea that it originated as an alternative for sacrifice. Falk considers this possibility in view of the "perceived partial continuity between the Dead Sea Scrolls and rabbinic prayer of the synagogue".¹⁰⁶

In her discussion of Qumran texts related to prayer and worship, Eileen Schuller has stated regarding the difficulty of classifying certain texts that "the presence (and presumed use) of so much nonsectarian material indicates some linkage and sense of continuity with the broader community".¹⁰⁷ Schuller expresses caution against the reconstruction of Second Temple period liturgies, because such a reconstruction has to be based on a comparison between texts and formulations from Qumran literature and the later rabbinic literature.¹⁰⁸

The article by Richard S. Sarason is similarly sceptical. Sarason concludes his study of 'intersections' between Qumran literature and rabbinic literature with regard to prayer texts and liturgies as follows: "Only very speculatively can the Qumran evidence be made to address the contemporary situation outside of Qumran for which there is no first-hand evidence".¹⁰⁹ In his commentary on Qumran liturgical texts, James R. Davila notes that "it is

¹⁰⁴ For a comparable expression about the union with 'heavenly beings' or 'sons of heaven', see 1QH^a XI, 21-22: *להתיצב במעמד עם צבא קודשים לבוא ליחד עם עדת בני שמים*. For a discussion of this theme mainly in relation to three liturgical texts, 4Q503 (*4QDaily Prayers*), *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat* and *4QBerakhot*, see the recent study of E.G. Chazon, 'Liturgical Communion with the Angels at Qumran', in D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E.M. Schuller (eds.), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran* (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 2000) 95-105.

¹⁰⁵ The question whether or to what extent the sectarian community had its own sacrificial worship cult as a substitute for the Temple cult is a matter of literary as well as archaeological debate. See e.g. T. Elgvin & S.J. Pfann, 'An Incense Altar from Qumran?', *DSD* 9 (2002) 20-33; Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 116-126, 118-119 finds no evidence for a sectarian sacrificial cult nor for an altar at Qumran.

¹⁰⁶ D.K. Falk, 'Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple', in Falk, García Martínez and Schuller (eds.), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*, 106-126 at 126.

¹⁰⁷ E.M. Schuller, 'Worship, Temple, and prayer in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in A.J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner, and B.D. Chilton (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls II Theory of Israel* (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 2001) 125-143 at 130. See also E.M. Schuller, 'Prayer, Hymnic, and Liturgical Texts from Qumran', in Ulrich and VanderKam (eds.), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*, 153-171 at 162-170 on the distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian material in liturgical texts.

¹⁰⁸ Schuller, 'Worship, Temple, and prayer in the Dead Sea Scrolls', 126, 127-128.

¹⁰⁹ R.S. Sarason, 'The "Intersections" of Qumran and Rabbinic Judaism: The Case of Prayer Texts and Liturgies', *DSD* 8 (2001) 169-181 at 181.

sometimes unclear, however, whether the relevant liturgical texts are sectarian compositions or works composed outside the community but adopted by it".¹¹⁰

Although no hypothesis about the provenance and social life-setting of non-sectarian material among poetical and liturgical Qumran texts will be attempted here, some of the (supposedly) non-sectarian Qumran texts will be discussed in the subsequent sections in view of temple imagery. The incorporation of such texts in our survey is, nevertheless, important for the comparative study of temple imagery in the literature of Qumran and Paul's letters.

4.2 Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice

4.2.1 *The text*

The text which is named after the recurring formula שיר עולת השבת, 'song for the sacrifice of the sabbath', as in 4Q400 frag. 1, col. I, 1,¹¹¹ was also found at Masada and included in the edition of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* by Carol Newsom and others.¹¹² The evidence of a Masada fragment of the Qumran *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* could provide an argument for the non-sectarian character of the text. The evidence does at least suggest that this type of text did not only circulate among the Qumran community.¹¹³

4.2.2 *The Earthly Temple in relation to the Heavenly Temple*

The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* only scantily allude to the earthly Temple, whereas this composition uses heavenly temple imagery in a very prominent way. The passage in which we do find an implicit reference to the earthly temple cult has an ambiguous setting. Thus, in 4Q400 Frag. 2, 1-2 (cf. 4Q401 frag. 14, col. I, 7-8) mention is made of praises of God's kingship by the 'most holy ones', who are also called 'servants in the holy of holies', משרתים בקודש קודשים,¹¹⁴ in 4Q400 frag. 1, col. I, 10 (cf. 4Q401 frag. 15). These 'most holy ones', along with the divinities of knowledge, are honoured among 'all the hosts of God'¹¹⁵ and revered by all institutions of men according to line 2 of 4Q400 frag. 2. Moreover, in line 3 of the same fragment, divine beings and men are mentioned side by side.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁰ J.R. Davila, *Liturgical works* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. / Cambridge, U.K., 2000) 10.

¹¹¹ Cf. 4Q401 1-2, l. 1; 4Q403 1, I, 30, and II, 18; 4Q405 8-9, l. 1, and 20, II, 21, 22, l. 6; 11Q17 II, 4, and VII, 9.

¹¹² 4Q400-407 and Mas1k (MasShirShabb) in C. Newsom *et al.* (eds.), *DJD XI Qumran Cave 4. VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts. Part 1* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1998) 173-401, pls. XI, XVI-XVIII, XX-XXXI. 11Q17 was published by García Martínez, Tigchelaar & Van der Woude, *DJD XXIII*, 259-304, pls. XXX-XXXIV, LIII.

¹¹³ Cf. C.R.A. Morray-Jones, 'The Temple Within. The Embodied Divine Image and its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources', in *SBLSP 1998 Part One* (SBLSP 37; Scholars Press: Atlanta, Ga., 1998) 400-431 about connections between the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and contemporary Jewish apocalyptic and 'merkabah mystical' traditions.

¹¹⁴ The verb שרת in biblical Hebrew often stands for priestly service in the Temple, in worship; cf. e.g. Exod 28:35.43; 29:30; 30:20; Num 1:50; 3:31; Deut 18:5; 1 Kgs 8:11; 2 Chron 23:6; Jer 52:18; Ezek 42:14.

¹¹⁵ Cf. use of מונה אלהים in 1 Chron 12:23 meaning 'host of God'.

¹¹⁶ Note the recent study by C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam. Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 42 (Brill: Leiden [etc.]: 2002) 252-279 which, criticising the interpretative decisions in Newsom's edition of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, counters the idea of dualism between earthly and heavenly temple imagery in this text and proposes a new hypothesis which interprets our text as a description of 'exalted (angelomorphic) humans' rather than 'angels' (277). Although the idea of a fluidity rather than a dualism is very interesting, the fragment of 4Q400 cited in the text above still suggests (the inequality of) a comparison between 'our priesthood' and that of divine beings.

In the same fragment, lines 6-7, the earthly worship of God appears to be contrasted to the heavenly counterpart by at least four rhetorical questions. Of these questions, which concern holiness, priesthood and the offering of praise, only two are fully quotable due to the incomplete state in which this fragment has been preserved. The first question is: **וכוהנתנו מה במעוניהם**, “And how (is) our priesthood (regarded)¹¹⁷ in their dwelling-places?” (line 6), that is, probably the dwelling-places of the divine, heavenly beings. The second question is: **[מה] תרומת לשון עפרנו בדעת אל[ים]**, “what is the contribution of our tongue of dust (compared) with the knowledge of divine beings?” The not fully preserved question about holiness (**קודש[י]הם** [...], ll. 6-7) might add another element to this juxtaposition.

However, this juxtaposition through rhetorical questions could well express the transcending glory of the heavens of God's kingdom. Thus, in spite of the rhetorical juxtaposition, we read in line 8 of the same fragment: **נרוממה לאלוהי דעת**, “let us extol the God of knowledge”. 4Q401 frag. 14, col. I shows an overlap with 4Q400 fragment 2; 4Q401 frag. 14, col. II conveys the revelation of God's mysteries and the announcement of hidden things, and this idea seems to bring the praise of God by heavenly and human beings together.

4.2.3 *Heavenly temple imagery in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*

The predominance of heavenly temple imagery in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* is reflected in fragments from 4Q400, 4Q403, 4Q404, 4Q405 and 11Q17.¹¹⁸ The heavenly temple imagery is conveyed by expressions like ‘god-like beings, priests of the exalted heights’, **אלים כוהני מרומי רום** (4Q400 1 I, 20), and ‘the tabernacle of utmost height, the glory of his kingdom, the inner shrine’, **משכן רוש רום כבוד מלכותו דביר** (4Q403 1 II, 10), or by the context of the passage in which the Temple is mentioned.

In this section, I will discuss in some detail the analogy between the heavenly temple imagery and the cosmological concept of seven heavens in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. This analogy appears most explicitly in a description of the heavenly holy of holies in a passage from 4Q403 Frag. 1, column II: “seven mysteries of knowledge in the wonderful mystery of the seven regions of the hol[y of holies]” (line 27). The seven regions of the holy of holies are also related to the ‘regulations of his (God's) sanctuaries’, **שבעת גולי פלא** (line 21), and in line 22 mention is made of ‘seven priesthoods in the wonderful Temple for the seven holy councils’. The idea which is implicit in this evocative imagery is the analogy between seven heavens and seven sanctuaries. In accordance with this idea of an analogy between temple imagery in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and heavenly regions are the following arguments from the text.

First, in various places a plurality of sanctuaries is described: for example, **מקדשיו** in 4Q403 1, II, 21 (cf. 4Q405 frags. 8-9, line 5, and 11Q17 II, 6-7) and **מקדשי פלא** [בכול] in 4Q404 frag. 5, line 5 (cf. 4Q405 frags. 4, 5, 69, 6, 58, 57, line 14). In cases where the sanctuary, **מקדש**, occurs in the singular, the context often suggests a location in the main vault above the heavens (cf. e.g. 4Q403 1, I, 42-43; 4Q405 frags. 4, 5, 69, 6, 58, 57, lines 9-11).

Secondly, the description of seven chief princes who are engaged in praises and blessings in 4Q403 1, I, 1-29, which has the most extensive version of this passage,¹¹⁹

¹¹⁷ The addition of the verb in parentheses can be derived from the part of the Hebrew phrase **מה נתחשב** [ב] which precedes the full question.

¹¹⁸ 4Q400 1, I, 3-20; 2; 4Q403 1, I, 39-46, II, 7-16, 18-27; 4Q404 5; 4Q405 frags. 4, 5, 69, 6, 58, 57, lines 7-15, frags. 8-9, frag. 11, frags. 14-15, col. I, frags. 15 col. II – 16, frag. 18, frag. 19, frags. 20 col. II – 21 – 22, lines 1-4, 6-10, frag. 23, col. II, 10-13; 11Q17 II, V-X. Cf. MasShirShabb I, 9-13, II, 24-26.

¹¹⁹ Cf. MasShirShabb II, 4Q404 frags. 2 + 3AB and 4Q405 frag. 3 for the reconstruction of this text.

indicates a transcending glory in the liturgy of worship. The seven chief princes, נשיאי ראש,¹²⁰ may be related to the mention of the ‘chiefs of the kingdom’, ראשי ממלכות, in 4Q405 23, II, 11-12, who are in “all the heights of the sanctuaries of his kingdom of glory”, בכול מרומי, מקדשי מלכות כבודו. Thus, an analogy between seven chief princes and presumably seven heavenly sanctuaries is concerned.

Finally, a relation between God’s dwelling-place and the heavenly temple imagery is conveyed through various references. 4Q400 frag. 2, line 4 mentions the ‘heavens of his kingdom’, שמי מלכותו (cf. 4Q401 14, I, 6). God’s residence above the heavens in this heavenly cosmology becomes clear, among others things, from the praise of God exalting “his glorious divinity above all the exalted heights” in 4Q403 1, I, 33-34. Thus, the plurality of sanctuaries is analogous with the plurality of heavens of God’s kingdom, while the singularity of the interior of the holy of holies refers to God’s dwelling-place where priests are called ‘servants of the presence of the most holy king’, משרתי פני מלך קודש קודשים, (4Q400 1, I, 8).

4.3 4QDaily Prayers (4Q503)

The liturgical text, called *4QDaily Prayers*, as well as the text discussed in the next section (*4QWords of the Luminaries*), was published by M. Baillet in 1982.¹²¹ In *4QDaily Prayers*, the following are recurring formulas of worship: שלום עליכה ישראל (with the variation שלום אל עליכה ישראל), ברוך אל ישראל, and ברוך אלוהי כול קודשים. The worship of God is related to the beginning of the light of day (cf. e.g. frags. 7-9 and 10).

A few remarks on the holy of holies can be found in *4QDaily Prayers* which are full of heavenly temple imagery. Thus, in frags. 13-16, the context of the passage indicates a link with cosmology rather than with the earthly temple cult. In line 8 of frags. 13-16, mention is made of [קודש קו]דשים במרומ[ים], the “holy of ho]lies in the height[s]”. *4QDaily Prayers*, frags. 1-3, line 14 and frags. 29-32, line 10, mention שערי אור, the ‘gates of light’. This imagery suggests the idea of a heavenly temple, to which the concepts of the holy of holies and gates are transposed.

4.4 4QWords of the Luminaries

There are two textual witnesses of the composition *Words of the Luminaries*, 4Q504 and 4Q506, of which 4Q504 is the most extensive. The fragments of 4Q504 address God in prayer (cf. frag. 8r, l. 1; frag. 4, l. 16; 3, II, 5; 1-2, I, 8). In the prayers, God is besought to remember his people, the people of Israel, and in the course of this entreaty, references are made to the biblical history of Israel (cf. e.g. frags. 1-2, cols. I-V). This biblical history concerns the atonement for Israel’s sin by God’s covenant with Moses (4Q504 1-2, II, 9-10). It further relates to the covenant with David and the offerings ‘to honour your people and Zion, your holy city and your glorious house’, לכבד את עמכה ואת ציון עיר קודשכה ובית תפארתכה, (4Q504 1-2, IV, 6, 8-12). This phrase signifies the city of Jerusalem and the first Temple. Another passage creates the impression of a priestly kingdom: כוהנים וגוי קדוש [ממלכת] (4Q504 frag. 4, line 10).

¹²⁰ Cf. 4Q403 1, I, 30-32, about the praise of the ‘chiefs of the praises of all the god-like beings’, ראשי תושבחות כול אלוהים - probably being the chief princes of the preceding passage - concerning the glory of God’s kingdom.

¹²¹ M. Baillet, *DJD* VII, 105-168, pls. XXXV, XXXVII, XXXIX, XLI, XLVIII, XLV, XLVII, XLIX-LIII.

4Q504 1-2, V, 6-17 comprises a request for the blessings of the covenant to be applied to the contemporary age, addressing the living God, אל חי, that he may remember his covenant. Among these blessings is probably the blessing associated with the worship of God in the Jerusalem Temple (cf. 4Q504 1-2, IV, 8-13).

A terse reference to heavenly temple imagery occurs in 4Q504 1-2, VII recto. This passage, which concerns a 'song for the sabbath day' (שיר ביום שבת), line 4), mentions "all the angels of the holy vault", כול מלאכי רקיע קודש, (line 6).

5. Temple theology and Scripture

5.1 Temple theology in the literature of Qumran

The extent to which a 'temple theology' in the literature of Qumran can be discerned depends on the degree to which themes related to temple imagery recur in important texts of which a substantial number of fragments are extant. In what follows, I will present some arguments in favour of the idea of a Qumran temple theology.

First, the historical context of the separation of the Qumran community from the regular temple cult may be inferred from a range of texts: 4QMMT, the *Damascus Document* and the *Pesher to Habakkuk*. The *Damascus Document* (CD-A I, 18) polemicises against the opponents of the sectarian community, labelling them as 'seekers of smooth interpretations', דורשי החלקות. Comparable evidence of this polemic against opponents occurs in 1QH^a X, 15 and 32; 4Q163 (*4QIsaiah Pesher*) 23, II, 10; 4Q169 (*4QNahum Pesher*) 3-4, I, 2 and 7, II, 2 and 4, col. III, 3 and 7; and in 4Q177 frag. 9, l. 4. The sectarian character of the majority of the above-mentioned texts supports the idea of a development of a Qumran temple theology from the perspective of separation from the contemporary Temple cult.

Second, a literary search for commonalities in the use of temple imagery in texts which are usually identified as sectarian texts may provide an argument in favour of a Qumran temple theology. One example is the image of the 'everlasting plantation' in relation to temple imagery. This theme is present in 1QS VIII, 5-6. 1QH^a XIV, 15, and connects the image of an 'everlasting plantation' to 'all the men of God's council. This image is very explicitly associated with the garden of Eden and its streams (cf. 1QH^a XIV, 15-17; XVI, 5-7 and 9-11). As the garden of Eden is related to the story of creation, it is important to note that the *Temple Scroll* (11QT^a XXIX) also identifies the idea of an eschatological Temple with a new creation, as we have discussed before. 1QH^a *Hodayot*^a conveys comparable imagery related to the sectarian community. Even though 1QH^a does not comprise temple imagery, the contrast in column IX, 26-27 seems to convey a negative perspective on the contemporary Temple cult. That is, the "service of iniquity", עבודת העוון, which belongs to the sons of man, is contrasted to the works of righteousness and the "foundation of truth", סוד האמת, which belong to God. Similarly, 1QS VIII, 5 also states that the community council shall be founded in truth.

Another example could be the theme of an eschatological temple. This theme appears in 4Q174 (*Eschatological Midrash*^a) and eschatological overtones surround the idea of the community as a Temple in the *Community Rule*. The interpretation of 2 Samuel 7:10 in 4Q174 frag.1 I, 21, 2, lines 1-2, relates the appointment of judges over Israel to "the house which [he will establish] for [him] in the last days". This aspect of judgment over Israel in connection to the eschatological Temple may be compared with the description of the community council in 1QS VIII, 1-7, as a "holy house for Israel" (line 5), which also fulfills judicial functions, as described in lines 1-4 and 6-7.

There are, however, limitations to the argumentation in favour of a Qumran temple theology.¹²² The contexts of the passages in which imagery with regard to views on the Temple occurs, can lead to divergent interpretations and divergent uses should not be harmonised. Nevertheless, the search for commonalities which could point to the development of a temple theology need not imply a defense of seamless coherence.

5.2 Qumran Temple theology and biblical interpretation

A developed temple theology of the Qumran community expresses itself through the hermeneutics of scriptural interpretation. A clear example of this is the above discussed *Eschatological Midrash* which provides a midrashic combination of verses from different biblical books. A leading thread in this text is the interpretation of 2 Samuel 7:10-14 in support of Qumran sectarian ideas of an eschatological Temple. The prooftext of Exodus 15:17-18 is interspersed between the interpretation of 2 Samuel 7:10 and 2 Samuel 7:11 in order to stress the continuity of the eschatological Temple with the establishment of God's sanctuary, as envisaged in the book of Moses.

In 4QMMT, the use of Scripture is in the interest of legal issues of ritual purity. Many of these legal issues pertain to the priestly service of the worship of God, but also to the holiness of the religious congregation in a broader sense. 4QMMT names certain priestly regulations in the context of dispute, quoting passages mainly from Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy as prooftexts.¹²³

The peshet of Isaiah 24:17 about the 'three nets of Belial' in CD-A IV, 12-19 conveys a sectarian perspective on the priestly establishment. The defilement of the Temple figures among the 'nets of Belial' and is related to wicked wealth and sexual immorality by fornication, intercourse with menstruating women and blood relations. Levitical laws partly underlie the sectarian idea of sexual immorality (Lev 15:19-24f., 18:1-30).

On different levels, the Qumran sectarian use of Scripture concerns the Temple. The purity of the Temple is an issue in 4QMMT, in contrast with the perceived contemporary situation of abuse and transgression. The perspective on the defilement of the Temple in other documents marks a later phase in the development of the Qumran community. 4QMMT refers to Levitical laws with regard to the purity of the Temple cult and the holiness of the priests. In the polemical perspective of the secluded sectarian community, the *Damascus Document* uses evocative imagery like the 'three nets of Belial' in order to give expression to the transgressions in Israel, rather than giving a list of legal issues for consideration.

6. Summary

Redactional and source-critical studies of the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule* have pointed to their related textual development. We can therefore read these texts as expressions of an evolving set of beliefs and practices of the sectarian Qumran community. Exegetical arguments of comparable themes, such as the image of the 'everlasting plantation', and labels of opponents, such as 'the seekers of easy interpretations', can be added to this

¹²² Cf. the caution expressed by Davies, 'The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document', 288: "One suspects that "Qumran theology" is a precarious edifice, and that the doctrines of the community were less homogeneous than is often supposed".

¹²³ 4QMMT B 1 giving "some of our regulations", מקצת דברינו, based on the Qumran interpretation of Scripture. Cf. Brooke, 'The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT', 1-20.

redactional and source-critical perspective. Although the assumption of coherence among the Qumran texts is suspicious, we may discern a development in sectarian thought about the Temple amounting to a temple theology with eschatological orientations.

The rhetoric of separation in 4QMMT probably addresses an external party and cannot be equated with novitiates as they are addressed in the *Rule of the Community* and the *Damascus Document*. In view of the polemic against the 'Wicked Priest' in the *Pesher to Habakkuk* and the veiled polemic against the priestly establishment, the addressees of 4QMMT could well be a party which had significant influence on the priestly order.

The temple theology of the literature of Qumran implicates the sectarian community in the idea of the eschatological Temple. Thus, there is a metaphorical level to this temple theology. The use of Scripture in the case of purity laws concerns ritual purity, while in the case of the eschatological perspective in Qumran texts, scriptural interpretation adds metaphorical views on the Temple. The *Rule of the Community* represents the sectarian community as a 'house of holiness', thereby competing with if not aiming at a substitution for the contemporary priestly establishment. The recensional history of the *Rule of the Community* may reflect a development from polemic against the priestly establishment in the sectarian situation of separation and exile to the explicit self-representation of the community as a Temple. The *Damascus Document* contains regulations stipulating the abstinence from the regular Temple cult, which has been associated with defilement, and sectarian worship.

The eschatological perspective on the Temple in the Qumran texts does, however, make clear that the sectarian community did not abandon the idea that the Jerusalem Temple was central to the worship of God. This is revealed by the continued circulation of 4QMMT within the Qumran community, in which Jerusalem has a prominent place with regard to the idea of holiness. The *War Scroll* further accords a prominent place to Jerusalem in connection with the idea of an eschatological battle (1QM I, 3; VII, 3-4; XII, 13, 17). The sectarian eschatological perspective envisages the eventual restoration of the Temple. This precludes the idea of a fundamental and definite substitution-theology.

The analogy between the earthly temple and the heavenly temple figures both in sectarian texts, like 1QS XI, 7-9 and 1QH^a XI, 21-22, and in texts of which the sectarian or non-sectarian character is subject of discussion, such as the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. This analogy suggests an implicit polemic against the corruption of the earthly Temple cult.

CHAPTER 3

THE EARLY JESUS-MOVEMENT AND THE TEMPLE

1. Introduction

1.1 Problems of historical criticism

This chapter will explore the traditions about and attitudes to the Temple which can be connected to the early Jesus-movement prior to the Jewish War (66-70 CE). In the decades from Jesus' ministry up to the eve of the Jewish War, the early Jesus-movement developed into a manifold missionary movement which spread from Israel to the Diaspora. This development has to be taken into account when we deal with the issue of the earliest Christian traditions about the Temple. The historical problem of identifying such early traditions is twofold.

First, except for Paul's letters, our earliest Christian sources about Jesus and his first followers are of a later date. The canonical Gospels as well as other canonical and apocryphal early Christian texts were presumably written between the last years of the Jewish War and several decades afterwards.¹ These texts primarily reflect the communal concerns and standpoints of their audiences with regard to the preaching of the gospel of Christ.² Since the texts which have come down to us mainly address congregations in the Diaspora, they are in various ways at a distance from the historical milieu of Jesus, that is, Israel and Palestinian Judaism.³ In order to reconstruct pre-70 CE Christian perspectives on the Temple, we therefore have to deal with the difficult question of which sources from the historical milieu of Jesus, both written and oral, underlie the earliest Christian writings.

Second, the vast difference between the pre-70 CE and the post-70 CE situation poses a further problem of historical criticism which is also a basic concern of the present chapter. After all, the Romans captured Jerusalem and destroyed the Temple in 70 CE at the end of the Jewish War. The majority of the earliest Christian writings which refer to the ministry of Jesus and to the social setting of the early Jesus-movement were written down after 70 CE. The destruction of the Jerusalem Temple coloured post-70 CE Christian polemics against Judaism, because Christianity separated its ways from Judaism.⁴ It may reasonably be wondered whether these changed historical circumstances after 70 CE also coloured the perspective on the Temple.

¹ Cf. e.g. U. Schnelle, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (UTB 1830; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 2019) 237-239, 261, 285, 538-541; G. Theißen & A. Merz, *Der historische Jesus. Ein Lehrbuch* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1996) 41-69; H. Conzelmann & A. Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch zum Neuen Testament* (UTB 52; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 2000) 321, 331, 343-344, 364-367, 373. Cf. my discussion in section 3.1.

² Cf. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 25 about this point of the primary kerygmatic character of Jesus-tradition made by form-critical studies of M. Dibelius, K.L. Schmidt, R. Bultmann and others.

³ Cf. e.g. passages in Mark (7:3-4) and John (5:1, 6:4) which reflect a distance to the Jews and their religious practices. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 262 refers to scholarly studies about the idea that 'your/their synagogues' in Matt 4:23, 9:35, 10:17, 12:9, 13:54, 23:34 implies a distance. Cf. G. Theißen, *Lokalkolorit und Zeitgeschichte. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Freiburg Switzerland / Göttingen 2019) 264-270 about textual evidence in Luke which suggests that the author of this Gospel would have a foreigner's perspective on the geography of Israel. Cf. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 51-69.

⁴ Cf. e.g. Ignatius, *To the Magnesians* 8-10; *Letter of Barnabas* 4, 9-10, 15-16; Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* 22:11, 40:2; Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* II, 6, 23.

An important example of the question whether post-70 CE circumstances have coloured the picture of Jesus' ministry in the Gospels is the synoptic tradition about Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of the Temple. This prophecy stands at the beginning of an eschatological passage (Mark 13:1-2.3-37, Matt 24:1-2.3-36, Luke 21:5-6.7-36). This eschatological passage concerns the interpretation of signs about events in the future and the expected end of the age. Certain 'future events', like persecution and the flight of followers of Jesus from Judaea, concern contemporary experiences of the early Jesus-movement. However, do they directly relate to Jesus' words or rather to an interpretation of Jesus' words in light of later events? What part of the passage can be isolated as an early tradition which relates to the historical milieu of Jesus, and what part consists of elaborations by the evangelist in his editorial framework? This is a methodical problem which we need to deal with in order to identify pre-70 CE levels of Gospel tradition.

In our search of pre-70 CE traditions, we need to distinguish between different levels of tradition which may all be important for our understanding of the Jesus-movement contemporary to Paul. One level of tradition centralises the words and deeds of Jesus with regard to the Temple as they were remembered by the direct environment of his followers. A second level of tradition emphasises interpretations of Jesus' words by his followers in light of later, but still pre-70 CE, experiences and circumstances. An important example of this is the witness to and preaching of the resurrection of Jesus Christ (cf. e.g. John 2:21-22). A third level of tradition concerns the attitudes of Jesus' followers to the Temple and may in some way be related to their gospel preaching (cf. e.g. Luke 24:52-53, Acts 3:1.11, 7:44-50f.). In our analysis of the different sources about the early Jesus-movement we will need to distinguish between these levels of tradition.

1.2 The conceptual starting point: the early Jesus-movement before 70 CE

An important aspect of the historical analysis of pre-70 CE traditions is the way in which we conceptualise the early Jesus-movement. The term 'Christians' (Χριστιανοί) is a relatively late marker for the collective identity of the early Jesus-movement. According to several scholars it originates from a negative, external way of designating the earliest followers of Jesus as a political threat to the status quo.⁵ The term Χριστιανοί only appears in three passages of the canonical New Testament (Acts 11:26, 26:28, 1 Pet 4:16). The earliest documents of the canonical New Testament, that is, Paul's Letters which are dated between ca. 49 and 61 CE,⁶ do not comprise the term 'Christians' at all. Paul instead refers to believers in Christ, addressing both Jews and Greeks (cf. e.g. Rom 1:16, 1 Cor 1:21-24). In Galatians 2:15-16, Paul calls himself and possibly to other co-workers 'we Jews by birth', ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, who know that they are justified through faith in Jesus Christ. Co-workers of Paul, like Prisca, Aquila and Apollos, are each individually described as Jews (Ἰουδαῖος) in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 18:2.24).

⁵ Cf. J. Taylor, S.M., 'Why were the disciples first called "Christians" at Antioch (Acts 11,26)', *RB* 101 (1994) 75-94, critically supports the idea first put forward by E. Peterson that the Roman authorities in Antioch first coined the term 'Christians' in the context of political connotations of sedition and criminality. Cf. É. Nodet, 'James, the Brother of Jesus, was never a Christian', in S.C. Mimouni (ed.), *Le judéo-christianisme dans tout ses états. Actes du colloque de Jérusalem 6-10 juillet 1998* (Cerf: Paris, 2001) 75: "The word 'Christian' was first coined by Roman authorities to qualify Jewish messianizing rebels outside Judea", and 76f. about Acts 11:26, 18:1f; Suetonius, *Claudius* § 25.

⁶ Cf. e.g. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life*, 1-31; M. Hengel & A.M. Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien. Die unbekanntten Jahre des Apostels* (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1998) 2-3.

The early Jesus-movement and the Temple

The early Jesus-movement started as a Jewish movement in Israel. Terms such as ‘Galileans’ for the apostles in Jerusalem (e.g. Acts 1:11, 2:7) and ‘the sect of the Nazoreans’ (e.g. in Acts 24:5) attest to this beginning of the missionary Jesus-movement as a Jewish movement.⁷ Although the Jesus-movement eventually attracted both Jewish and Gentile converts,⁸ the spreading of the mission initially depended on the first followers of Jesus, who were most of all Jewish.⁹

In my view the traditional scholarly construct ‘Jewish Christianity’ is problematic as a descriptive term for the early Jesus-movement. For this term has the disadvantage that it is indistinctly used for certain texts within the New Testament and for groups branded as heretical sects in patristic literature.¹⁰ ‘Jewish Christianity’ suggests that one branch of Christianity is concerned, whereas it appears to apply only to a later situation in which the churches outside Israel had become more dominant than the Jerusalem church. Because of our focus on the early Jesus-movement, we should think in terms of ‘Christian Jews’ and ‘early Christian-Jewish traditions’.¹¹ This terminology underlines the fact that the first followers of Jesus were and saw themselves as Jews who had embraced the faith in Jesus Christ.

1.3 The historical framework for our approach to the early Jesus-movement

My primary concern in this chapter consists of the identification of different levels of Gospel tradition about the early Jesus-movement and the Temple and of a reconstructed image of the ways in which gospel traditions about the Temple were spread to the Diaspora. In order to identify different levels of pre-70 CE tradition about the early Jesus-movement and the Temple, I will proceed with my discussion according to the following subdivision of issues.

⁷ Cf. Taylor, ‘Why were the disciples first called ‘Christians’ at Antioch’, 90 n. 46 refers to a statement in the 10th century Byzantine *Suidae Lexicon*, X 523 (ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ μετωνομάσθησαν οἱ πάλοι λεγόμενοι Ναζιραῖοι καὶ Γαλιλαῖοι Χριστιανοί) of which the ‘former names’ seem to correspond to e.g. Acts 1:11, 2:7 (Γαλιλαῖοι) and 24:5 (ἡ τῶν Ναζωραίων ἀρεσις).

⁸ Cf. Rom 1:16, 1 Cor 1:21-24, Acts 11:1, 13:46-47f. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 18.63 (the so-called ‘Testimonium Flavianum’): καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο, “He [Jesus] won over many Jews and many of the Greeks”; text and translation from L.H. Feldman, *Josephus in nine volumes* IX, 50-51.

⁹ Note the mediatory role of Jesus’ disciples Philip and Andrew between certain curious ‘Greeks’ (Ἑλληνέες τινας), perhaps godfearers among those who went up to worship, and Jesus himself in John 12:20-22f.

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. the recent survey by J. Carleton Paget, ‘Jewish Christianity’, in *CHJ III The Early Roman period, 731-775*, which also deals with problems of definition of the neologism of ‘Jewish Christians’ at length; cf. 733 where Carleton Paget applies the term to certain groups of Christians like the Ebionites, Nazarenes and Elchasaites as described by Christian writers from the late second century CE onwards. Further on, however, on page 742, Carleton Paget applies the term also to the early Jesus-movement: “In the beginning of all Christianity was Jewish Christianity. The first Christians were practising Jews operating within the sphere of Judaism”.

Cf. e.g. the ‘Introduction’ by F. Stanley Jones in Mimouni (ed.), *Le judéo-christianisme dans tout ses états*, 13-14 referring to the fact that ‘Jewish Christianity in all its stages’ is “a subject discussed by many disciplines [traditional Church History, traditional New Testament scholarship, scholarship of Second Temple Judaism, and Talmudic scholarship] but owned by none”.

¹¹ For a perspective on the early Jesus-movement as a form of Judaism, see e.g. R.A. Wild, S.J., “The Encounter between Pharisaic and Christian Judaism: Some Early Gospel Evidence”, *NovT* 27 (1985) 105-124; G.P. Luttikhuisen, “Vroeg-christelijk jodendom”, in T. Baarda, H.J. de Jonge & M.J.J. Menken eds., *Jodendom en vroeg christendom: continuïteit en discontinuïteit* (Kok: Kampen, 1991) 163-189. Cf. G.P. Luttikhuisen, ‘Vroegchristelijk jodendom’, in idem, *De veelvormigheid van het vroegste christendom* (Eburon: Delft, 2002) 75-100.

First, I will survey the prophetic and post-biblical traditions of cult criticism and the use by Jesus and the early Jesus-movement of such traditions. The question emerges how to separate post-70 CE circumstances of compilation or even redaction from an accurate historical picture of the attitudes of Jesus and his earliest followers towards the Temple in our interpretation of passages like Mark 11:15-19 (par.), Matthew 12:1-8 (par.), and Acts 7:48-50. Prophetic inspiration is, however, a prominent element in traditions about the beginning of the Jesus-movement (cf. Mark 1:1-3, Matt 1:22-23, 3:1-3, Luke 4:16-21, *Gospel of Thomas* logion 52). Thus, the question of a Jewish framework for cult criticism within the early Jesus-movement must be considered seriously.

Second, the sources about the historical Jesus and their problems will be discussed. The importance of the apocryphal and non-Christian sources next to the traditional, canonical New Testament writings is the starting-point for our discussion. In view of the pluriformity of the early Jesus-movement, we would present an incomplete picture of the historical Jesus if we were to exclude the non-canonical and non-Christian texts from our discussion by dismissing it *a priori* as secondary or unreliable information.¹²

Third, I will discuss the historical background and milieu of Jesus. That is, I will refer to important aspects of first century CE Galilee and survey how recent scholarly studies, textual as well as archaeological, have modified the picture of the Galilean milieu of the historical Jesus. I will subsequently examine whether and to what extent we can get a notion of contemporary Galilean attitudes to the Temple. Then I will explore what Jesus' Galilean origin and the contemporary Jewish attitudes to the Temple may contribute to our understanding of Jesus' attitude to the Temple.

Fourth, the question about the relation between Jesus and his followers on the one hand and John the Baptist and his baptist movement on the other will be the focus of our attention. I will evaluate the significance of connections as well as differences between Jesus' socio-religious position and that of John the Baptist. With regard to the subject of attitudes to the Temple, a comparison between the socio-religious role of John's baptism and the socio-religious significance of the Temple may be illustrative. In this connection, I will examine how Jesus' appeal to John's baptism in the synoptic tradition should be understood.

Fifth, I will turn to a discussion of individual Gospel traditions about Jesus' attitude to the religious practices of the Temple cult and his deeds and words related to the Temple. At the level of the interpretation of Jesus' words by his followers, I will discuss the subject of the Temple as a metaphor in Jesus-traditions. My discussion intends to distinguish clearly between verbal transmission, later interpretation, and redaction to the extent that this is possible in studying the Gospel traditions.

Eventually, I will consider the pre-70 CE perspectives of the early followers of Jesus on the Temple. In this connection, my study focuses on the encounters of the early Jesus-movement with Jewish movements, such as the priestly establishment and the Pharisees, with regard to their attitudes to the Temple. I will further address the question about the possible relations between the early Christian-Jewish attitudes to the Temple and Essene views about the Temple. The tradition in the Acts of the Apostles about Stephen's polemic against the Temple is a specific case for our discussion, since it sets the scene for a transition to missionary activity beyond Israel into the Diaspora in the agenda of the author of Luke-Acts. The transition from Israel to the Diaspora is treated by way of epilogue to this chapter, as I focus on Temple traditions related to Jesus and the early Jesus-movement in Israel.

¹² Cf. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 36-41; H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels. Their History and Development* (SCM: London / Trinity Press International: Philadelphia, 1990) 43-48 at 44 about the 'prevailing prejudice': "Even in recent times, scholars have characterized the apocryphal gospels as secondary, derivative, speculative, and merely concerned with the edification and entertainment of their readers, while the canonical gospels are routinely seen as original, historical, and replete with theological insight".

2. Prophetic traditions of cult criticism

2.1 Prophetic traditions: the priority of morality above ritual

The prophetic traditions of cult criticism are mainly found in the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos, Hosea, and Micah. They stress the moral outrage against the corruption of the Temple worship by practices of unrighteousness and godlessness in which the people of Israel engage, even though Israel is considered holy by God (cf. Lev 19). The prophetic cult criticism usually applies to Israel, but may also concern Judah and Jerusalem in particular.

Isaiah 1:11-13 voices the moral outrage as follows: “1:11 For what purpose to me is there a multitude of sacrifices, says the Lord. I have become weary of the whole burnt-offerings of rams, the fat of the bullocks, the blood of young bulls, young rams, and full-grown rams. I do not desire them. 12 When you enter to appear before me, who requires this trampling of my courts by you? 13 You shall not bring any vain offering any more; the smoke of the sacrifice is an abomination to me. There are new moon, Sabbath, and the convocation of an assembly, but I cannot endure wickedness together with solemn assembly”.¹³ Similarly, Jeremiah’s cult criticism occurs in the context of an admonition against the people of Judah and Jerusalem that they have disobeyed God’s words and law (Jer 6:19): “Your whole burnt-offerings are not desired, and your sacrifices do not please me”(Jer 6:20b).

The priority of righteousness above ritual pervades the prophetic traditions of cult criticism. Thus, Jeremiah 7:21-23 conveys the idea that a way of life in accordance with God’s commandments is more important than the ritual cult of burnt offerings and sacrifices. Amos 5:21-24 voices a similar priority by saying that justice and righteousness should be established before Israel’s cult of sacrifices and offerings can be acceptable to God.¹⁴ Amos 5:25-27 even juxtaposes Israel’s period in the wilderness without a sacrificial cult to the contemporary situation which is associated with idolatrous practices and impending exile.¹⁵ Hosea 6:6 conveys the prophetic message of cult criticism as follows: “For I desire loyalty, not sacrifice, and knowledge of God rather than whole burnt-offerings”. Prophetic criticism of the Temple cult is finally expressed in Micah 6:6-8.

The universalising message about the Temple cult, found in the post-restoration oracles in Isaiah 56:6-8 and 60:1-14, further raises the idea that only God’s righteousness and glory are of transcending significance. Thus, in Isaiah 56:7 we read that the Temple shall be called “a house of prayer for all peoples”, thereby including foreigners (cf. Isa 56:3-6). The moral precondition is conveyed in the preceding verses (Isa 56:1-2) which stress the need to do righteousness and keep God’s commandments. Isaiah 60:8-14 envisages how foreigners add to the glorification of Israel and the Jerusalem Temple. At the same time, God’s transcending glory is expressed in Isaiah 60:13. In this verse, the ‘place of my Temple’ is paralleled by ‘the place of my feet’. This image of the ‘place of my feet’ appears to correspond to Isaiah 66:1: “Thus says the Lord: ‘The heavens are my throne and the earth is my footstool. Where then is this house which you will build for me, and where is this resting-place for me?’”. The passage of Isaiah 66:1-6 supports the idea that the ritual of Temple cult without obedience to God’s words is just idolatry.

¹³ My translations of passages from the Prophets are based on the MT. The LXX has a slightly different text for the first part of Isa 1:13; whereas the MT reads *לֹא תוֹסִיפוּ הִבִּיא מִנְחַת־שׁוּא*, the LXX reads *οὐ προσθήσεσθε· ἐὰν φέρητε σμίδαλον, μάταιον* which seems to concretise the general term ‘vain offering’, *מנחת־שׁוּא*, of the MT.

¹⁴ Note the equivalent terms for ‘solemn assembly’ in the passages from Isaiah and Amos concerning cult criticism; *עצרה* in MT Isa 1:13; *עצרת־יכם* in MT Amos 5:21. Cf. 1 Samuel 15:22.

¹⁵ This thematic contrast between original devotion in the wilderness and idolatry in a cultivated state is also found in Jeremiah 2:2-3 and Hosea 2:14-20 and 9:10.

2.2 The impact and use of prophetic traditions

a. *Prophetic cult criticism in other biblical and apocryphal texts*

Certain biblical and apocryphal texts have incorporated the prophetic theme that obedience to God's words should precondition ritual commitment to the Temple cult. The general influence of prophetic traditions in the Second Temple period is further expressed by the inclusion of the prophets into the contemporary Jewish liturgy of scriptural readings¹⁶ and by references to the prophets in contemporary Jewish literature.¹⁷

MT Psalm 40:6-9 (= LXX Ps 39:6-9) introduces the idea that God requires the wholehearted observance of his will and his law rather than offerings and sacrifices. MT Psalm 50:7-15 (= LXX Ps 49:7-15) and MT Psalm 51:17-19 (= LXX Ps 50:17-19) likewise present a juxtaposition between the external aspect of ritual services and the intrinsic, unconditional worship of God. The influence of prophetic ideas in the Psalter is even more important since some Psalms were apparently used to accompany the Temple service.¹⁸

In the Septuagint text of Sirach we also encounter the influence of the prophetic tradition. Thus, the statement in LXX Sirach 34:19, "The most High does not delight in offerings of godless people, nor is He appeased for sins by a multitude of sacrifices", could echo Isaiah 1:11. Sirach 34:19 constitutes part of an exhortation against social injustice which blemishes sacrifices and offerings.¹⁹ The importance accorded to Sirach during the late Second Temple period is shown by manuscripts of a Hebrew text of Sirach discovered at Qumran, Masada and in the Cairo Genizah (cf. 2Q18, 11Q5 cols. XXI-XXII, MasSir).

b. *Universalism vs. exclusivism*

In the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, conflicting ideas emerged about the significance of the Temple as a 'house of prayer'. The Maccabees apparently rejected the universalistic idea of the Temple as a 'house of prayer for all peoples' which is voiced in Isaiah 56:7. 1 Maccabees 7:37 represents the Jerusalem Temple as a 'house of prayer and supplication for your people', οἶκος προσευχῆς καὶ δεήσεως τῷ λαῷ σου. This Maccabean idea of a 'house of prayer' excluded a constructive foreign part in the Temple cult, since the direct context of the narrative concerns the defilement of the Temple by the Hellenistic Seleucid rulers.

The negative attitude to "Hellenisation and the influx of foreign ways", Ἑλληνισμὸς καὶ πρόσβασις ἄλλοφυλισμοῦ (2 Macc 4:13) may have sprung from the context of the Maccabean war against foreign oppression and the profanation of the Temple (1 Macc 1:36-40, 2:7-13, 3:45, 50-53; 2 Macc 4:13, 6:1-6). Even if this specific negative attitude could be played down as an exceptional case of war propaganda,²⁰ there are other indications about the problematic relation between prophetic universalism and the exclusivism of the Temple cult.

¹⁶ Cf. e.g. Acts 13:15; *m. Meg.* 4:2; Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.37-43, there § 40 (οἱ μετὰ Μωυσην προφηῆται).

¹⁷ Cf. references to the Prophets in Philo's treatises, catalogued in E. Junod *et al.*, *Biblia Patristica, Supplément: Philon d'Alexandrie* (Éd. du CNRS: Paris, 1982) 89; Josephus' Biblical Antiquities (*Ant.* 1 - 11.296), *Ag. Ap.* 1.41, and applications of prophecy to later events in *Ant.* 13.64.68.71; Qumran commentaries on the prophets: 4QpIsa^{a-c}; 4QpHos^{a-b}; 1QpMic; 4QpNah; 1QpHab; 1QpZeph, 4QpZeph; 5QapocrMal.

¹⁸ Cf. LXX Sir 50:18 mentions οἱ ψαλμῶδοι in the Temple service led by Simon the high priest; *mTamid* 6:4 mentions Levites in the Temple as the singers of certain Psalms (Ps. 24, 48, 82, 94, 81, 93, 92).

¹⁹ πλῆθος θυσιῶν, in Sir 34:18-19 and MT Isa 1:11 כִּי־בָרַב־רַב / LXX Isa 1:11 πλῆθος τῶν θυσιῶν ὑμῶν.

²⁰ Cf. the recent focus on interaction against the supposed general background of Hellenism rather than on opposition and conflict in Collins & Sterling (eds.), *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*. See also L.H. Feldman's review article, 'How much Hellenism in the Land of Israel?', *JSJ* 33 (2002) 290-313.

Revolutionary, exclusivist ideas about the Temple cult were influential during the early Roman period (*J.W.* 2.320, 409-414; *Ant.* 18.9). Josephus also records an exemplary case in which foreigners (ἄλλόφυλοι) were expected to keep apart from the purification rituals of the Jewish people during a religious festival (*J.W.* 1. 229).²¹ The extent to which foreigners were permitted access to the Jerusalem Temple precincts was even a negative concern for the Jewish people.²² However, the priestly establishment upheld the part of foreigners in the ritual of the Temple cult as an ancestral tradition (*J.W.* 2.412-413).

c. Contemporary Jewish perspectives on the corruption of the Temple cult

Various Palestinian Jewish groups apparently perceived the danger of corruption of the Temple cult. The revolutionary movement called the ‘fourth philosophy’ held that the corruption of Jewish ancestral tradition was mainly caused by foreign dominion (*Ant.* 18.4-10). Popular movements of protest expressed common concerns against the corruption of the ancestral laws by the introduction of foreign images in Jerusalem and in the Temple precincts (*J.W.* 1.648-655; 2.5-7, 170-171, 184-185, 192-198). Significantly, one such a popular uprising at the time of Herod I’s impending death (4 BCE) was in fact led by two highly esteemed teachers of the ancestral laws (*J.W.* 1.648).

The priestly establishment was also under fire. Josephus’ implicit criticism of the early Roman practice of appointing high priests who were merely of priestly descent (*Ant.* 20.247-249), and his account of cases of outrage against certain high priests (cf. *J.W.* 2.5-7; *Ant.* 20.199-203) attest to this fact. Josephus also refers to the ‘writings of the ancient prophets’ as an oracle on the bad fate of Jerusalem and its Temple (*J.W.* 6.109-110) in a situation of slaughter of Jews by other Jews, usurpation of the priesthood and pollution of the Temple by the revolutionaries (cf. *J.W.* 4.147-154, 159, 163).

The sectarian communities of the Essenes and the community of Qumran perceived the corruption of the contemporary Temple cult in the early Roman period as an accomplished fact. The Essenes had their own partial alternative to the Temple cult (cf. chapter 1). The *Damascus Document* expresses its polemic against the contemporary Temple cult with a reference to, among other prooftexts, Malachi 1:10 (CD-A VI, 13-14). Certain Qumran commentaries on the prophets are also very polemical in their viewpoint on the defilement of the contemporary Temple cult and the corruption of the priestly establishment (1QpHab VIII, 8-13, IX, 3-7, XII, 7-9; cf. 4QpIsa^b II, 6-10; 4QpHos^b II, 14-17). The Qumranite view was determined by separation from the regular Temple cult. The Qumran community underpinned its self-definition as a holy community in Israel (1QS VIII, 4-12) separated from the ‘dwelling of the men of injustice’, מושב אנשי העור, (1QS VIII, 13) with words from Isaiah 40:3 (in 1 QS VIII, 14f.) about the preparation for the way of the Lord in the desert (cf. chapter 2).

²¹ Cf. J.D.G. Dunn, ‘Jesus and Purity: An Ongoing Debate’, *NTS* 48 (2002) 449-467 at 450-456 about the “importance of purity in Second Temple Judaism” even extending to “Jewish subconsciousness”.

²² Cf. *J.W.* 1.152, about Pompey’s entering the Holy of Holies: “Of the misfortunes (αἰ συμφοραί) of that time nothing seized the people so much as the fact that the sanctuary hitherto kept out of sight was disclosed by foreigners (οἱ ἄλλόφυλοι)”. Other negative examples about foreign infringement on the Temple concern Pontius Pilate and Caligula (*J.W.* 2.169-177, 184-187, 192-203; *Ant.* 18.55-62, 261-309). Cf. my chap. 1.

See also *Ant.* 15.417 about an inscription (γραφή) at the entrance of the second court of the Temple “forbidding any foreigner to enter, threatening with the penalty of death”, κωλύον εἰσεῖναι τὸν ἄλλοεθνῆ, θανατικῆς ἀπειλουμένης τῆς ζημίας (*Ant.* 15.417). Cf. the parallel account in *J.W.* 5.194 about several tablets, στήλαι, in Greek and Latin. A Greek inscription comparable to Josephus’ description was published by M. Clermont-Ganneau in *PEFQS* (1871) p. 132; its Greek text (quoted from R. Marcus & A. Wikgren, *Josephus in nine volumes* VIII, 202-203 n. d) reads: Μηθένα ἄλλογενῆ εἰσπορεύεσθαι ἐντὸς τοῦ περὶ τὸ ἱερόν τρυφάκτου καὶ περιβόλου. ὃς δ’ ἂν ληφθῆ ἑαυτῷ αἴτιος ἔσταιδιὰ τὸ ἕξακολουθεῖν θάνατον.

d. The early Jesus-movement and prophetic traditions of cult criticism

How can references to prophetic cult criticism in the New Testament inform our historical perspective on Jesus and his earliest followers? The prophetic inspiration is a main thread in the Gospel narratives about the beginning of the Jesus-movement and passages about Jesus' attitude to the Temple. The question is whether this main thread is a redactional product originating from apologetic, missionary concerns to relate Jesus' ministry to the fulfilment of prophecy²³ or to what extent it applies to the historical milieu of Jesus' earliest followers.

The four canonical Gospels relate the beginning of the Jesus-movement to the precursory activity of John the Baptist²⁴ and refer to Isaiah 40:3 as a proof-text (Mark 1:2-4; Matt 3:3-4; Luke 3:1-6; John 1:23). It should, however, be noted that this 'proof-text' is cited in different ways²⁵ and only John 1:23 suggests that Isaiah 40:3 are the direct words of John the Baptist himself. Notwithstanding the variations, the prophetic character of John's baptism is a common theme in the canonical Gospels. The Synoptic Gospels even suggest that Jewish people viewed John the Baptist as a prophet (Mark 11:32, Matt 14:5, 21:26, Luke 20:6); an idea confirmed by Jesus (Matt 11:9-10, Luke 7:26-27).²⁶ Thus, the prophetic inspiration probably was an important element at the beginning of the Jesus-movement.

The issue of Jesus' affiliation with the role of a prophet or his use of prophetic traditions is more complicated. For the prophetic role is one among many roles accorded to Jesus,²⁷ and the question of tradition or redaction is imperative for the case of prophetic words concerning the Temple attributed to Jesus.²⁸ According to scattered Gospel traditions, Jesus was considered a prophet among the Jewish people (Matt 21:46; John 6:14), among his followers (Luke 24:19) and among those healed by Jesus (John 9:17). According to Luke 4:17-21, Jesus refers to the fulfilment of the prophecy from Isaiah implying his own ministry. Jesus' proverb about a prophet who is not honoured in his home town is more common in the Gospels (Mark 6:4; Matt 13:57; Luke 13:33; John 4:44; *GTh* 31, 52). Even though the association of Jesus' ministry with aspects of prophetic activity is widespread in the Gospel traditions, the historicity of separate elements of Jesus' prophetic message is disputable.²⁹

²³ Matt 2:15.17, 4:14, 13:35, 21:4, 27:9 are examples of Matthew's characteristic language about the 'fulfilment' of prophetic words (ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος). Cf. John 2:17 and 12:37-43 as about words from Scripture applied to Jesus by his disciples and redactional use of Isaiah respectively.

²⁴ Cf. the contrast between John's baptism with water and Jesus' baptism with the Holy Spirit in Mark 1:8, Matt 3:11, Luke 3:16, and John 1:32-34; Acts 18:25, 19:2-4.

²⁵ Mark 1:2-3 begins with words from Exod 23:20 or Mal 3:1 (Mark 1:2) and then turns to Isa 40:3 (Mark 1:3); Matt 3:3 cites Isa 40:3; Luke 3:4-6 cites a larger portion, that is, Isa 40:3-5; John 1:23 only cites Isa 40:3a-b.

²⁶ Note that in Matt 11:10 / Luke 7:26-27 Jesus cites Exod 23:20 / Mal 3:1 concerning John the Baptist as a precursor, while the same 'quotation' figures in Mark 1:2 to introduce the preaching of John the Baptist. Cf. the *Gospel of Thomas* (*GTh*) logia 78 and 46 which partly correspond with Matt 11:7b-8/Luke 7:24b-25 and Matt 11:11/Luke 7:28 respectively; *GTh*, however, does not include the tradition that Jesus affirms John as prophet.

²⁷ See Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 175-492 at 221-253 with bibliography about Jesus as prophet of the eschatological kingdom of God. M. Öhler, 'Jesus as Prophet: Remarks on Terminology', in M. Labahn & A. Schmidt (eds.), *Jesus, Mark and Q. The Teaching of Jesus and its Earliest Records* (JSNTSup 214; Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 2001) 125-142 notes problems with defining Jesus' prophetic features as based on words (Theißen & Merz, J. Becker) or on deeds (E.P. Sanders, J.D. Crossan) respectively.

²⁸ M.J. Borg, *Conflict, Holiness, and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus* (Trinity Press International: Harrisburg, Pa., 1998) 196 n. 100, 203 n. 131 refers to E.E. Ellis, 'Luke xi.49-51: An Oracle of a Christian Prophet?', *ExpTim* 74 (1962-63) 157-158, that "early Christian prophets may have 'peshered' sayings of Jesus".

²⁹ Cf. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 245 refer to the warnings against 'this generation' about eschatological judgement in Luke 11:49-51 par. and in Luke 11:29 par. as a possible example of the influence of a secondary "reaction to negative experiences with the mission in Israel", that is, a later addition.

The early Jesus-movement and the Temple

Was Jesus' attitude to the Temple connected to prophetic traditions of cult criticism? All four canonical Gospels include the event of Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts which brought him into conflict with the priestly establishment (Mark 11:15-17, Matt 21:12-17, Luke 19:45-46, John 2:14-17). These Gospel narratives give the unmistakable impression that the objective of Jesus' action was to denounce the corruption of the Temple cult. Jesus' critical attitude to the contemporary state of the Temple and the priestly leadership appears to be affirmed also by the *Gospel of Thomas* (cf. logia 66, 71). In view of Jesus' denouncement of corruption, his actual teachings probably did contain allusions to traditional Jewish teachings of the prophets.³⁰

In the synoptic tradition (Mark 11:17, Matt 21:13, Luke 19:46), Jesus juxtaposes the ideal of the Temple as a 'house of prayer' (Isa 56:7)³¹ to the perceived reality of the Temple as a 'hideout of robbers' (Jer 7:11). John 2:14-16 has in common with the Synoptic tradition that Jesus' action focuses on money-changers and traders. However, the words 'you shall not make the house of my Father a house of trade' (John 2:16) appear to be an allusion to Zechariah 14:21. With regard to allusions to prophetic cult criticism, the Synoptic Gospels and John comprise divergent versions. This divergence, together with other points of comparison and contrast, will be discussed in a subsequent section.

At this point, we may at least infer from the Gospel narratives that Jesus' action was inspired by prophetic concerns for proper worship uncorrupted by money interests.³² Even though the commerce in the Temple precincts was related to customary ritual practices,³³ Jesus took offence at it. Jesus' denouncement of the corrupted state of the Temple may have a parallel in sectarian polemic against the wealth of the Temple (cf. 1QpHab IX, 3-7; CD-A VI, 15-16). The polemic against unjust gain as applied to the context of the Temple cult also corresponds with prophetic traditions (cf. e.g. MT Jer 8:10; Mic 3:11).

The canonical Gospel traditions about Jesus' contacts with scribes and Pharisees also comprise references to prophetic cult criticism. The impression which arises from these Gospel traditions is ambiguous, as there are examples of positive relations and agreements between Jesus and certain scribes and Pharisees (Luke 7:36, 11:37, 13:31, 14:1; John 3:1f.) as well as instances of disputes and polemic (Mark 2:23-28 par., Mark 8:15 par.). This divided picture complicates the task of separating redaction from tradition. Below, I will discuss the main examples of references to prophetic cult criticism in the setting of debates and disputes.

The pericope of Mark 12:28-34, a conversation between Jesus and a scribe about the first of all commandments, voices the influence of prophetic tradition. Thus, according to Mark 12:32-33, a scribe believed that the observance of the first of all commandments (Deut 6:5, Lev 19:18) is more relevant than "all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices". These words, which express the priority of love of one's neighbour above ritual, probably are a paraphrase of Hosea 6:6. This view could be more widespread among the moderate part of the Pharisaic movement and its scribes, because of a number of sayings from the early Pharisaic-rabbinic

³⁰ Examples in different contexts are Jesus' allusion to Mic 7:6 in Matt 10:35-36 / Luke 12:52-53/ *GTh* logion 16, to the 'sign of Jonah' in Matt 12:39 / Luke 11:29f., or to Isa 6:9f. in Matt 13:14-15 / Mark 4:12 / Luke 8:10.

³¹ Note the significant difference between the citation of Isa 56:7 in Mark 11:17 (οἶκος προσευχῆς πάντων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν) and that in Matt 21:13 / Luke 19:46 (οἶκος προσευχῆς), which I will discuss in a subsequent section.

³² Cf. the Jesus-tradition shared by Matt 6:24 and Luke 16:13, that one 'cannot serve both God and Mammon' [Aramaic word for wealth]. Cf. Luke 16:9.11; Mark 10:23 / Matt 19:23 / Luke 18:24.

³³ Cf. e.g. C.A. Evans, *WBC 34B Mark 8:27-16:20* (Thomas Nelson: Nashville, 2001) 171-172 and K. Paesler, *Das Tempelwort Jesu. Die Traditionen von Tempelzerstörung und Tempelrenewerung im Neuen Testament* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1999), 243-244 about exchange and commerce as a customary practice in the outer Court (the court of the Gentiles) related to the Temple cult.

tradition.³⁴ Mark's version, compared to parallel accounts in Matthew and Luke, conveys the only positive reference to one of the scribes, εἷς τῶν γραμματέων, in this context.³⁵ This positive reference probably serves a didactic purpose of showing that the essence of Jesus' teachings could be grasped even by people among Jesus' opponents.

Although the scribe's words suit a didactic purpose, it does not fit Mark's agenda of describing Jesus' opponents, the scribes among others, in a negative way (cf. Mark 3:22, 11:27, 12:38). The scribe's allusion to Hosea 6:6 rather provokes the idea that he implicitly attacked the casuistic position of the Sadducees who had priestly affiliations; another thing which he would have in common with Jesus (cf. Mark 12:18-27). Even if the scribe's reaction "fits the Markan context well, underscoring the rightness of Jesus' message, even in the face of priestly criticism and opposition",³⁶ it also accords with Josephus' evidence of tensions between the Pharisees (with their scribes) and the Sadducees (cf. my chap. 1). Thus, in my view Mark probably fitted a piece of authentic Jesus-tradition about a particular context of debate and dialogue into his own narrative framework.

The Gospel according to Matthew provides two examples of Jesus' reference to the prophetic cult criticism of Hosea 6:6 in his argument with the Pharisees. In Matthew 9:9-13, the prophetic words 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice' figure as part of the answer (Matt 9:13) to the Pharisees' question why Jesus eats with tax-collectors and sinners. In the pericope of Matthew 12:1-8, the prophetic words of Hosea 6:6 figure as part of the answer (Matt 12:7) to the Pharisees' question whether Jesus' disciples do not break the Sabbath laws. Both pericopes, Matt 9:9-13 and 12:1-8, have parallels in the other synoptic Gospels (Mark 2:13-17.23-28 and Luke 5:27-32, 6:1-5), but the latter do not refer to Hosea 6:6.

The quotations from Hosea 6:6 in Matthew 9:13 and 12:7 may well be the product of Matthean addition, for it puts the Pharisees on the defence concerning a subject, prophetic cult criticism, which does not occur in the other canonical Gospels. Instead, the Pharisees are rather criticised for hypocrisy in their teachings of the traditions of the elders, in particular the purity regulations in the public domain, in other Gospel traditions (cf. Mark 7:1-23; Matt 15:1-20; Luke 11:37-41f.). Even though the idea of the Pharisees applying the priestly rules of ritual purity to the public domain is influential, it is a matter of debate whether the Pharisees' purity regulations derived from their interpretation of biblical purity laws or constituted a broadened reapplication of priestly purity rules.³⁷

³⁴ Cf. *mAboth* 1:12 about a saying attributed to Hillel that associates the discipleship of Aaron (the priesthood) with humanity and observance of the Law; *Abot R.Nat.* B 8.11b where Yohanan ben Zakkai refers to Hosea 6:6.

³⁵ Note the contrast with the negative references to νομικός τις ἐκπειράζων αὐτόν and to εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν [νομικός] πειράζων αὐτόν in the parallel pericopes of Luke 10:25-29 at v. 25, and Matt 22:34-40 respectively. Evans, *WBC 34B Mark 8:27-16:20*, 262 explains for differences between Mark 12:28-34 and parallel Synoptic accounts on the basis of the circulation of variant forms of the dialogue in the "oral dominical tradition" and of Mark and Luke reflecting a "different occasion" respectively.

³⁶ Quotation from Evans, *WBC 34B Mark 8:27-16:20*, 267 without giving a definite answer to the question of historicity; cf. p. 261 about previous scholarly scepticism about the historicity of the Markan setting

³⁷ In favour of the idea of reapplication of ritual, priestly purity by the Pharisees are e.g. D.A. Hagner, *WBC 33B Matthew 14-28* (Word Books: Dallas, Tex., 1995) 430-431 interpreting Matt 15:1-11, with reference to *mBer* 8:2-4, *γSabb* 1.3d, Mark 7:3-4 and K. Berger, *Wer war Jesus wirklich?* (Quell Verlag: Stuttgart, 1995; pagination from the Dutch translation by F. Hijzeler published at Kok: Kampen, 1996) 39, 60.

Note the recent discussion by J.C. Poirier, 'Why Did the Pharisees Wash their Hands?', *JJS* 47 (1996) 217-233 at 217-218 about the opposed positions of the "majority view (=Neusner) of the Pharisees as priestly imitators" and of E.P. Sanders who relates the Pharisaic regulations to (interpretation of) biblical purity laws. Poirier proposes a middle ground position of Pharisaic pietistic practices; in view of the same debate, J.D.G. Dunn, 'Jesus and Purity: An Ongoing Debate', 454 notes purity concerns as a defining characteristic of the Pharisees, but also an 'exaggerated expression' by them of 'common Judaism's' concerns.

We may use the special material in Matthew 12:5-7 to illustrate the point of Matthean redaction in view of post-70 CE circumstances. In the pericope of Matthew 12:1-8, the words “something greater than the Temple is here” (Matt 12:6) articulate an idea of cult criticism which is not found in the parallel passages of the other synoptic Gospels. Matthew 12:5-7 draws the subject of the Temple further into this argument. This Matthean elaboration could be seen as an attempt to polemicise against a post-70 CE concern of the Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition with purity regulations which substituted the purity system of the destroyed Temple.

The additional Matthean material may reflect the polemical accents of the author in light of the post-70 CE situation, when the Pharisees had become the dominant, ‘normative’ movement in Israel. Polemic against the Pharisees is most explicit in the typical Matthean diatribe against the scribes and the Pharisees in Matthew 23.³⁸ As they have apparently become the main opponents to the Jesus-movement in the Matthean perspective, the prophetic cult criticism in Matthew 9:13 and 12:7 addresses the Pharisees and not the priestly establishment. A reversal of positions of authority attributed to the Pharisees and the priestly establishment is also reflected in John 1:19,24, and illustrates post-70 CE circumstances.

The use of prophetic traditions of cult criticism is finally discernable in the account of Acts about the speech of Stephen (Acts 7:2-53). This speech with its consequences forms the ideological breaking point for the author of Luke-Acts to turn from the centrality of the Jerusalem church to the increasing importance of the gospel mission in the Diaspora. The speech of Stephen (Acts 7:2-53) voices a severe polemic against the contemporary state of the Jerusalem Temple cult. This polemic is underpinned by references to prophetic cult criticism from Amos 5:25-27 and Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:42-43 and 7:49-50 respectively. The speech of Stephen includes an interpretation of prophetic cult criticism to the effect of associating the building of the Temple with idolatry (cf. Acts 7:45-48).

Even though we may find certain biblical and post-biblical parallels to the vocabulary of polemic as a possible historical setting,³⁹ the speech of Stephen is first of all a Lucan composition, if not a Lucan interpretation of a breaking point in the history of the missionary Jesus-movement.⁴⁰ Thus, the question is whether, within this post-70 CE Lucan framework, any pre-70 CE elements of tradition from the early Jesus-movement can be distilled from the interpretive use of prophetic cult criticism in the speech of Stephen. I will further discuss this issue in the section at the end of this chapter.

In the course of the above discussion, we have touched on the complications of determining pre-70 CE and post-70 CE levels of tradition concerning the use of prophetic cult criticism. The distinction which can nevertheless be made between clear redaction and possible tradition may provide us with a vantage point from which to study the attitude(s) of the early Jesus-movement toward the Temple before 70 CE in greater detail.

³⁸ Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 262 points to the picture of scribes and Pharisees as hypocrites in Matthew in relation to the question about the addressees of Matthew, the Matthean congregation; cf. Tomson, ‘*If this be from Heaven ...*’, 263-267, 272-276.

³⁹ E.g. the phrase “stiff-necked people, uncircumcised in hearts and ears” in Acts 7:51, which supposedly addresses the council presided by the high priest (Acts 6:12,15, 7:1) may echo biblical tradition (cf. Exod 33:3, 34:9, Jer 9:25-26), but it also has a parallel in Qumran polemic against the Temple and the ‘Wicked Priest’ being ‘uncircumcised in the foreskin of his heart’, in 1QpHab XI,12-13 (לבו פשרו על הכוהן אשר גבר קלונו מכבודו) (כִּי־אֵל מִלֹּאֵם אֵת עֹרֶלְתָּ לָבוֹ פֶּשְׁרוֹ עַל הַכֹּהֵן אֲשֶׁר גְּבַר קִלְוֹנוֹ מִכְבוֹדוֹ). Cf. Habakkuk 2:19-20 where the lifeless state of adornments of gold and silver appears to be juxtaposed to the presence of God in his holy Temple, implying a juxtaposition between temptations to idolatry and true worship of God.

⁴⁰ Cf. C.C. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews. Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church* (Augsburg Fortress: Minneapolis, 1992) 77 citing an inference by Räisänen from the comparison between Acts 7:48-50 and Acts 17:24: “This makes it probable that verses 48-50 represent *Luke’s* own point of view”.

3. Sources about Jesus

In the previous discussion, I have mainly referred to the canonical Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, since they contain the most elaborate narrative frameworks about the beginning of the Jesus-movement. I will now discuss the sources about the historical Jesus for a refinement of the distinction between pre-70 CE and post-70 CE levels of Jesus-tradition.

3.1 Christian literary sources about Jesus

3.1.1 *The Canonical Gospels*

a. *The Synoptic Gospels and the 'two-sources hypothesis'*

The 'two-sources hypothesis' has become relatively established as a scholarly explanation for the literary relations between the three Synoptic Gospels Mark, Matthew, and Luke.⁴¹ According to this hypothesis, the overlap between the narratives of the Synoptic Gospels points to common source material reducible to two main sources. The first source which Matthew and Luke have in common is Mark or a 'Vorlage' of Mark, depending on the way minor correspondences between Matthew and Luke, as opposed to Mark, are evaluated.⁴² The second source shared by Matthew and Luke concerns material which is not found in Mark and which, apart from a few possible exceptions,⁴³ mainly consists of sayings. For this reason it is designated as 'Logienquelle' or 'Synoptic Sayings Source' and often referred to as Q (for 'Quelle').

There are certain problems with the two-sources hypothesis. One problem, the fact that Matthew and Luke still comprise passages peculiar to these respective Gospels, can be solved by presenting a slightly modified form of the two-sources hypothesis. This modified form of the hypothesis presupposes four sources: Mark, Q, additional material of Matthew (M), and additional material of Luke (L).⁴⁴

A more persistent problem concerns the room which the textual evidence of the Synoptic Gospels could still leave for an alternative hypothesis. David J. Neville has recently challenged the priority of Mark presupposed by the 'two-sources hypothesis'. He discusses the possibility that the 'two-gospels hypothesis' (Mark's dependence on Matthew and Luke), also known as the 'Griesbach hypothesis', may equally well or even better explain the literary relations between the Synoptic Gospels.⁴⁵ However, Neville builds his alternative case only on three direct examples from Mark (1:21-22, 3:7-12, 6:1-13 in his chapter 8, 268-333), so that the impression remains that these examples are the few lacunas in the dominant 'two-source hypothesis'. Therefore, Markan priority should still be our working hypothesis.

⁴¹ Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 128-129 mentions H.-J. Holtzmann in 1863 as architect of this hypothesis and B.H. Streeter's elaboration in 1924. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 41, Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 200-214, and Conzelmann & Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 66-83 all presuppose the 'two-sources hypothesis'.

⁴² Cf. Theißen & Merz, *op.cit.*, 42 about a 'Vorlage' of Mark; Koester, *op.cit.*, 128-130, 275-289 refutes the 'Urmarkus hypothesis', explaining the minor agreements instead as "due to common stylistic and grammatical corrections of the sometimes awkward Markan text or (being) caused by accidental common omissions" (275).

⁴³ Theißen & Merz, *op.cit.*, 44-45, refer to the pericopes Matt 4:1-11/Luke 4:1-13 and Matt 8:5-13/Luke 7:1-10 as exceptions, to which Koester, *op.cit.*, 128-133 at 130-131 adds "materials about John the Baptist and Jesus' baptism (parts of Matt 3:1-17 = Luke 3:2-9, 16-17, 21-22)"; Cf. Schnelle, *op.cit.*, 214-233.

⁴⁴ Cf. e.g. B.D. Ehrman, *The New Testament. A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* (Oxford & New York: Oxford UP, 2000) 77 about the "four-sources hypothesis".

⁴⁵ D.J. Neville, *Mark's Gospel – Prior or Posterior? A Reappraisal of the Phenomenon of Order* (Sheffield [etc.]: Sheffield AP, Continuum, 2002) 268-333 sustaining parts of his discussion by previous scholarship.

Mark

As the supposedly oldest written Gospel among the Synoptic Gospels,⁴⁶ Mark is also the briefest Gospel whose ending is not even sure (according to certain manuscripts running up to Mark 16:8, but according to others up to Mark 16:20). Although the author of Mark does not make an explicit statement about his sources (in contrast with e.g. Luke 1:1-4), he probably relied on pre-70 CE tradition related to the historical milieu of the early followers of Jesus.

The written composition of Mark is usually dated to the end of the Jewish War (66-70 CE) or its aftermath (70-74 CE), depending on the interpretation of Mark 13:2.14.⁴⁷ A much earlier dating of the composition of Mark to 40 CE, as has been suggested by some scholars,⁴⁸ must be excluded because the picture of apocalyptic circumstances in Mark 13:7-8 cannot be related to the reign of Caligula (37-41 CE).⁴⁹ Instead, the references to the emergence of a plurality of false prophets in Mark 13:5-6.21-23 appear to reflect the circumstances from the mid-50s CE to the end of the Jewish War, as described by Josephus (cf. *J.W.* 2.258-263, 6.285-288).⁵⁰

It is further significant that Josephus calls the outcome of the Jewish War as a ‘desolation’, ἐρημία (*J.W.* 6.288; cf. §§ 7-8, 296) in a digression about manifest signs concerning the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem. Josephus also refers to the Roman sacrifice to their standards in the Temple court (*J.W.* VI, § 316). This picture of Josephus bears a striking resemblance to the idea of the ‘desolating sacrilege’, τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, in Mark 13:14. Thus, the evidence strongly suggests a date in the aftermath of the Jewish War for the written composition of Mark.

The Sayings Source (Q)

The presumed existence of an early Sayings Source Q has gained further credibility in light of the discovery and study of the *Gospel of Thomas* (*GTh*), a collection of sayings of Jesus, which I will further discuss in the next section.⁵¹ According to many scholars, the early Sayings Source Q which is lost formed the foundation of Matthew and Luke as written composition, although the question of its original language, Greek or Aramaic, is disputed.⁵²

⁴⁶ Cf. J. Marcus, *Marcus 1-8. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27; Doubleday: New York [etc.], 2000) 41-45 for a survey of principal reasons why the ‘two-sources hypothesis’ explains the synoptic literary relations better than the ‘Griesbach hypothesis’ (Markan dependence on Matthew and Luke).

⁴⁷ E.g. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 43; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 238-239; Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 37-39 argues for 69 CE as the earliest possible date of composition, “allowing for a bit of time after the flight from Jerusalem in 67-68 for the re-formation of the Markan community”.

⁴⁸ Cf. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 238-239 for bibliographical references.

⁴⁹ Mark 13:7-8 (‘nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom’) reflects a picture of the outbreak of war; Mark 13:14 further mentions the ‘desolating sacrilege’ as an accomplished fact. By contrast, Josephus’ account of Caligula’s reign (37-41 CE) is determined by embassies and petitions because of the impending but *unfulfilled* plan to have Caligula’s image set up in the Jerusalem Temple (*Ant.* 18.257-309). Caligula’s terror has instead been related by various scholars (Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 45; D.C. Allison, Jr. *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, Trinity Press International: Harrisburg, Pa., 1997, 50-51) to Jesus’ temptation to worship Satan in Matt 4:1-11 / Luke 4:1-13 as a conflict between idolatry and the worship of God.

⁵⁰ The ‘signs and wonders’, σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, of the false Christs and prophets in Mark 13:22 resemble the ‘signs of delivery’, τὰ σημεῖα τῆς σωτηρίας, of a false prophet mentioned in Josephus (*J.W.* 6.285).

⁵¹ Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 86-99 states about *GTh* and Q that “both documents presuppose that Jesus’ significance lay in his words, and in his words alone” (86).

⁵² Cf. e.g. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 44 n. 25; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 222-223; Conzelmann & Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 78-80; Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 1-66.

Scholars have inferred from the representation of the proclamation of Jesus as the Christ and the portrayal of the opponents of Jesus in this sayings material that the traditions contained in Q can be dated between the 40s and early 50s of the first century CE.⁵³ The Jesus-traditions in Q are commonly related to the historical milieu of the early followers of Jesus who preached his gospel, Israel.⁵⁴ Recently, Jonathan L. Reed has undertaken a substantial analysis on the basis of place names in the sayings (e.g. Capernaum, Chorazin, Bethsaida), spatial imagery, themes, and theology in order to locate Q's provenance more precisely in Galilee.⁵⁵ According to Dale C. Allison, Jr., the evidence of Q at least reflects the perspective of a group with ties to Galilee, such as Jesus' earliest Galilean disciples.⁵⁶ We will come to the subject of Jesus and his Galilean background in a subsequent section.

With regard to the composition of Q, there are divergent opinions about the question whether it is possible to discern different stages in this composition. The scholarly positions on this matter depend on, among other things, the supposed accuracy of the reconstruction of Q⁵⁷ and the supposed validity of a comparison with other texts (like, for example, *GTh* and Paul's Letters).⁵⁸ The relation between sapiential, prophetic and apocalyptic elements in Q is a matter of contention between those who advocate a reconstruction of different stages in the composition of Q.⁵⁹ Even though the composition history of Q is highly disputed, an analysis of the Q material may at least provide us interpretive clues about stages in the history of the early Jesus-movement.

The relation between Mark and Q is complicated by the occurrence of overlaps. Nevertheless, these overlaps are usually viewed as so sparse that the theory of Mark and the early sayings source Q as two independent sources can still be sustained.⁶⁰ Moreover, the overlap may just be the product of Matthean and Lucan redaction which blended separate traditions into one composition.

⁵³ Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 45; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 221; cf. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 162: "Q was composed at a time when the controversy of the law had not yet emerged, and when the question of observance of the Law had not yet been used as a criterion in order to decide whether or not the followers of Jesus were within or outside of Israel"; Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 49-54, 60.

⁵⁴ Cf. e.g. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 45; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 220: "Die Logienquelle entstand vermutlich in (Nord-)Palästina, denn sie ist theologisch primär auf Israel ausgerichtet"; Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 52-54 about its "Palestinian origin".

⁵⁵ J.L. Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus. A Re-examination of the Evidence* (Trinity Press International: Harrisburg, Pa., 2000) chapter 6, 'The Sayings Source Q in Galilee' (170-196) concludes that Q's perspective "fits the cultural developments of Galilee in the first century C.E." (195); cf. a case-study in his chapter 7, 'The Sign of Jonah: Q 11:29-32 in its Galilean Setting' (197-211).

⁵⁶ Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 53 hesitates to draw Galilean provenance for Q as a firm conclusion. Cf. Conzelmann & Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 82 about the possibility of Q's provenance from Galilee, the area to the north of the lake of Gennesaret in particular.

⁵⁷ Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 44-45 are very sceptical about the hypothetical reconstruction of anything beyond the 'final redaction' of Q; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 223-226 notes a relative consensus about the development of Q from separate blocks of sayings material; Conzelmann & Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 80-82 plead for caution in the reconstruction of compositional stages mainly on the basis of Luke.

⁵⁸ Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 133-171 draws evidence from *GTh* and the Letters of Paul into his argument for different stages of composition; Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 36-40, 54-66 draws parallels from the composition history of other ancient texts and evidence from Paul and Papias into his argument.

⁵⁹ Cf. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 149-150, following previous analyses by D. Lührmann and J. Kloppenborg, distinguishes between an *original version* of Q with wisdom sayings and eschatological sayings and the *redaction version* of Q with an apocalyptic perspective. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 7-8 criticises Kloppenborg's "reconstruction of an early wisdom document" and focuses instead on the social setting of separate sayings groups.

⁶⁰ Cf. e.g. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 231; Conzelmann & Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 83.

Additional material in Matthew and Luke

Apart from the two sources, Mark and Q, which Matthew and Luke share both, Matthew and Luke also contain different traditions. The traditions peculiar to Matthew have been described as rather heterogeneous, while the traditions peculiar to Luke appear to be more thematically arranged.⁶¹ Helmut Koester has pointed to a number of the additional traditions in Matthew, mainly parables, which are paralleled by sayings in the *Gospel of Thomas*.⁶² These parallels show that, also in the case of additional materials which are not commonly shared among the Synoptic Gospels, we may suppose a broad and independent tradition of various pieces of information relating to the historical milieu of Jesus.

b. *John*

The scholarly consensus generally supports the idea that the composition of the Synoptic Gospels dates from an earlier period than John.⁶³ Nevertheless, John presents distinct evidence about Jesus which probably also goes back to very early traditions. John has a different narrative framework than the Synoptic Gospels. Its literary structure, with apparently disjointed transitions and a double close (John 20:30-31 and 21:24-25), has led scholars to suppose a development of the text in stages, before the final text of John was composed.⁶⁴ The composition of the final text is usually dated around the turn of the first century CE in view of the interpretation of John 21:20-25 as a mirror of the later standpoint of the Johannine community on the witness of the 'beloved disciple'.⁶⁵ An early dating is usually countered by the argument that John 11:48 discusses the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 CE.⁶⁶

The variegated sources of John are usually categorised by themes such as 'Semeia' or signs source, dialogue and discourse source, and a source for the Passion narrative. John's relation to the synoptic tradition has been differently interpreted in terms of literary dependence or the independent use of traditions which underly the synoptic tradition.⁶⁷ Jesus-traditions in John unparalleled in the synoptic tradition do sometimes add significant details to our picture of the historical milieu of Jesus (cf. e.g. John 1:35.40.43-44, 3:1f.22-30, 4:1-3, 5:2).⁶⁸ Parallels between independent Johannine tradition and the *Gospel of Thomas* may

⁶¹ Cf. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 44-48; U. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 206-209, there 207-208 for a survey of the passages of 'Matthäus-Sondergut' and 'Lukas-Sondergut' respectively.

⁶² Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 103-104 about Matt 13:44/GTh 109, Matt 13:45-46/GTh 76 and Matt 13:47-50/GTh 8.

⁶³ Cf. e.g. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 42.

⁶⁴ Cf. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 49; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 250-251.

⁶⁵ Another argument for dating John around the turn of the first century CE, and not much later, based on the early attestation of John by P52 in the manuscript tradition, is supported by Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 50 and by Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 540-541 dating John between 100 and 110 CE with reference to the dating of P52 to ca. 125 CE as a *terminus ad quem*, but countered by Conzelmann & Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 373: "eine genauere Aussage als "2. Jahrhundert" ist nicht möglich". This scholarly debate affirms the impression that the dating of John has to depend on traditio-historical and literary arguments rather than on dating manuscripts.

⁶⁶ Cf. e.g. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 540.

⁶⁷ Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 50 suggest John's independent use of traditions underlying the synoptic tradition. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 558-571 argues for John's literary dependence on Mark for the Passion narrative and notes that the existence of a 'Semeia-Quelle' has recently become disputed. Cf. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 250-267; Ehrman, *The New Testament*, 152-153.

⁶⁸ Cf. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 51.

further point to the antiquity and historical value of Jesus-traditions in John.⁶⁹ John also contains later interpretations of older traditions (e.g. John 2:17.22, 12:16).

3.1.2 *Extra-canonical Gospels*

Early Christian writings outside the canon of the New Testament are increasingly recognised as an important source of pre-70 CE traditions about the historical Jesus. Since the monumental study of Walter Bauer on orthodoxy and heresy in earliest Christianity in 1934⁷⁰ and the initial publication of texts discovered at Nag Hammadi by the 1950s, the traditional standpoint of the inauthentic, or derivative character of non-canonical texts has become historically questionable. Nevertheless, not all non-canonical texts are equally useful for the study of the historical Jesus.

The recent critical surveys by Gerd Theißen and Annette Merz and by James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans respectively show that a number of texts are considered particularly important for historical Jesus-research in the present state of scholarship.⁷¹ My own survey will generally follow their list of those non-canonical texts whose importance for historical Jesus-research is at least considered an issue. In this way, I will endeavour to sort out the main arguments for and against the idea that these non-canonical texts comprise pre-70 CE Jesus-traditions. I will further consider the relevance of these texts for the subject of traditions about the Temple.

The Gospel of Thomas

An important, if not the most important example of a non-canonical Gospel, which is occasionally even drawn into the debate about the composition of Q, is the *Gospel of Thomas* (*GTh*).⁷² This Gospel has been preserved in a Coptic manuscript of Nag Hammadi Codex II and three Greek papyri from Oxyrhynchus (*P.Oxy.* 1, 654, 655), and was first published by Pahor Labib in 1956.⁷³ It should be noted that the divergence of the parallel Greek papyrus fragments from the main Coptic text might also be instructive about the composition history of Gospel texts.⁷⁴

The Coptic text of *Thomas*, which has been subdivided into 114 logia in scholarly editions, provides an extensive body of Jesus-traditions, usually introduced by the phrase 'Jesus says/said'. In contrast to the canonical Gospels, however, the sayings of Jesus in

⁶⁹ Cf. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 113-124 about connections between 'Johannine' sayings and *GTh*.

⁷⁰ W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* cited by Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 40 and Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, xxix-xxx.

⁷¹ Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 51-65 and J.H. Charlesworth & C.A. Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', in B.D. Chilton & C.A. Evans (eds.), *Studying the historical Jesus: evaluations of the state of current research* (NTTS 19; Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1994) 479-533 at 480; cf. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*.

⁷² Cf. F. Neirynek, 'The Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (BETL 86; Leuven UP & Peeters: Leuven, 1989) 123-175 at 132: "In fact, the study of the Gospel of Thomas is at the origin of the new interest for apocryphal gospels".

⁷³ In my references to *GTh*, I base myself on the more recent edition by B. Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7 together with XIII, 2**, *Brit.Lib.Or.* 4926 (1), and *P.Oxy.* 1, 654, 655 *I Gospel According to Thomas, Gospel According to Philip, Hypostasis of the Archons, and Indexes* (Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1989) 37-128.

⁷⁴ Cf. H.W. Attridge, 'Appendix. The Greek Fragments', in Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7 together with XIII, 2**, *Brit.Lib.Or.* 4926 (1), and *P.Oxy.* 1, 654, 655 I, 96-128 at 99-101 about 'Relationships among the Greek and Coptic Witnesses'.

Thomas are not situated in a general narrative framework, even though several sayings do figure in a dialogical setting, usually with his disciples (*GTh* 6, 12, 13, 18, 20-22, 24, 37, 43, 51-53, 61, 72, 79, 99, 100, 104, 113, 114).⁷⁵ In spite of the absence of a general narrative framework, the arrangement of sayings of Jesus in *Thomas* may represent a thematic or interpretive framework.⁷⁶

The value of *Thomas* for Historical Jesus research depends partly on the perspective taken to the theology conveyed by this non-canonical Gospel. If the gnostic features of *Thomas* are viewed as underlying this entire Gospel, this could lead to a late dating of its final redaction.⁷⁷ Nevertheless, *Thomas* can be contrasted to other clearly ‘gnostic’ texts from the Nag Hammadi Codices, because it does not contain digressions on gnostic themes and, as has been noted by Stephen J. Patterson, because its gnostic features still accord with the socially radical ethos known from other early Jesus traditions.⁷⁸

For our dating of *Thomas* we depend on literary and manuscript evidence. Since logion 71 of *Thomas* is usually interpreted as a saying about the destruction of the Temple, 70 CE may be regarded as *terminus post quem* for *Thomas*. The Greek papyri *P.Oxy.* 1, 654 and 655, on the other hand, provide evidence for the (mid-)second century C.E. as *terminus ante quem* for the composition of *Thomas*.⁷⁹

Scholars have disputed whether or not *Thomas* comprises pre-70 CE Jesus-traditions independent from the (sources of the) Synoptic Gospels.⁸⁰ If *Thomas* is, however, compared with the Synoptic Gospels, the similarities should not only be analysed as a confirmation of the Synoptic tradition, for the differences are at least as important.⁸¹ An important difference with the Synoptic tradition is, for example, the fact that the Synoptic Gospels attribute a leading role to Peter, among the disciples (Mark 3:16, 8:29, 16:7; Matt 16:16-19; Luke 9:20, 24:34), whereas logion 12 of *Thomas* attributes a leading role to James after Jesus’ departure. The reference to ‘James the righteous’ in *GTh* 12 most probably denotes James the brother of Jesus, and this accords with the dominant role of James in the Jerusalem church as reflected in

⁷⁵ Other people than ‘the disciples’ in dialogue with Jesus are Simon Peter, Matthew and Thomas (*GTh* 13), Mary (*GTh* 21), Salome (*GTh* 61), a man (*GTh* 72), a woman from the multitude (*GTh* 79), ‘they’, in differing degrees of probability Jesus’ opponents (*GTh* 91, 100, 104), and Simon Peter (*GTh* 114).

⁷⁶ *GTh* logion 1 sets the stage for the entire Gospel through the emphasis on the interpretation of Jesus’ sayings.

⁷⁷ Cf. e.g. J.D. Crossan, *Four Other Gospels. Shadows on the Contours of Canon* (Winston Press: Minneapolis [etc.] 1985) 28-35 situates *Thomas*’ theological vision within the “spectrum of asceticism and gnosticism”; Conzelmann & Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 221 note the disputed question to which extent *Thomas* is a ‘gnostic’ text or a Gospel text belonging to the broader tradition of wisdom literature. Cf. the middle ground position concerning *Thomas*’ theology proposed by J.-D. Kaestli, ‘L’Évangile de Thomas. Que peuvent nous apprendre les «paroles cachées de Jésus»?’, in idem & D. Marguerat (eds.), *Le mystère apocryphe. Introduction à une littérature méconnue* (Essais Bibliques no. 26; Labor et Fides: Geneva, 1995) 47-66.

⁷⁸ S.J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Polebridge Press: Sonoma, CA, 1993) chapter 5, ‘Thomas Christianity. A Social-Historical Description’, 121-157, at 157.

⁷⁹ Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 52 refer to “etwa 140 n.Chr. als spätest mögliche Entstehungszeit”; cf. Conzelmann & Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 221: “EvThom stammt, wie griechische Papyrusfragmente zeigen, aus dem 2. Jahrh.”. The evaluation of this papyrus evidence may determine how much room is left to the hypothesis of N. Perrin, *Thomas and Tatian. The Relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron* (SBL, Academia Biblica, 2002) that *Thomas* depends on the late second-century CE Syriac Diatessaron.

⁸⁰ Cf. e.g. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 52-55 refer to two possible examples, *GTh* 31 and 65, of Jesus-tradition in *Thomas* which could antedate parallel passages in Mark par. (6:1-6 and 12:1-12), while they also mention an argument against *Thomas*’ independence (possible gnostic elaboration of the synoptic tradition).

⁸¹ Cf. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 55 about this necessity in the interest of “neue Einsichten in den Prozeß der Traditionsbildung”; Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*, 241 about the use of *Thomas* as confirmation of the synoptic tradition: “such a limited approach does not tap the full potential of the Gospel of Thomas for the question of the historical Jesus”.

Paul's Letter to the Galatians (Gal 2:1-14). This may speak for an independent, pre-70 CE Jesus-tradition in *Thomas*, since the dominant role of James apparently receded to the background with the destruction of Jerusalem under post-70 CE circumstances.⁸²

F. Neiryneck has further pointed to the lack of evidence for *Thomas*' dependence on Mark,⁸³ which may count as another argument against the refutation of *Thomas*' value for Historical Jesus research. Arguments in favour of independent, pre-70 CE levels of tradition in *Thomas* have to depend on a comparative analysis of individual traditions.

The 'Jewish-Christian' Gospels and Christian Judaism

The so-called 'Jewish-Christian' Gospels of the Nazoraeans, Ebionites and Hebrews have only been fragmentarily preserved in patristic literature.⁸⁴ From the perspective of the church fathers in late antiquity, such Gospels could indeed be viewed as marginal products of 'Jewish-Christian' groups on the fringes of the orthodox church. The question is, however, whether and how these Gospels could relate to the Jewish beginnings of the Jesus-movement.

The *Gospel of the Nazoraeans* (*Gos.Naz.*), purportedly written in Hebrew characters according to Jerome and Eusebius, contains readings of Matthew which diverge from the canonical version of Matthew. Simon C. Mimouni has explained the term 'Nazoraeans' in the early Christian writings pertaining to Historical Jesus research as designating the Law-observing group of Christian Jews among whom James played a leading role.⁸⁵ The fact that *Gos.Naz.* apparently comprised its own version of Matthew is significant: Matthew also includes the Jesus-tradition that 'before heaven and earth have passed away, not one iota or serif from the Law will lose validity, until all things have come to pass' (Matt 5:18).

The *Gospel of the Ebionites* (*Gos.Eb.*), which has been preserved through quotations in Epiphanius' *Panarion*, contains traditions about the baptism of John, the first disciples of Jesus and words spoken by Jesus. An example of the orientation of this Gospel on Israel is provided by a fragment in Epiphanius about the commission of the twelve apostles 'for a testimony to Israel', εἰς μαρτύριον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.⁸⁶ In this respect the Gospel is unparalleled by the canonical commission narratives.

The *Gospel of the Hebrews* (*Gos.Heb.*), mainly extant through quotations by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Jerome, contains traditions about the beginning of Jesus' mission, Jesus' teachings and the appearance of the risen Lord to James. This latter tradition about the resurrection is only generically paralleled in 1 Corinthians 15:7. Significantly, this fragment of the *Gospel of the Hebrews* has the same epithet as *GTh* 12 with regard to the name of Jesus' brother, namely 'James the just'.⁸⁷ The tradition about the resurrection witnessed by James further refers to the role of a 'servant of the priest' (*seruus sacerdotis* / ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ

⁸² Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 20.200f. about the execution of James and "certain others" in Jerusalem in ca. 62 CE.

⁸³ Neiryneck, 'The Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark', 133-140, 170.

⁸⁴ Cf. recently, A.F.J.Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition* (VCSup 17; Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1992).

⁸⁵ S.C. Mimouni, 'Les Nazoréens. Recherches étymologique et historique', *RB* 105 (1998) 208-262, there 208-231, distinguishes between the disputed meaning of Ναζαρηνός (perhaps toponymical) and ναζωραῖος related to Law-observing practice; É. Nodet, '«Les Nazoréens»: discussion', *RB* 105 (1998) 263-265. Cf. R.A. Pritz, *Nazarene Jewish Christianity* (Magness Press, Hebrew University: Jerusalem & Brill: Leiden, 1988).

⁸⁶ Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30 13 2-3; Greek text from A.F.J. Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, 65.

⁸⁷ *Iacobus Iustus* in Jerome, *de viris illustribus* II / Ἰακώβος ὁ δικαίος in Jerome, *de viris illustribus graeco sermone*; texts in A.F.J. Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, 79-81.

ἱερέως) who received a linen cloth from the risen Lord. This detail provides evidence about the possible significance of the Temple cult within circles of the early Jesus-movement.⁸⁸

Non-canonical Gospel fragments on papyrus

In the late 19th and early 20th century, several finds of non-canonical Gospels were made among papyrus-collections. Important examples of substantial fragments are the so-called *Fayyum fragment* (= *P.Vindob. G 2325*; published in 1887), *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 840* (published in 1908), *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1224* (published in 1914), and the *Egerton Gospel* (published in 1935).⁸⁹

The *Fayyum fragment*⁹⁰ contains seven lines of Greek text concerning the Last Supper and Jesus' words addressing Peter. Wilhelm Schneemelcher has considered it a "secondary, indeed an abridged, rendering of the synoptic material" and dated it to the 3rd century CE.⁹¹

Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1224, dated to the beginning of the fourth century CE, consists of a number of Greek fragments comparable to synoptic traditions. *P.Oxy. 1224* may be more interesting for our search: one restored fragment conveys a question which presents an analogy between the instruction of a 'new teaching', διδασχὴ καινή, and the proclamation of a 'new baptism', βάπτισμα καινόν.⁹² This analogy may add something to our understanding of the relation between Jesus and John the Baptist.

The *Egerton Gospel (Papyrus Egerton 2)*⁹³ is of particular interest, since one fragment (1 recto) describes a scene about Jesus' healing of a leper which could display Jesus' attitude to purity regulations related to the healed leper. *P.Eg. 2* is currently dated around 200 CE and it comprises four fragments.⁹⁴ F. Neirynek has argued that the version of *P.Eg. 2* about Jesus' cleansing of the leper is closely connected to Luke 17:14 and depends on the Synoptic tradition.⁹⁵ On the other hand, J.D. Crossan leaves the possibility open that *P.Eg. 2* is rooted in an oral tradition underlying the Synoptic Gospels.⁹⁶

⁸⁸ Cf. the importance attributed to *Gos.Heb.* by C.-B. Amphoux, 'L'Évangile selon les Hébreux. Source de l'Évangile de Luc', *Apocrypha* 6 (1995) 67-77 referring to evidence from Ignatius and Papias.

⁸⁹ Apart from the editions of the texts cited in the subsequent notes, the more comprehensive critical edition of Greek and Latin texts by Aurelio de Santos Otero, *Los Evangelios Apocrifos* (Editorial Católica: Madrid, 1956) may still be noted here.

⁹⁰ Ed.pr. G. Bickell, *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer I* (1887) 54-61; cf. Greek text in E. Klostermann, *Apocrypha II Evangelien* (Walter de Gruyter: Berlin, 1929) 23.

⁹¹ W. Schneemelcher, 'The so-called Fayyum Fragment', in idem (ed.), *NTApo I* (ET by R.McL.Wilson; Clarke: Cambridge, U.K., & WJK: Louisville, Ky., 1991) 102.

⁹² Fragment 2v col. I in Klostermann, *Apocrypha II*, 26 presenting Greek fragments up to 7 lines with many reconstructions; ed. pr. by B.P. Grenfell & A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri X* (1914) 1-10.

⁹³ Ed.pr. by H. Idris Bell & T.C. Skeat, *Fragments of an unknown Gospel and other early Christian papyri* (Trustees of the British Museum, London 1935) 1-41, plates I-II

⁹⁴ While Bell & Skeat, *Fragments of an unknown Gospel*, 1-41 still date it to the mid-second century CE, Theissen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 57 refer to more recent scholarship proposing a dating around 200 CE; cf. F. Neirynek, 'The Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark', 161-162.

⁹⁵ F. Neirynek, 'Papyrus Egerton 2 and the healing of the leper', *ETL* 61 (1985) 153-160; in their discussion of the 'Egerton Gospel', Charlesworth and Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', 514-525 are likewise sceptical concluding that it in all probability it "represents a second-century conflation of Synoptic and Johannine elements". Theissen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus* (1996) 56-57 leave the question of the relation of *Papyrus Egerton 2* to the canonical Gospels open for further debate.

⁹⁶ Crossan, *Four Other Gospels*, 63-87 at 74.

Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 840 (*P.Oxy. 840*)⁹⁷ is important for our subject, since it describes a scene which suggests Jesus' attitude to purity regulations and the ritual of the Temple cult. The general framework of Jesus' confrontation with a Pharisaic chief priest is unique for *P.Oxy. 840*. Nevertheless, parts of the account of this confrontation may have parallels in other Gospel traditions. J. Jeremias and W. Schneemelcher have argued that, because of the parallels with Jesus' polemic against Pharisaic hypocrisy about ritual cleanliness in the Synoptic Gospels, the *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 840* presents "an unknown gospel of Synoptic type".⁹⁸ Even though the account of *P.Oxy. 840* may have parallels in the synoptic Gospels, these parallels are partial and at times only based on a few catchwords. The detailed information about the rites of purification related to the Jerusalem Temple cult⁹⁹ strengthens the idea that the *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 840* may present an authentic tradition which is at least as old as the Synoptic tradition. The tradition forming the basis of *P.Oxy. 840* is, therefore, sometimes dated to the first century CE.¹⁰⁰

The anomalous idea of the Pharisaic chief priest may, however, cast doubt on an early dating of *P.Oxy. 840*. A recent study by François Bovon proposes to identify *P.Oxy. 840* with an inner-Christian 'controversy over purity', situating it in a Gnostic or Manichaean milieu of the second or third century. Starting from the observation that the designation 'saviour', ὁ σωτήρ, for Jesus in *P.Oxy. 840* is very comparable to gnostic texts, Bovon proceeds to interpret the purity terminology instead as polemical "prefiguration" to Jewish-Christian practices and institutions.¹⁰¹ Even though such a literary reading of *P.Oxy. 840* may indeed have accorded with the ideology of certain heterodox milieus, the parallels with canonical Jesus-traditions which Bovon also acknowledges, attest to the limitations of reading *P.Oxy. 840* as an exclusively Gnostic or Manichaean text.¹⁰²

In view of their potential significance for the subject of Jesus' attitude to the purity of the Temple and related purity regulations, I will further discuss *P.Eg. 2* and *P.Oxy. 840* when dealing with individual Gospel traditions about Jesus' attitude to the Temple.

Non-canonical Gospels under canonical names

Important non-canonical Gospels under canonical names, of which fragments have come down to us, are the '*Secret Gospel of Mark*' (*Sec.Gos.Mk.*)¹⁰³ and the *Gospel of Peter* (*Gos.Pet.*).¹⁰⁴

⁹⁷ Ed.pr. by Grenfell & Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* V (London 1908) no. 840; for the Greek text, cf. William D. Stroker, *Extracanonial Sayings of Jesus* (SBLRBS 18; Scholars Press: Atlanta, GA, 1989) 22-23.

⁹⁸ Jeremias & Schneemelcher, 'Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 840', in Schneemelcher (ed.), *NTApo I* (1991) 94.

⁹⁹ Cf. the separation between a stair down for those undergoing purification and a stair up for those purified in the 'pool of David', the place of the chief priest's own purification; this separation could be characteristic of contemporary ritual baths, *miqvaoth* (cf. *mSheqalim* 8.2) The 'pool of David' in the chief priest's words according to *P.Oxy. 840*, may be compared with Neh 2:14 which refers to the 'King's Pool' in Jerusalem; Josephus, *J.W.* 5.145 refers, however, to Solomon's pool.

¹⁰⁰ Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 62.

¹⁰¹ F. Bovon, 'Fragment *Oxyrhynchus 840*, Fragment of a Lost Gospel, Witness of an Early Christian Controversy over Purity', *JBL* 119/4 (2000) 705-728.

¹⁰² Bovon, 'Fragment *Oxyrhynchus 840*', 721. Note that the designation of Jesus as 'saviour', ὁ σωτήρ, also figures in canonical New Testament writings, like John 4:42, Acts 13:23. 2 Peter 1:11 attests to the combination of the designations 'saviour' and 'Lord' for Jesus, ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.

¹⁰³ Ed.pr. by M. Smith, *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass., 1973) there 445-453.

The *Secret Gospel of Mark* is preserved through quotations from a supposed letter of Clement of Alexandria, which Morton Smith found as a Greek manuscript insertion of three leaves in a 17th century book in 1958. The quotations mainly concern a passage about a young man who was raised and taught about the mysteries of the kingdom of God by Jesus in Bethany. The scholarly reception of the *Secret Gospel of Mark* diverges between scepticism about its authenticity,¹⁰⁵ its more positive evaluation as a composition from the second century CE,¹⁰⁶ and its exceptional consideration as a pre-70 CE Jesus-tradition which effects the scholar's perspective on early versions of Mark.¹⁰⁷ In view of its highly disputed literary status, *Secret Mark* may at most only concern us indirectly when a comparison with traditions in the canonical Gospels is applicable.

The *Gospel of Peter*, as it appears in the Akhmim fragment, contains a particular version of the Passion-resurrection narrative. There is an ongoing debate on the question whether this version of the Passion narrative is literarily dependent on the canonical Gospels or whether it constitutes an independent tradition which contains primitive material.¹⁰⁸ Since the Jews lament the end of Jerusalem according to the version of the *Gospel of Peter* (τὸ τέλος Ἱερουσαλήμ in *Gos.Pet.* 7:25), an explicit feature not paralleled in the canonical Passion narratives, we may presume a post-70 CE setting for the composition of *Gos.Pet.*

In my view, the *Gospel of Peter* may be more interesting for its subsequent elaboration on pre-existing gospel traditions within the Jesus-movement than for Historical Jesus research. Thus, at the level of encounters between the missionary Jesus-movement and Jewish groups, and the priestly establishment in particular, certain details in *Gos.Pet.* call for attention. One example is the reference to a perception by the priestly establishment of the circle around Peter as 'evildoers and persons who wanted to set the Temple on fire',

¹⁰⁴ The *Gos.Pet.* is to different extents mentioned and cited in the testimonia of Eusebius (*Hist.eccl.* III, 3, 1-2; VI, 12, 1-6) and Theodoret (*Phil.hist.* II 2) and the Akhmim fragment; cf. the edition of M.G. Mara, *L'Évangile de Pierre* (SC 201; Paris, 1973) 39-69 of which the Greek text is reproduced in Neiryck, 'The Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark', 171-175.

¹⁰⁵ Charlesworth & Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', 526-532 conclude negatively about *Secret Mark* as "a tenuous chain of evidence" (532). J.-D. Kaestli, 'L'Évangile secret de Marc. Une version longue de l'Évangile de Marc réservée aux chrétiens avancés dans l'Église d'Alexandrie?' in idem & Marguerat (eds.), *Le mystère apocryphe*, 85-106 excludes the possibility that *Secret Mark* would reflect pre-70 CE Jesus-tradition (99) and notes the persisting doubt about its authenticity because of the inaccessibility of the original document to the scholarly community (100-102). A. Jakab, 'Une lettre «perdue» de Clément d'Alexandrie?' Morton Smith et l'«Évangile secret» de Marc', *Apocrypha* 10 (1999) 8-15 identifies the 'letter' in which *Secret Mark* is quoted as a "writing or letter of Pseudo-Clement of Alexandria".

¹⁰⁶ Cf. P.W. van der Horst, 'Het 'Geheime Markusevangelie'. Over een nieuwe vondst', *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 33 (1979) 27-51 elaborates the idea that *Secret Mark* may be situated in an (early) second century CE Christian milieu which made free use of Gospel traditions (p. 48); F. Neiryck, 'The Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark', 168-170 considers *Secret Mark* a product of the mid-second century CE depending on the canonical Gospels. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 59 note a scholarly consensus about the idea that *Secret Mark* is "eine im 2.Jh. entstandene gnostische Überarbeitung des kanonischen MkEv".

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Crossan, *Four Other Gospels*, 89-121 at 108-110 uses the working hypothesis that "canonical Mark is a very deliberate revision of *Secret Mark*" and posits the dependence of John 11 and Mark 10:46 on *Sec.Gos.Mk.* 2 and 5 respectively; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 293-303 states that "scepticism [about the relation between *Secret Mark* and Clement's genuine writings] is hard to justify" (294).

¹⁰⁸ Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 59-62 refer to the 'independent tradition' position of Adolf von Harnack (1893) and H. Koester (1990) and to the 'literary dependence' position of Theodor Zahn (1893) and M. Dibelius and many scholars after him; cf. the position of Crossan, *Four Other Gospels*, 125-181 and idem, *The Cross that Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative* (San Francisco, 1988) that *Gos.Pet.* depends on "intracanonical tradition". Charlesworth & Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', 503-514 refute Crossan's idea of a pre-synoptic source underlying the *Gospel of Peter* and conclude about *Gos.Pet.* as "little more than a blend of details from the four intracanonical Gospels" (511).

ὡς κακοῦργοι καὶ ὡς τὸν ναὸν θέλοντες ἐμπρῆσαι (*Gos.Pet.* 7:26). I will turn to this subject in more detail in my section on the encounters between the missionary Jesus-movement and Jewish movements concerning the Temple.

*Gnostic 'Dialogue Gospels'*¹⁰⁹

Another category of extra-canonical texts which is given consideration in Historical Jesus research concerns the gnostic 'Dialogue Gospels', as they have been termed by Helmut Koester. Dialogue Gospels include two Nag Hammadi texts, the *Apocryphon of James* (*Ap.Jas.*; also known as the *Epistula Jacobi*)¹¹⁰ and the *Dialogue of the Saviour* (*Dial.Sav.*)¹¹¹, but also the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (*Gos.Eg.*). Only Greek fragments have been preserved of *Gos.Eg.* through quotations in the *Stromata* of Clement of Alexandria.¹¹²

The *Apocryphon of James* contains a secret teaching of the risen Lord revealed to James together with Peter in the form of a dialogue. The reference to parables in the synoptic tradition and the presence of sayings not found in the canonical Gospels has led scholars to consider the *Apocryphon of James* as an important text for Historical Jesus research.¹¹³ Interestingly, the end of the text of the *Apocryphon of James* attests to the centrality of Jerusalem for James who went there in order to pray. The *Dialogue of the Saviour* conveys a conversation with questions from the disciples, mainly Judas, Matthew and Mary, and answers from Jesus. The fragments of the *Gospel of the Egyptians* contain questions by Salome and answers by Jesus as well as a number of sayings.

Apart from the non-canonical texts considered here,¹¹⁴ other apocrypha are in many cases determined by later theological elaboration in different directions. In my view, the *Gospel of Thomas* has strong potential significance for Historical Jesus research. *P.Oxy.* 840 and *P.Eg.* 2 are of further interest for our investigation of the historical Jesus, since they may contain elements of early Jesus-tradition which should be evaluated in the discussion about Jesus' attitude to the purity of the Temple. The 'Jewish-Christian' Gospels, the *Gospel of Peter*, and the *Apocryphon of James*, convey traditions which may provide additional clues for the retrieval of a picture of the missionary Jesus-movement before 70 CE.

¹⁰⁹ This designation was coined by Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 173-200; cf. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 55-56.

¹¹⁰ M. Malinine et al. (eds.), *Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha: Codex Jung F. I r – F. VIII v (p. 1-16)* (Zürich & Stuttgart, 1968); cf. F.E. Williams, 'The Apocryphon of James: I, 2:1.1-16.30' in H.W. Attridge (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex): Introductions, Texts, Translations, Indices* (NHS 22; Leiden [etc.] Brill, 1985) 13-53.

¹¹¹ S. Emmel, H. Koester & E. Pagels (eds.), *Nag Hammadi Codex III, 5: The Dialogue of the Saviour* (NHS 26; Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1984).

¹¹² Cf. Klostermann, *Apocrypha* II, 15-16 who also notes references to the *Gos.Eg.* by Hippolytus and Epiphanius; cf. W. Schneemelcher, 'The Gospel of the Egyptians', in idem (ed.), *NTApo I Gospels and related writings* (1991) 209-215.

¹¹³ Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 55 and D. Kirchner, 'The Apocryphon of James', in *NTApo* I, 287 dating the text to the early second century CE.

¹¹⁴ In their survey, Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 65-68 still refer to a rubric of 'freie Jesusüberlieferung', among which Jesus-sayings in Paul's letters, the writings of Papias and the Apostolic Fathers are included; Charlesworth & Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', 480 still include the *Protoevangelium of James* in their list; O. Cullmann, *NTApo* I, 416-425 has categorised this text among post-canonical infancy gospels.

3.2 Non-Christian literary sources about Jesus

3.2.1 Early Jewish literature

A first-century CE Jewish source which may convey information about the historical Jesus and the early Jesus-movement, is Flavius Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*. The *Jewish Antiquities* contain three passages concerning this subject: a passage about Jesus, the so-called 'Testimonium Flavianum' (*Ant.* 18.63-64); a passage about John the Baptist (*Ant.* 18.116-119), and a passage about James the brother of Jesus (*Ant.* 20.200-201). Josephus' passages about John the Baptist and James are usually recognised as authentic. The 'Testimonium Flavianum', however, is perceived by many scholars as the product of a Christian reworking of an original text which may be reconstructed to a larger or lesser extent.¹¹⁵ Recently, Serge Bardet has attempted to take the interpretation of the 'Testimonium Flavianum' beyond the question of interpolation by proposing to read it not in traditional terms as Jewish evidence about the beginnings of Christianity, but as Jewish evidence about a messianising movement within Judaism.¹¹⁶

Since the 'Testimonium Flavianum' tells us more about the movement which Jesus started rather than adding new details for Historical Jesus research, the value of the 'Testimonium Flavianum' may mainly lie in the contextual information which it provides about the early Jesus-movement before 70 CE.

Other traditions surrounding Josephus' work, like the 'Slavonic additions' and the Hebrew version called Josippon, are given little credit in recent scholarship on the historical Jesus in view of their disputed authenticity and the perceived agenda of a much later period.¹¹⁷

Possible traditions about Jesus in early rabbinic literature have received scholarly attention in view of parallels with Gospel traditions about Jesus' death. The identification of many such passages with the historical Jesus is, however, problematical. Frequently discussed passages, *bSanh.* 43a and 107b, refer to 'Yeshu the Nazarene', ישו הנוצרי, as a person who practised magic, allured and led Israel astray. The description of his death "on the eve of Passover" is compared with the Gospel tradition in John by scholars.¹¹⁸ The viewpoint of Jesus leading Israel astray is attributed to the Pharisees in John 7:47-49. The present perfect of the rhetorical question in John 7:48, "has anyone of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed in him?", may, however, point to later circumstances.¹¹⁹ Thus, rabbinic traditions about 'Yeshu the Nazarene' may also reflect a fixed standpoint which had taken shape after 70 CE. They inform us about a negative rabbinic perspective concerning Jesus, but not about the attitude(s) of Jesus and the movement of his early followers to the Temple.

¹¹⁵ Cf. e.g. L.H. Feldman, 'The Testimonium Flavianum: The State of the Question', in R.F. Berkey & S.A. Edwards (eds.), *Christological Perspectives Festschrift H.K. McArthur* (New York, 1982), 179-199, 288-293; idem, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980)* (Berlin, 1984); Emil Schürer, 'Josephus on Jesus and James, *Ant.* xviii 3,3 (63-4) and xx 9, 1 (200-3)', in idem, *The History of the Jewish People I*, 428-441; W.A. Bienert, 'The Witness of Josephus (*Testimonium Flavianum*)', in *NTApo I*, 489-491; Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 74-82; C.A.Evans, 'Jesus in Non-Christian Sources', in Chilton & Evans (eds.), *Studying the historical Jesus*, 466-477.

¹¹⁶ S. Bardet, *Le Testimonium Flavianum. Examen historique, considérations historiographiques* (Collection «Josèphe et son temps» V; Cerf: Paris, 2002).

¹¹⁷ Cf. Evans, 'Jesus in Non-Christian Sources', 451-453 categorises these traditions among 'dubious sources', having "nothing to offer critical Jesus research". Cf. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 93-95.

¹¹⁸ Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 82-84; Evans, 'Jesus in Non-Christian Sources', 443-449 (with bibl.).

¹¹⁹ Cf. by contrast, Acts 15:5 about Pharisaic converts; cf. traditions about Joseph of Arimathea 'looking for the kingdom of God' (Mark 15:43.45, Luke 23:50) and as a 'disciple of Jesus' (Matt 27:57.59, John 19:38).

3.2.2 Graeco-Roman literature

The passages in Graeco-Roman literature which concern Christianity¹²⁰ represent more often contemporary pagan attitudes to the Christians rather than a picture of the historical Jesus and the early Jesus-movement before 70 CE.¹²¹ The Roman historian Tacitus directly refers to Jesus Christ and the early movement of his followers. Tacitus mentions Jesus' execution under Pontius Pilate in the context of his report about the persecution of Christians in Rome under Nero: "Christ(us), the originator of that name, had been executed by the procurator Pontius Pilate. The pernicious superstition, checked for the moment, was bursting out again not only throughout Judaea, the birthplace of the plague, but also throughout the city into which all that is horrible and shameful streams from every quarter and is constantly practised".¹²²

With regard to Tacitus' report, Craig A. Evans has pointed to the anachronism of the reference to Pontius Pilate as a procurator in view of epigraphic evidence which assigns Pontius Pilate as the function of prefect of Judaea.¹²³ Apart from this, Tacitus' version of Judaea as the 'birthplace of this plague', *Judaea origo eius mali*, further attests to the derivative character of his information. *Judaea* may geographically refer to Israel at large. However, in Tacitus' Roman perspective (cf. Tacitus' *Historiae* V, 1-6,1), the term indicates the general rather than detailed character of Tacitus' information on the origins of Christianity, for the early Jesus-movement started in Galilee (cf. Acts 10:37 ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας).

3.3 Epigraphical evidence

At the end of 2002, the epigrapher André Lemaire published an article in the *Biblical Archaeology Review* about an ossuary with an Aramaic inscription which according to him provides the earliest historical reference to Jesus. The type of ossuary with its inscription is dated by Lemaire between 20 BCE and 70 CE, and, in his view, situated in Jerusalem and identified as the ossuary of James, the brother of Jesus. Lemaire comes to this conclusion on the basis of comparative evidence and a scientific examination in the laboratory of the Geological Survey of Israel. The inscription reads as follows: יעקוב בר יוסף אחי ישוע: "James (Ya'akov/Jakob), son of Joseph (Yosef), brother of Jesus (Yeshua)".¹²⁴

There are, however, several problems which complicate the issue whether this inscription could provide reliable evidence for historical Jesus research. First, the ossuary was not unearthed in the course of excavations by archaeologists, but has come to light through Lemaire's contacts with a collector. This deprives scholars of reliable and invaluable information about the historical context and original location of the ossuary. Second, the supposition that 'Jesus' in this inscription can indeed be identified with Jesus of Nazareth

¹²⁰ Cf. e.g. W. den Boer, *Scriptorum paganorum I-IV saec. de Christianis testimonia* (Leiden: Brill, 1965) for a survey of Greek and Latin texts from pagan authors of antiquity about Christianity.

¹²¹ Evans, 'Jesus in Non-Christian Sources', 454-462 considers the writings of Thallus (apud Julius Africanus), Mara bar Sarapion (a Syrian Stoic of the late first century CE), Suetonius, Pliny the Younger, Celsus (apud Origen), and Lucian of Samosata as 'sources of minimal value'; Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 86-91.

¹²² Translation from M. Whittaker, *Jews and Christians* (Cambridge UP: Cambridge, 1984) 148.

¹²³ Evans, 'Jesus in Non-Christian Sources', 464-466.

¹²⁴ A. Lemaire, 'Burial Box of James the Brother of Jesus', *BAR* 28/6 (2002) 24-33, 70, there p. 28 for the reconstructed text and translation of the inscription. Cf. H. Shanks & B. Witherington, *The Brother of Jesus* (Harper, 2003).

worshipped by his followers as Jesus Christ has not been proved sufficiently. Third, in a brief reaction to Lemaire's publication, Paul Flesher has noted the possibility that the Aramaic inscription may as well fit into Galilee of later centuries".¹²⁵ Since the scholarly debate about this inscription has yet to start,¹²⁶ the potential significance of this epigraphical evidence can only be noted without definite conclusions about its authenticity and provenance.

4. The historical Jesus and his Galilean background

4.1 The importance of Galilee in the Gospel traditions about Jesus

How did Jesus' attitude to the Temple relate to other positions in contemporary Israelite society? In order to gain further insight into the historical background to Jesus' attitude to the Temple, it may be helpful to begin with the evidence about Jesus' milieu, which at the beginning of his ministry was Galilee (cf. Mark 1:14-20f.; Matt 3:13, 4:12-23f.; Luke 4:14-15; John 1:43, 2:11; Acts 10:36-37). This search for Jesus' contemporary milieu is important, not in order to reduce the quest for the historical Jesus to a question about his social milieu, but to unearth a relatively neglected aspect of how Jesus' words may have appealed to contemporary issues which were central to life in Galilean communities.

The manifold references to Jesus' Galilean descent in the early Christian writings attest to the fact that this identification of Jesus was highly important in the oldest Gospel traditions. Jesus is designated as a Galilean in Matthew 26:69 and in Luke 23:6. Jesus' Galilean background apparently provided an argument for certain Jewish opponents to undermine any prophetic or messianic claim of Jesus from the outset (John 7:41, 52). From Matthew's hindsight perspective, however, Jesus' descent from Nazareth rather formed the fulfilment of prophetic words (Matt 2:23; cf. *Gos.Naz* as quoted by Jerome, *vir.ill.* 3).¹²⁷ The designation 'Jesus of Nazareth' frequently occurs in the four canonical Gospels. Bystanders, followers, and opponents of Jesus' ministry alike use this expression (cf. e.g. Mark 1:24, 10:47, 16:6 and Luke 4:34, 24:19 ('Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρηνός);¹²⁸ Matt 21:11 ('Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας); John 1:45 ('Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ)).

Other passages in the canonical New Testament writings, however, refer to Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος (cf. Matt. 26:71; Luke 18:37; John 18:5.7, 19:19; Acts 2:22, 3:6, 4:10, 6:14, 22:8, 26:9). This designation appears more difficult to relate to Nazareth etymologically. The manuscript evidence of the canonical New Testament comprises the variant reading Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρηνός for Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος and vice versa in a number of cases (e.g. Mark 10:47; Luke 18:37, 24:19; John 18:5). The answer to the question whether or not this evidence indicates that these two terms are interchangeable as variant Greek spellings for descent from Nazareth depends on the context in which the term occurs.

¹²⁵ P.V.M. Flesher, 'Does the James Ossuary really refer to Jesus Christ?', http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/James_Ossuary.htm (2003).

¹²⁶ For instance, P.W. van der Horst, 'Het grafchrift van Jakobus, de broer van Jezus', *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 57 (2003) 1-9 argues in favour of the authenticity and relevance of the inscription for Historical Jesus research and discusses its merit for renewed interest in non-literary sources among New Testament scholarship.

¹²⁷ Cf. Lev 21:12, Judg 13:5, Isa 11:1, 53:2 as prooftexts to the (root of the Semitic) word or the idea which the author of Matthew may have had in mind.

¹²⁸ See parallel usages of words ending on -ηνος, like Γερασσηνός in e.g. *J.W.* 2.480, Mark 5:1, Luke 8:26.37, and Δαμασκηνοί in e.g. *J.W.* 1.103 and 2 Cor 11:32. Cf. Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1990) §§ 56-57.

If the term *Ναζωραῖος* is used in the plural form, it could be related to the group of Christian Jews (cf. Acts 24:5) which observed the Jewish law, in particular certain practices of purification according to the Nazirite vow (Acts 21:18-26; cf. notes 7 and 85 above). Can Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος also stand for Jesus' observance of particular practices of purification, that is, for Jesus the Nazirite? According to Klaus Berger, the term *Ναζωραῖος* could be a later reinterpretation by non-Jewish Christians of Jesus as *ναζιραῖος*, a Nazirite, in view of traditions about Jesus' affiliation with John the Baptist in the early stages of his ministry.¹²⁹ The New Testament writings which comprise the designation Ἰησοῦς ὁ *Ναζωραῖος* do, however, also figure in the context of the later stages of Jesus' ministry and even the gospel mission after Jesus. Unless the context strongly suggests a link between the term *Ναζωραῖος* and the religious practice of the Nazirites, the designation Ἰησοῦς ὁ *Ναζωραῖος* may probably indeed apply to Jesus' Galilean background.

Jesus' first disciples are also associated with the Galilean environment in various Gospel traditions which deal with the beginning of Jesus' ministry in Galilee. The synoptic Gospels and the *Gospel of the Ebionites* provide the clearest evidence that Jesus gathered his first disciples in Galilee (cf. Mark 1:16-20; Matt 4:18-22; Luke 5:1-11; *Gos.Eb.* apud Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.13.2f.). John 1:35-51 provides a testimony of Jesus' first disciples which appears to emphasise the idea that some of the first followers of Jesus had also been disciples of John the Baptist. John 1:43-51, 2:11 further confirms the important place of Galilee at the beginning of Jesus' ministry. John adds information about the descent of Philip, Andrew and Peter from Bethsaida (John 1:44; cf. 12:21), a place north of the Sea of Galilee. Acts 10:36-38 attest to the Galilean beginnings of Jesus' ministry. Acts 1:11 address Jesus' disciples as 'men of Galilee', ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι, in the context of the revelation about Jesus' ascension to heaven.

Galilee also has an important place in Gospel traditions about the appearances of the risen Lord to his disciples and their subsequent gospel mission. In three of the four canonical Gospel narratives about Jesus' resurrection, Jesus promises to go before his disciples to Galilee to reveal himself there (Mark 14:28, 16:7; Matthew 26:32, 28:7.10.16-20; John 21:1-23). The *Gospel of Peter* gives an additional account of the departure of Peter and Andrew to the sea, probably the Sea of Galilee, after the news of the empty grave (*Gos.Pet.* 14.58-60).

Luke's post-resurrection account differs, however, substantially from the above-mentioned Gospel traditions. Luke 24:5-7 only contextualises the words spoken by Jesus about the fate of the Son of Man during his earthly ministry in Galilee. Luke's version of the post-resurrection events, however, focuses most of all on the subsequent role of the Jerusalem church, which could explain the minimal attention for Galilee. Instead of Galilee as the place of apostolic commission in Matt 28:16-20, Luke-Acts posit the central place of the Jerusalem church in the subsequent gospel mission (Luke 24:47-52, Acts 1-5f.; cf. Gal 1:18-2:10).

In view of the Jerusalem-centered perspective of Luke-Acts, the evidence in Luke-Acts which does refer to the Galilean origins of the Jesus-movement is the more significant. In the context of the passion narrative, Luke 23:5 remarks on these Galilean origins: "He stirs up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, from Galilee even to this place".¹³⁰

Luke shares with the other Synoptic Gospels the tradition about Peter's renouncement of Jesus when confronted with the question whether he was a disciple of Jesus, a view in which the bystanders were apparently confirmed because of Peter's Galilean descent (Mark

¹²⁹ K. Berger, *Wer war Jesus wirklich?* (pagination from the Dutch translation, 1996; Quell Verlag: Stuttgart, 1995) 29-33 at 31-32 notes the Nazirite characteristics of John the Baptist in Luke 1:15 as compared with Judges 13:4-5, and the parallel between Jesus' words in Matt 8:22 / Luke 9:60 and Num 6:6.

¹³⁰ Translation from RSV. This verse has no parallel in the other Synoptic Gospels.

The early Jesus-movement and the Temple

14:70, Luke 22:59, Matt 26:73).¹³¹ Luke further shares the Synoptic tradition about the presence of women who had followed Jesus from Galilee at his crucifixion (Luke 23:49-55f.; Mark 15:40-41; Matt 27:55-56).

The first disciples of Jesus who preached the gospel were apparently perceived first and foremost as Galileans by other Jews in Jerusalem according to Acts 2:7. The evidence of the Acts of the Apostles further reveals that the earliest missionaries of the gospel of their teacher Jesus carried their mission out in the name of 'Jesus Christ of Nazareth' (Acts 3:6, 4:8-12). Paul's persecution of the church before his conversion to the faith in Christ is described as 'opposing the name of Jesus of Nazareth' in Acts 26:9.¹³²

The evidence of Luke may further pertain to Jesus' relation to other Galileans and to Judaeans and Jerusalem respectively. In Luke 13:1-5, Jesus' reaction to the event that Pilate had 'mixed the blood of Galileans with their sacrifices' amounts to an exhortation to repentance and implicates those who dwell in Jerusalem.¹³³ Although there is no parallel narrative other Gospels, Luke 13:1-5 could be historically credible.

At the time of Jesus' ministry, Jews were massacred by Pilate in Jerusalem in the course of their demonstrations against his subversion of the Jewish ancestral laws concerning Jerusalem and the Temple (*J.W.* 2.169-177; *Ant.* 18.55-62). Among the massacred Jews were probably many 'from the countryside', ὁ ἐκ τῆς χώρας λαός (*J.W.* 2.170). It may further be assumed that the Galileans had their share in these sufferings which Josephus describes as sufferings of the multitude (*J.W.* 2.177).¹³⁴ Josephus does not attribute any role to the priestly establishment in joining the demonstrations. Perhaps the priestly establishment, in its uneasy compromise with Roman rule, only had something to lose in view of the damage to the Temple precincts at the time of a previous revolt (ca. 6-4 BCE; *Ant.* 17.250-298).

Jesus' reaction to the misery which befell the Galileans in Jerusalem in Luke 13:1-5 expresses a warning for all to repent sin. Jesus implicitly denounced the hypocrisy of those who had not suffered this fate and thought themselves to be above sin. The repeated exhortation in Luke 13:3.5, "unless you repent you will all likewise perish"¹³⁵, applies to the cases of the Galileans and the inhabitants of Jerusalem respectively. The shift of focus from the Galileans (Luke 13:2-3) to the Jerusalemites (Luke 13:4-5) is significant. The fact that Jesus relates these two cases to each other may convey the underlying idea that he had the Jerusalem Temple, as the contemporary focal point of nationwide demonstrations, in mind.

Jesus' emphasis on repentance may further be understood in light of a preceding passage, Luke 12:57-59, in which Jesus advocates the settlement of conflicts rather than going

¹³¹ Mark 14:70 reads: ἀληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ, καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ; (direct question). Luke 22:59 reads ἐπ' ἀληθείας καὶ οὗτος μετ' αὐτοῦ ἦν, καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖός ἐστιν (indirect question). Matt 26:73 specifies the question as a matter of a Galilean accent: ἀληθῶς καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ, καὶ γὰρ ἡ λαλία σου δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ. The variant readings of Mark 14:70 and Matt 26:73 appear to be harmonizations. John 18:15-18.25-27 does not have the point of Galilean origin as part of questions to Peter.

¹³² Note that Paul, who had not known Jesus personally (cf. 1 Cor 15:3-8), writes about 'Jesus Christ' or 'Christ Jesus' on the basis of revelation (1 Cor 15:8; 2 Cor 12:1; Gal 1:11-12) but never about 'Jesus of Nazareth'.

¹³³ Cf. M.J. Borg, *Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus* (Trinity Press International: Harrisburg, Pa., 21998) 205-207 at 205 n. 137 considers the Siloam incident mentioned in Luke 13:4 as also 'involving Roman action' because of its mention as a 'case parallel'.

¹³⁴ Cf. *Ant.* 17.250-298, there 288, about the Galilean share in the sufferings due to the suppression of a previous revolt at the time of Varus' governorship of Syria (ca. 6-4 BCE). *Ant.* 20.118-124 even attributes a main role to the leaders of the Galileans in inciting the masses to struggle for liberty after a conflict between Galilean Jews and Samaritans was left unsettled.

¹³⁵ Translation from RSV.

to court. In the same way, Jesus' reaction in Luke 13:1-5 appears to call for repentance of sins rather than political involvement for the cause of religious tradition.¹³⁶

Apart from this exhortation about repentance aimed at all those who took part in Israel's worship cult, Jesus' words for Jerusalem itself in Luke 13:34-35 are very negative. They express a prophetic woe against Jerusalem which is held responsible for the killing of the prophets (Luke 13:34) and against the priestly establishment which appears to be implied in the words 'behold, your house is forsaken' (Luke 13:35).¹³⁷ These words in Luke 13:34-35 are only paralleled in Matthew 23:37-39 and thereby constitute a Jesus-tradition in Q. This Jesus-tradition in its present form, in particular in Luke 13:35b, has been interpreted as a later addition by the composers of Q.¹³⁸ Nevertheless, the prophetic woe in Luke 13:34-35a / Matt 23:37-38 does not necessarily form a hindsight or post-70 CE perspective. In fact, Jesus' criticism of the Temple and the priestly establishment as a 'forsaken house' may be consistent with Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts in view of corruption.

The interpretation of 'your house', ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν, as referring to the Jerusalem Temple and its priestly establishment may be supported by echoes from Scripture¹³⁹ and the immediate context of Jesus' words about Jerusalem. The 'house' which is mentioned in relation to Jerusalem could only be the Temple. The term 'your house' probably expresses Jesus' polemical distance from the priestly establishment. Another Jesus-tradition (Luke 11:49-51 / Matt 23:34-36) also includes elements of a polemic which contrasted the righteousness of the prophets with the bloodshed in the Temple precincts. The Galilean social environment of Jesus' early ministry may be important in this connection, since Jesus' teachings addressed many followers from Galilee who went up to Jerusalem with him.

Thomas 60, which is about a Samaritan carrying a lamb on his way to Judaea, may also provide a contemporary context of the danger of bloodshed. Jesus appears to warn his disciples that they must take care not to be killed themselves instead of the sacrificial animal. The fact that Jesus takes the case of a Samaritan as an example here may express a polemical distance from the priestly establishment, since Samaritans together with the Gentiles were considered to be on the fringes of acceptable contributions to the Temple cult (*m. Sheq.* 1:5).

Finally, two passages in John may point to a contrast between the Galilean social environment and Judaea and Jerusalem with regard to the way Jesus' message was received during his early ministry. In John 4:45 we read: "So when he came to Galilee, the Galileans welcomed him, having seen all that he had done in Jerusalem at the feast, for they too had gone to the feast".¹⁴⁰ As for the preceding narrative of John, Jesus' presence in Jerusalem at the occasion of a feast is only mentioned in John 2:13-25, which deals with Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts and other signs at the time of Passover. It is therefore logical to assume

¹³⁶ I disagree with M.J. Borg, *Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus*, 205-207, who suggests Luke 13:1-5 fits into prophecy of Jesus about war and the destruction of Jerusalem.

¹³⁷ Translation from RSV. Luke 13:35 reads ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν; Matt 23:38 reads ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος.

¹³⁸ Cf. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 192-204 at 204 about a later conviction that "when Jerusalem repents, the end will come" expressed by Luke 13:35b.

¹³⁹ 1 Kgs 9:7; Jer 12:7, 22:5; Tob 14:4. Paesler, *Das Tempelwort Jesu*, 250-255 refers to the biblical tradition about the Temple as the 'house of God', but interprets Luke 13:34-35 as a reproach against Jerusalem, hence also against the Temple. J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)* (Doubleday: Garden City, N.Y., 1985) 1033-1038 leaves a broader interpretation of ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν open to question.

¹⁴⁰ Trans. from RSV. The Greek text reads: ὅτε οὖν ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἐδέξαντο αὐτὸν οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι πάντα ἑωρακότες ὅσα ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ἑορτῇν.

that John 4:45 refers back to these events, for there is no other occasion of Jesus' deeds in Jerusalem in the sequence of the narrative before John 4:45.¹⁴¹

The Galileans welcomed Jesus, according to John 4:45, because of his teachings and deeds in Jerusalem of which they had been witnesses themselves: they had also gone up to Jerusalem to celebrate Passover. Jesus' Galilean followers apparently supported the prophetic message behind their teacher's confrontation with the priestly establishment in Jerusalem wholeheartedly.

Judaea and the Judaeans,¹⁴² on the other hand, are described in John 7:1 as being very hostile to Jesus. Thus, we read: "And after this, Jesus went about in Galilee, for he did not want to go about in Judaea because the Judaeans sought to kill him". The contrast between the Galilean and Judaeans attitudes to Jesus which appears from reading John 4:45 and John 7:1 respectively attests to the Galilean support base of the early Jesus-movement. Above all, however, this contrast may point to a Galilean social setting for Jesus' attitude to the Temple.

4.2 The socio-religious geography of Galilee in relation to Judaea

4.2.1 'Galilee of the Gentiles' and Jewish Galilee

The relations between Galilee and Judaea, and Galilee and Jerusalem in particular, provide the general context with which Jesus' attitude to the contemporary Temple cult interacted. Although the sources about Galilee and Judaea in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods are heavily determined by a Judaeans perspective,¹⁴³ I will aim to emphasise the Galilean part of the picture. For a better understanding of the socio-religious geography may illuminate the way in which Jesus, as a Galilean, could have perceived Jerusalem and the Temple. Although it would probably be wrong to suppose a disjunction between Galilean Judaism and Judaeans Judaism,¹⁴⁴ as we will also see in the discussion of historical evidence, it is a fact that Galilee had a history different from that of Judaea in the Hellenistic period.

Galilee is described by Josephus as a region lying at the northern periphery of the Jewish Holy Land, subdivided into an Upper and Lower Galilee which were "surrounded by many foreign nations", τῶσούτοις ἔθνεσιν ἀλλοφύλοις κεκυκλωμένοι (J.W. 3.35-43, there § 41). In Isaiah 8:23-9:1 we come across the form "Galilee of the Gentiles",¹⁴⁵ which is also quoted in Matthew 4:15-16 in relation to Jesus' early ministry in Galilee. The idea that Galilee was surrounded by the Gentile nations is further substantiated by references in both Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* and 1 Maccabees: "Tyre and Sidon and the other nations of Galilee" (*Ant.* 12.331; cf. 1 Macc 5:15).

¹⁴¹ Cf. F.J. Moloney, S.D.B., *The Gospel of John* (Sacra Pagina Series vol. 4; Liturgical Press: Collegeville, Minnesota, 1998) 160: "a link with 2:23-25, where the last reference to a feast is found, is clearly intended".

¹⁴² I here follow the "larger consensus" that the term Ἰουδαῖοι in the specific context of John 7:1 as in other instances in John "means 'Jewish authorities in Jerusalem'", as discussed by J. Beutler, 'The Identity of the 'Jews' for the Readers of John', in R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt & F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel* (Royal Van Gorcum: Assen, 2001) 229-238 at 230. Cf. A. Reinhartz, 'Jews' and Jews in the Fourth Gospel', in *Ibidem*, 341-356 at 347: "The Johannine usage supports an understanding of Ἰουδαῖος that includes ethnic-geographic, political and religious elements".

¹⁴³ Josephus wrote as a native from Jerusalem about Galilee. The recent study of S. Freyne, 'Galilee-Jerusalem Relations According to Josephus' *Life*', in *idem*, *Galilee and Gospel. Collected Essays* (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 2000) 73-85 focuses on Josephus' Judaeans perspective. 1 Maccabees conveys the Judaeans perspective of the Maccabees (1 Macc 2:1-6f.) in their revolt against the Hellenistic oppression by Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. M. Goodman, 'Galilean Judaism and Judaeans Judaism', in *CHJ III The early Roman period*, 596-617.

¹⁴⁵ MT Isa 8:23 גליל הגוים; LXX Isa 8:23 adds after Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν the phrase τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

Galilee was a scene of battle between the forces of Seleucid rulers and the Judaea-based Maccabees in the Maccabean era (cf. *Ant.* 12.332-334, 350 and 13.191-193; 1 Macc 5:9-20). Apart from the struggle against foreign oppression and the profanation of Jewish ancestral customs, the annexation of the districts of Samaria and of Galilee to Judaea was probably in the interest of the Maccabees (cf. *Ant.* 13.50 and 125-127, cf. 1 Macc 10:30.38, 11:34). This annexation was imposed on the Seleucid ruler, king Demetrius, by the Maccabean leader Jonathan by ca. 150 BCE. Galilee, though bordering on foreign nations, was, however, not a foreign region to the religious traditions of Israel.

Seán Freyne has rightly pointed out that the designation 'Galilee of the Gentiles' should not be interpreted as an ethnic description of Galilee at the first century CE, as though it were predominantly Gentile and Hellenistic and had only recently been judaised. In this connection, Freyne refers to the influence of the History of Religions approach, which emphasised the Hellenistic component in the early Jesus-movement, "ultimately leading to the assertion that 'in all probability Jesus was not a Jew', since Galilee was pagan".¹⁴⁶ The influence of this History of Religions approach on the negative interpretation of Jesus' attitude to the Jewish law has further been noted and rejected in recent scholarly work on the historical Jesus.¹⁴⁷

Archaeological evidence provides information about the typical existence of a Jewish Galilee in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. In his survey on archaeology and Galilee, Freyne has pointed to the need to identify the material culture which is related to the Jewish way of life, such as ritual baths (*miqwaoth*) and burial customs. In his view, the fact that the archaeological evidence of synagogues in Galilee before 70 CE is sparse and hard to identify, has to do with the fact that the post-70 CE evidence of synagogues in Galilee in certain cases constitutes a continuation of earlier existing places of Jewish worship.¹⁴⁸ Jonathan L. Reed has further noted that even in the case of the more Hellenised cities like Sepphoris and Tiberias the evidence of first century CE material culture indicates that these were predominantly Jewish cities.¹⁴⁹

The works of Josephus and the books of the Maccabees further illustrate the life of Jewish Galilee in the Hellenistic period. 1 Maccabees 5:14-23 refers to the 'brethren in Galilee' whose situation led the Maccabees to fight many battles against 'all Galilee of the Gentiles', that is, those parts of the territory where the Gentiles had made their inroads in addition to Ptolemais, Tyre, and Sidon. Galilee was apparently viewed as an 'ally', σύμμαχος, of the Maccabees from the perspective of the Seleucid rulership (Josephus, *Ant.* 13.154). Even if our picture may be coloured by Maccabean war propaganda, Jewish Galilee was a historical reality in the Hellenistic period.

¹⁴⁶ Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*, 8.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Tomson, 'If this be from Heaven ...', 144-159 refers to the position of Rudolf Bultmann that Jesus would have fundamentally rejected the Jewish law and discusses instead how Jesus' attitude to the Law concurs in certain points with the positions of different Jewish movements. Cf. P.J. Tomson, 'Jesus and his Judaism', in M. Bockmuehl (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus* (Cambridge UP: Cambridge, 2001) 25-40.

¹⁴⁸ S. Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*, 179-180 refers to the sites of Meiron, Khirbet Shema and Gush ha-Lab in upper Galilee, where this assumption is confirmed by stratified digs. Freyne also discusses the numismatic evidence of Hasmonean coins found in many sites of Jewish settlements in Galilee. Cf. J.F. Strange, 'First Century Galilee from Archaeology and from the Texts', in D.R. Edwards & C.T. McCullough (eds.), *Archaeology and the Galilee* (Scholars Press: Atlanta, Ga., 1997) 39-48 at 44 about the architectural feature of "re-presentation of the sacred space of the Temple" in ancient synagogues also found in the "putative first-century synagogues of Magdala-Taricheae, Capernaum, and Gamla".

¹⁴⁹ Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus*, 212-220 at 217 refers to "many features of the Judean material culture in the same period, notably stone vessels, *miqvaoth* or ritual baths, burial in *kokhim* shafts with ossuaries, and a diet absent of pork".

It should also be noted that Josephus' reports about the Judaisation of certain regions under Hasmonean rulers do not apply to Galilee.¹⁵⁰ Josephus does mention the fact that Alexander Jannaeus, Hasmonean ruler from 103 to 76 BCE, was brought up in Galilee (*Ant.* 13.322) and implies the presence of a Jewish population in Galilean cities like Asochis and Sepphoris (*Ant.* 13.337-338). The inclusion of Galilee, גליל, in the Qumran text *4QProphecy of Joshua* (4Q522 frag. 9, col. I + 10, line 10) concerning territories for the Israelites may further corroborate the existence of Jewish Galilee in the Hellenistic period. This evidence in my view undermines Richard A. Horsley's conclusion about the "historical reality and effectiveness of conversion of the Idumeans *and the Galileans*".¹⁵¹ These two ethnic groups cannot be compared, since the Idumaeans were judaised, whereas the Galileans were already perceived as 'brethren' from the beginning of the Maccabean revolt (1 Macc 5:14-23).

4.2.2 Galilee and the Pharisees

The question about the presence of the Pharisees and the influence of their teachings in Galilee is important for our understanding of Jewish Galilee during the early Roman period. In his *Jewish Antiquities* (*Ant.* 18.15), Josephus discusses the influence of the Pharisaic teachings among the people (δῆμοι), and a passage from his *Life* (§ 197) further attests to the popular commitment to the Pharisaic party, since certain Pharisees were of common descent (δημοτικῶν). How did the popular influence of the Pharisees extend to Galilee and Judaea?

Since Josephus' first digression about the Jewish schools in his *Jewish Antiquities* (*Ant.* 13.171-173) stands in the midst of his historical narrative of events related to Judaea and the Maccabean campaigns, it may be assumed that the three Jewish schools, including that of the Pharisees, started as Judaeian movements. The supposed Judaeian social setting of the Sadducees and the Essenes is corroborated by evidence from the New Testament (e.g. Acts 4:1, 5:17) and from Philo (*Hypothetica* 11.1) respectively. Josephus' account of his training in the courses of the three Jewish schools in his *Life* (§§ 9-12) presupposes an educational setting in Jerusalem. The interrelationships between the leading Pharisees and the priestly establishment, presumed in Josephus' works (*J.W.* 2.411; *Life* 190-194, 197-198), suggest that the Pharisees had an established position, not so much in Galilee but rather in Jerusalem and Judaea.

Richard A. Horsley has pointed to the implicit correlation between the Pharisaic conflict with John Hyrcanus and the revolt of the Judaeian people against John Hyrcanus.¹⁵² Josephus writes about the growing influence of the Pharisees by the time of Alexandra's rule from 78 to 69 BCE (*J.W.* 1.110). Therefore, it may be argued that the Pharisaic influence could have begun to spread into Galilee from this period at the earliest.¹⁵³ Freyne notes a

¹⁵⁰ Josephus suggests that John Hyrcanus I (134-104 BCE) captured Samaria, destroyed the Samaritan temple at Garizim and judaised the Idumaeans (*Ant.* 13.254-258, 275-283; Aristobulus I (104-103) judaised the Ituraeans according to Josephus (*Ant.* 13.318). Horsley, *Galilee. History, Politics, People* (Trinity Press International: Valley Forge, Pa., 1995), 37-38 infers from Josephus' evidence about Aristobulus' campaign against the Ituraeans (*J.W.* 1.76; *Ant.* 13.318-319) that Hasmonaean power had come to extend into Galilee, even though a campaign against Galilee is not explicitly mentioned.

¹⁵¹ Horsley, *Galilee. History, Politics, People*, 39-45. Italics are mine.

¹⁵² R.A. Horsley, *Galilee. History, Politics, People*, 135; cf. 129, 147-152 for the argument about the Pharisees' "mediating political-economic-religious function in that Judean temple-state" (129): they implemented regulations from the priestly ruling circles of Jerusalem under the later Hasmoneans and Herod. This argument is, however, complicated by Josephus' evidence of tensions between Pharisees and Sadducees.

¹⁵³ Cf. S. Freyne, 'Galilee and the Halakhah', in idem, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 BCE to 135 CE* (reprint 1998; T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1980) 305-343, there 329-334 surveying 'possible alternatives to Pharisaism in Galilee' (prophetic figures, the life-style of the *hasidim*).

“special concern with the purity regulations” on the basis of recent archaeological evidence from Sepphoris, Iotapata and Gamala.¹⁵⁴ On the basis of this evidence, Freyne argues in favour of some Pharisaic presence in Galilee, but agrees with Shaye D. Cohen about the limited extent to which the Pharisees established their position in Galilee before 70 CE.¹⁵⁵

The Gospel traditions about the Pharisees provide a historically problematic picture, because the Gospel texts reflect a later perspective on conflicts between the respective early Christian communities and the Pharisaic leadership in Israel.¹⁵⁶ This later perspective, however, concerns the categorical polemic against the Pharisees. In his recent study on ancient Christian Gospels, Helmut Koester has shown a number of cases in which the same sayings of Jesus figure within (Synoptic tradition) and without (*Thomas*) a context of polemic against the Pharisees respectively.¹⁵⁷ This contrast between different settings for the same sayings-tradition may suggest that the polemical setting was edited in view of later conflict with the Pharisees. The geographical information concerning the Pharisees in the Gospel texts may, however, be related to the pre-70 CE situation, as I will explain below.

The Synoptic Gospel narratives contain passages referring to the Pharisaic presence and activity in Galilee at the time of Jesus' ministry.¹⁵⁸ The Synoptic Gospels, however, also imply a concentration of Pharisaic activity in Judaea and Jerusalem. This creates the impression that Jewish religious movements in Judaea and Galilee were to some extent interwoven.¹⁵⁹ A number of disputes of the Pharisees and the Sadducees with Jesus is situated in Judaea and Jerusalem in the synoptic Gospels.¹⁶⁰ Matthew 3:1-7 appears to suggest that the Pharisees and the Sadducees came to John the Baptist in the wake of a multitude which had come from Jerusalem, all of Judaea and the entire region around the Jordan. The tradition about John's baptism in a fragment from the *Gospel of the Ebionites*, which runs parallel to the Synoptic Gospel narratives implicitly links the Pharisees to Jerusalem (*Gos. Eb.* preserved in Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.13.4f.).

Certain passages in the synoptic Gospels about the presence of the Pharisees in Galilee explicitly refer to their provenance from Jerusalem. Thus, Matthew 15:1 mentions Pharisees

¹⁵⁴ Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*, 9-13, 83 n. 24; cf. his chapter 8, 'Archaeology and the Historical Jesus', 160-182 at 174 about pre-70 evidence of *mikwaoth* or ritual baths in Gamala, Khirbet Shema, Sepphoris and Iotapata, and a presumed synagogue in Magdala. Dunn, 'Jesus and Purity: An Ongoing Debate', 453 n. 16 notes a few disputed identifications of *miqwaoth*, which do not preclude his conclusion that "the evidence of an attentive practice of purity in the Galilee of Jesus' time remains substantial" (453).

¹⁵⁵ Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*, 83 n. 24, 84 referring in note 26 to S.J.D.Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee. His Vita and Development as an Historian* (Leiden: Brill, 1979) 226f.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Freyne, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian*, 319-320 about the general recognition that the synoptic tradition was coloured by later experiences of conflict with Judaism: "In particular the sharp polemic of *Mt.* is considered to reflect the tensions of the Jamnia period, but to some degree these same tendencies can be detected in the other three gospels also" (320).

¹⁵⁷ Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 83 compares *GTh* 113 to Luke 17:20-21 (cf. 155-156); 91-92 compares *GTh* 89 (as a community rule) to Luke 11:39-40/*Matt* 23:25-26 (as a polemical saying); 109-110 compares *GTh* 104 to Mark 2:18-20.

¹⁵⁸ E.g. Mark 2:13-3:6, 7:1-13, 8:10-13; *Matt* 9:10-13, 10:34, 12:1-14.24.38-45, 16:1-4; Luke 5:30-6:11, 7:36-50, 11:37-54, 13:31, 14:1-6f., 15:1-2, 16:14-15. Note that according to Luke 17:11-21, one conversation between the Pharisees and Jesus appears to be situated in Samaria.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. M. Goodman, 'Galilean Judaism and Judaeans Judaism', 596-617 concludes that there was a common ground between Galileans and Judaeans, whereas, in the case divergent cultural and religious practices found in rabbinic texts but not in Josephus, the theological significance of the divergences cannot be ascertained.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. e.g. Mark 10:1-9; 12:13-27; *Matt* 19:1-9, 22:15-46; Luke 19:37-40, 20:27-40. Note that, in contrast to Mark 12:13-17 and *Matt* 22:15-22, the testing of Jesus with a trick question about tribute to Caesar in Luke 20:19-26 is not attributed to the Pharisees but to 'spies' sent by the scribes and the chief priests (Luke 20:19-20).

and scribes from Jerusalem. Luke 5:17 talks about the Pharisees and teachers of the law “who had come from every village of Galilee and Judea and from Jerusalem”.¹⁶¹ The special mentioning of Jerusalem further suggests a significant concentration of Pharisees there, which cannot be just as easily assumed for other cities in Judaea and Galilee. Although the picture of John reflects certain anachronisms probably coloured by the post-70 CE situation,¹⁶² there are also passages which imply a concentration of Pharisaic influence in Judaea and Jerusalem in Jesus’ time (cf. John 3:1, 4:1-3, 7:45-52, 9:8-13f., 11:45-48, 18:3).

The idea that the most prominent and leading Pharisees were to be found in Jerusalem figures in both the New Testament (cf. e.g. Acts 5:34, 23:1.7-9; John 7:45-48) and Josephus’ works (*J.W.* 2.411; *Life* 21). This presence of leading Pharisees in Jerusalem may have contributed to the Judaeian attitude of superiority toward Galilee. The Judaeian and, more specifically, Jerusalemite superiority was effected by the system of Temple taxation and dynastic rule over Galilee in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, as Richard A. Horsley and Seán Freyne have pointed out.¹⁶³

We may summarily conclude that the Jewish character of Galilee in Jesus’ time corresponds with Pharisaic presence in Galilee. Josephus’ evidence (*Life* 190-198) suggests that the authority of the priestly establishment weighed most heavily in Galilee, followed by the popular influence of the Pharisees.

4.2.3 Galilean attitudes to the Herodian dynasty

Another important dimension of Galilee at the time of Jesus’ ministry concerns the political circumstances of its subjection to the rulers of the Herodian dynasty and Galilean attitudes to this rule. The beginning of the rule by Herod I (37-4 BCE) was characterised by exploitation and repression. Herod’s exploitation was effected through his severe taxes (*Ant.* 15.365) which was one of the reasons which provoked opposition. Herod I repressed his opponents violently, as is evident from Josephus’ accounts of Herod’s persecution of Antigonus’ party (*Ant.* 15.5-6f.), Herod’s execution of conspirators (*Ant.* 15.277-291), and general measures to quell each potential revolt by means of bloodshed (*Ant.* 15.366f.).

Herod’s tyrannical rule was probably hated much by the Galileans, and his measures, perceived as a subversion of Jewish tradition, incited general Jewish hatred. Thus, Herod I met general Jewish opposition to his plans to introduce foreign practices in Jerusalem (*Ant.* 15. 267-279). Josephus further writes that Herod I abandoned the practice of appointing high-priests from the Hasmonean lineage (*Ant.* 14.490-491; 20.247, 249).

Josephus also points at the hostility of the Galileans to Herod I, and Herod’s measures to prevent revolts against him from succeeding. Josephus attributes a revolt against the pro-Roman forces of Herod I first of all to the Galileans (*Ant.* 14.450). Although Josephus adds that a good part of Judaea also revolted, the prominent place of Samaria and Galilee in Herod’s establishment of military colonies (*Ant.* 15.292-296) indicates the latent opposition to Herod I in the northern part of Israel. It is further significant that Josephus claims that only the Pharisaic and Essene movements in Judaea were excused from persecution when refusing to

¹⁶¹ Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)*, 1035 categorises Luke 5:17 among the passages in Luke about reactions of people from Jerusalem to Jesus.

¹⁶² Cf. e.g. John 1:19-24 about priests and Levites from Jerusalem sent from the Pharisees. This description seems to reverse the order which would be in accordance with the historical situation before 70 CE, when the priestly establishment was invested with the most authority. After 70 CE, however, the Pharisaic movement became the dominant representatives of Palestinian Jewish leadership.

¹⁶³ R.A. Horsley, ‘Jerusalem and Galilee’, in idem, *Galilee. History, Politics, People*, 128-157 at 132-144; Freyne, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian*, 282-285; idem, *Galilee and Gospel*, 105-111.

take the oath of loyalty (*Ant.* 15.365-371). Galileans apparently enjoyed no such privilege of excuse.

Herod's cruelty probably became part of the collective memory of the Galileans. As Herod I was also the initiator of the expansion of the Jerusalem Temple (*Ant.* 15.380-425), the political circumstances of exploitation and repression may have coloured Galilean perceptions of the Temple. William Horbury has argued that Herod's Temple was political by itself because of its function as a 'royal sanctuary' in a 'Herodian form of ruler-cult'.¹⁶⁴

Josephus writes negatively about the establishment of Tiberias in Galilee by Herod the tetrarch (4 BCE – 39 CE), the son of Herod I, during the reign of the Roman emperor Tiberius, as being contrary to the ancestral laws of the Jews. Josephus describes its new settlers, among which were many Galileans, pejoratively as a 'mob' (*Ant.* 18.36-38 at § 37).¹⁶⁵ The Galilean anticipation on the plan of the Jerusalem assembly to demolish the palace of Herod the tetrarch at Tiberias was occasioned by the depictions of animals in this palace, which were in contradiction with the ancestral laws (*Life* 65-67). This incident exhibits the negative Galilean attitude towards the Hellenising tendency of the Herodian dynasty at the time of the Jewish war.

Josephus' portrayal of king Agrippa II (28-92/93 CE), the great-grandson of Herod I, and his family as thoroughly Hellenised (*Life* 359) may be contrasted to his information about the Galilean susceptibility to disparaging remarks about Agrippa II (*Life* 38-39). This evidence indicates a gulf between Galilee and the Herods in an atmosphere of growing anti-Roman sentiment.

4.2.4 Jesus and Galilean attitudes to the Jerusalem Temple

a. Galilean attitudes to Jerusalem and the Temple

The Galilean background of the Jesus-movement has been interpreted in different ways in the context of Josephus' evidence. Richard A. Horsley has maintained that the Galileans in the first century CE were potentially revolutionary because of the pressure of social and economic conditions. Horsley argues that the Galileans were negatively disposed to the expansion of the Jerusalemite temple-state with its 'laws of the Judaeans'.¹⁶⁶

Concomitantly, Horsley attributes to the early Jesus-movement a radical social renewal of Israelite traditions and a negative ambivalence towards the Temple and the 'laws of the Judaeans'. The Israelite traditions presupposed basic covenantal relations and emphasised the mediatory role of prophets to implement God's salvation. According to Horsley Jesus' mediatory role consisted in the renewal of the social roles of families and villages.¹⁶⁷

There is, however, a problem with this interpretation of the Jesus-movement in its Galilean context, for Horsley tends to minimise the evidence of Galilean adherence to the

¹⁶⁴ Cf. W. Horbury, 'Herod's Temple and 'Herod's Days'', in idem (ed.), *Templum Amicitiae*, 103-149 at 108.

¹⁶⁵ *Ant.* 18.37 σύγκλυδες δὲ ᾤκισαν, οὐκ ὀλίγον δὲ καὶ τὸ Γαλιλαῖον ἦν; Greek text from L.H. Feldman, *Josephus in nine volumes* IX, 30 based on critical editions of B. Niese and Th. Reinach. Feldman's reading σύγκλυδες, 'rabble' is to be preferred to L. Dindorf's reading συνήλυδες, 'those assembled', because of the overall pejorative context of this passage in Josephus' narrative (cf. § 38).

¹⁶⁶ This is Horsley's interpretation of Josephus' evidence. Thus Horsley, *Galilee. History, Politics, People*, 42 translates οἱ Ἰουδαίων νόμοι (*Ant.* 13.257-258) as "the laws of the Judeans" and τὰ Ἰουδαίων ἔθη καὶ νόμιμα (*Ant.* 15.254) as the "customs and laws of the Judeans".

¹⁶⁷ Horsley, *Galilee. History, Politics, People*, 128-157, 256-282 at 281.

Temple cult¹⁶⁸. Seán Freyne has further raised objections against Horsley's position which distinguishes between a Judaeian ruling class and a Galilean peasant class with distinctive ways of life opposed to each other in a history of ongoing conflict. According to Freyne, this view is "open to question in the case of Palestinian Jewish society".¹⁶⁹ In a discussion of the question whether the Galileans were revolutionaries, Freyne has argued that this is not the case and that the primary meaning of the term Γαλιλαῖοι is geographical.¹⁷⁰ Freyne has emphasised the connections and kinship (ὁμοφυλίᾳ) between Judaea and Galilee, as expressed in Josephus' works.¹⁷¹

The debate between Horsley and Freyne, who have interpreted the evidence of Josephus' works about Galilee-Jerusalem relations very differently, involves the question to what extent Josephus presents a historical picture and to what extent his Judaeian attitude to Galilee distorts this picture. Martin Goodman has pointed to the possibility that the picture of Galileans as revolutionaries "may be no more than a Judaeian stereotype".¹⁷²

An example of Josephus' negative Judaeian perspective on the Galileans may be his description of Galilean settlers in Tiberias as a 'mob' (mentioned in the previous section). A Jerusalemite perspective may further underlie Josephus' description of the escalation of violence between the Galileans and the Samaritans during Cumanus' governorship of Judaea (48-52 CE) in his *Jewish Antiquities* 20.118-124.¹⁷³ Josephus writes mainly from the perspective of the Jerusalem leadership¹⁷⁴ whose primary concern it was to counter the greater danger of the outbreak of war which would endanger the Temple.

Josephus describes how bands of robbers arose throughout Judaea in the wake of this conflict which was barely contained by the Jerusalem leadership (*Ant.* 20.124). This description of Josephus suggests an implicit link between the robbers and the leaders of the Galileans. For his account begins with the Galilean incitement to the masses to fight for liberty (§§ 119-120) and shifts to the argument of the Jerusalemite leaders against 'rebels', οἱ ἀφροσώτες, and 'robbers', οἱ ληστοὶ (§§ 123-124). This implies a Jerusalemite perspective which readily equated a Galilean protest movement with potential revolutionary activity, even if the Galileans had a right cause to protest against an intolerable situation.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. e.g. Horsley, *Galilee. History, Politics, People*, 146 states with regard to Josephus' account in *Ant.* 20.118 about pilgrimage to Jerusalem as custom of the Galileans that "there was *some* Galilean pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the major festivals"; Josephus, however, refers to a whole *battle* between Galileans and Samaritans while the former were on their way to Jerusalem passing through Samaria.

¹⁶⁹ Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*, 17-20. Cf. S. Freyne, 'The Geography of Restoration: Galilee-Jerusalem Relations in Early Jewish and Christian Experience', *NTS* 47 (2001) 289-311.

¹⁷⁰ Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*, 35-44, 80-85, cf. 82 n.22 for criticism of M. Hengel's characterisation of the Galileans as Zealots, as "the identification of the Fourth Philosophy [of which Judas the Galilean was the founder] with the Zealots has been seriously challenged in more recent scholarship".

¹⁷¹ Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*, 84-85, 108-111, 114-131, at 84 about a "shared symbolic world-view" with the Jerusalem temple as the "central focal point" for both Galileans and Judaeans as a mitigating factor for alienation from the religious leadership otherwise experienced by Galileans. Cf. Freyne, 'How Revolutionary was Galilee?', in idem, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian*, 208-255 at 228 concludes that the "predominantly peasant ethos for Galilee" could not be the typical environment for a large-scale movement of revolutionaries (246-247).

¹⁷² M. Goodman, 'Galilean Judaism and Judaeian Judaism', 596-617 at 615.

¹⁷³ Cf. L.H. Feldman, *Josephus in nine volumes* IX, 451 note *e* for critical discussion and bibliography about the divergent reading in the parallel passage of *J.W.* 2.232 according to certain mss. Feldman defends the authenticity of the version in *Jewish Antiquities*.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Freyne, 'Galilee-Jerusalem Relations According to Josephus' *Life*', in idem, *Galilee and Gospel*, 73-85 mentions Josephus' appeal to his Jerusalem origins and his priesthood to establish his position in Galilee.

As opposed to the Jerusalemite perspective on Galilean revolutionary activity which would endanger the Temple, Josephus' account of the Galilean-Samaritan conflict does, however, attest to the Galileans' traditional attachment to the Jerusalem Temple. Josephus notes that it was the custom of the Galileans, ἔθος ἦν τοῖς Γαλιλαίοις, to make their way to Jerusalem at the occasion of a Jewish festival (*Ant.* 20.118). Josephus gives a picture of an intolerable situation, in which Galileans on their way to Jerusalem at the occasion of a festival having to pass through Samaritan territory were slain by Samaritans. A Gospel tradition in Luke also points to a continuous tension between the Galileans and the Samaritans with regard to the Jewish pilgrimage to Jerusalem passing through Samaritan territory. Thus, we read in Luke 9:53 about a village of the Samaritans: "but the people would not receive him, because his face was set toward Jerusalem".¹⁷⁵

The traditional attachment of the Galileans to the Jerusalem Temple was part of the larger social world of Jewish Temple religiosity. As becomes clear from Philo (*Spec.Laws* 1.66-70) and the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 2:1.5-11), pilgrimage to Jerusalem was also a custom in the diaspora. Freyne has pointed to the fact that, in the context of a system of tithes and pilgrimage related to the Jerusalem Temple cult, Jerusalem could profit directly from the revenues, while Galilee would benefit indirectly from the pilgrimage from the east.¹⁷⁶ Freyne has argued in favour of the traditional attachment of the Galileans to the Jerusalem Temple cult on the basis of an analysis of Josephus' *Life*.¹⁷⁷

Nevertheless, Freyne also claims that the challenge of Jesus' prophetic message for the priestly establishment consisted in the fact that it undermined the "centrality of Jerusalem and the unqualified loyalty that it was able to foster among its rural adherents".¹⁷⁸ Why would a message which undermined the centrality of Jerusalem attract the Galileans if they were undivided in their loyalty to the Jerusalem Temple cult? How can it be assumed that Jesus would aim to undermine the centrality of Jerusalem? This is a problem with Freyne's position. For Jesus' criticism of the priestly establishment, even if it amounted to apocalyptic prophecy concerning the threat of war and destruction, does not necessarily entail a challenge to the centrality of the Jerusalem Temple cult.

At the level of criticism against the priestly establishment, the pre-70 CE Galilean context may provide information about the grievances of Jesus' Galilean contemporaries. The contemporary Galilean perspective on the Jerusalem leadership was probably determined by the fact that it was tied to a power constellation dominated by the Romans. Josephus states that people from, among other regions, Galilee gathered in Jerusalem not only for religious observances but also for an anti-Roman protest at the time of Varus' governorship from 6 to 4 BCE (*Ant.* 17.254-268).

As the cruel regime of Herod I was probably part of the Galileans' collective memory, the fact that the Jerusalem Temple became identified with Herod's ambitious rebuilding plan may have alienated the Galileans to some extent from this 'Herodian' Temple. Josephus' digression about Herod's expansions on the Jerusalem Temple (*Ant.* 15.380-425, there §§ 388-391) does in fact convey negative overtones about Herod's plans. The sceptical expectation of the bystanders that Herod would rather destroy the whole edifice, καταλῦσαι

¹⁷⁵ Translation from RSV.

¹⁷⁶ S. Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*, 105.

¹⁷⁷ Freyne, 'Galilee-Jerusalem Relations According to Josephus' *Life*', in idem, *Galilee and Gospel*, 73-85. Cf. Freyne, 'The Galileans and the Temple', in idem, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian*, 259-304 at 277-287 about the Galilean adherence to traditional temple offerings and tithes to the priests and relative negligence of more recent, halakhic developments with regard to rulings for tithes; cf. 322-323.

¹⁷⁸ Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*, 112.

τὸ πᾶν ἔργον (§ 388), corresponds with Josephus' description of the instability of the Herodian foundations for the Temple which replaced the old foundations (§ 391).

Josephus' critical description may be about more than only the architectural flaws. His picture of Herod's merciless cruelty and his description of Herod in another passage as a tyrant rather than a king (*Ant.* 16.4) throws a different light on Herod's speech about his rebuilding plans as an 'act of piety in return for God's gift of this kingdom' (*Ant.* 15.387).¹⁷⁹ As the subject of the holy Temple was concerned, Josephus probably criticised Herod implicitly with his comments on the instability of the new Herodian foundations because of which part of the Temple had to be raised again by Nero's time (*Ant.* 15.391).¹⁸⁰ These comments may convey nothing less than a sarcastic attack on Herod's pseudo-piety.

The negative Galilean sentiments on the Herodian dynasty and the Herodian Temple may have been mistaken for revolutionary Galilean tendencies by the Jerusalemite establishment because of certain precedents.¹⁸¹ The Galilean resentment was probably determined by the political circumstances which were viewed as corrupting the ancestral traditions of temple religiosity.

b. *Jesus' Galilean attitude to the Jerusalem Temple*

The widespread Galilean resentment against the corrupting Herodian influence on the ancestral traditions and on the Temple cult probably found a charismatic exponent in Jesus of Nazareth. The Gospel traditions about Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts from commerce strongly suggest that Jesus was surrounded by a popular movement which had gone up to Jerusalem with him from Galilee (Mark 11:1-17; Matt 21:1-13; Luke 19:28-46; cf. John 12:12-19). Jesus' criticism of the contemporary Temple cult posed a challenge to the authority of the priestly establishment (cf. Mark 11:27-33; Matt 21:23-27; Luke 20:1-8).

Certain passages in the synoptic Gospels reflect Jesus' animosity against the Herodian sphere of influence. In Mark 8:15, Jesus warns against 'the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod'.¹⁸² Other passages, like Mark 3:6, 12:13 and Matthew 22:16, refer to the deliberations of the Pharisees together with the 'Herodians', apparently partisans of the Herodian dynasty, against Jesus. Jerusalem testified to the building and fortification programs of the Herods (cf. *J.W.* 5.148, 152, 161-183, 238-245). At the time of Jesus' ministry, the actual political influence of the Herodian dynasty was limited to the rule over Galilee and Perea by Herod Antipas (4 BCE –39 CE). Since these regions were the areas of activity of the John the Baptist and his followers and of the early Jesus-movement, confrontation with Herodian power appeared inevitable.

The Galilean Jesus-movement apparently posed a challenge to the pro-Roman establishment. In this connection, the question about paying taxes to Caesar, which was posed in the presence of some of the Herodians according to the version of Mark 12:13-17, apparently served to check possible revolutionary tendencies within the Galilean Jesus-movement. According to Luke 13:31, the tetrarch Herod Antipas, who had John the Baptist executed, had plans to kill Jesus. In his reaction in Luke 13:32-35, Jesus' words start to address Jerusalem: "it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem" (Luke

¹⁷⁹ Translation based on R. Marcus, *Josephus in nine volumes* VIII, 188-189.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. the negative connotation to the 'innovation', *καίνισις*, of ancestral traditions in Josephus, *Ant.* 18.9.

¹⁸¹ Cf. *Ant.* 18.4-10, 23; *J.W.* 2.118; Acts 5:36-37. Cf. the negative scepticism attributed to the Jerusalem leadership about Jesus' messiahship because of his Galilean descent in John 7:40-52.

¹⁸² ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡρῴδου. A variant reading has τῶν Ἡρῴδιανῶν instead of Ἡρῴδου.

13:33b).¹⁸³ Jesus' words in Luke 13:33-35 voice a prophetic polemic against Jerusalem and its 'house' which could well be the Herodian Temple.¹⁸⁴ Jesus' words strongly express the idea that his destiny was not in the hands of Herod, whereas Jesus' prophetic message severely criticised the priestly establishment.

The early Jesus-movement was apparently perceived negatively as a Galilean subversive movement by the Jerusalemite authorities, as we may infer from the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles (cf. Acts 5:34-39; 24:5 about the 'sect of the Nazarenes'). According to the canonical Gospels, Jesus was arrested as though he were a robber and the leader of a rebellious movement (Mark 14:43-50; Matt 26:47-56; Luke 22:47-53; John 18:2-12).

According to the Synoptic tradition, the conflict between Jesus and the priestly establishment arose over the authority which determined what was (il)legitimate practice in the Temple precincts. Jesus' action probably appealed to his Galilean followers because he gave a new impetus to popular piety and denounced practices on the fringes of the Temple worship which could corrupt the Temple cult. Jesus' criticism of the contemporary state of the Temple cult may have generated expectations among the Galilean followers that he would also act against the political situation, which in their view corrupted the Temple.

5. John the Baptist and Jesus

The relation between John the Baptist and Jesus of Nazareth may further add to our understanding of the early Jesus-movement and the Temple. John's baptism was a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins, βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, according to the Synoptic Gospel tradition (Mark 1:4, Matt 3:1-6, Luke 3:3; cf. *Ant.* 18.118). Compared to contemporary Jewish bathing rituals and baptist sects, John the Baptist had set a precedent with this baptism.¹⁸⁵ Since John the Baptist figures as precursor to Jesus in the canonical Gospels, it should be noted that a central element in Jesus' message also concerned the forgiveness of sins (Mark 2:10, 11:25; Matt 6:14-15, 9:6, 18:21-35; Luke 5:24, 17:3-4) and that baptism played a part in the early stages of Jesus' ministry.

Robert L. Webb has pointed to the contrast between the self-administered character of Jewish ritual bathing practices in the Second Temple period and the mediatory function of John's baptism.¹⁸⁶ The most interesting function of John's baptism for our perspective on the early Jesus-movement and the Temple is the one described by Webb as an 'alternative to atoning sacrifices of the Temple cult'.¹⁸⁷ John's supposed priestly descent, as we learn from Luke 1:5-13, may be significant in this respect. The beginning of the *Gospel of the Ebionites* (in Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.13.6 and 30.14.3) likewise points to the priestly descent of John the Baptist, and adds the massive appeal of John's baptism in a very explicit way: καὶ ἐξήρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντες, "and all went out to him" (cf. Mark 1:5). The attention which John the

¹⁸³ Translation from RSV.

¹⁸⁴ See the previous discussion in section 4.1.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. K. Rudolph, 'The baptist sects', in *CHJ III The early Roman period, 471-500* for a survey of baptist sects from the second century BCE to the third century CE. R.L. Webb, 'John the Baptist and His Relationship to Jesus', in Chilton & Evans (eds.), *Studying the historical Jesus, 187-197* categorises six functions expressed by John's baptism: conversionary repentance, the mediation of divine forgiveness, purification from uncleanness, the eschatological announcement of the expected figure, initiation into the "true Israel" and protest against the Temple establishment.

¹⁸⁶ Webb, 'John the Baptist and His Relationship to Jesus', 187-190 and nn. 26-29, 32, 34 and 36 about Jewish ritual bathing and immersion practices in the Hebrew Bible, Second Temple period literature, and the Mishnah.

¹⁸⁷ Webb, 'John the Baptist and His Relationship to Jesus', 192 and 197.

Baptist apparently also received from priestly circles according to certain Gospel traditions (Matt 3:7; John 1:19f.), may further attest to the challenging function of John's baptism.¹⁸⁸

John the Baptist was active in the area around the Jordan, and in the Gospels there are many traditions which relate John the Baptist and Jesus to each other.¹⁸⁹ All four canonical Gospels contain the tradition that Jesus was baptised by John (Mark 1:9-11; Matt 3:13-17; Luke 3:21-22; John 1:29-34). In addition to this, the *Gospel of the Ebionites* (apud Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30.13.7) also contains this tradition.¹⁹⁰ John 3:22-24 provides evidence about the common ground of Jesus and John the Baptist as leaders of a baptist movement in the early stages of Jesus' ministry, before John's imprisonment.

The parallel development of the initial circles of disciples of John and Jesus is substantiated most of all in John. Thus, John 1:35-42 includes a tradition about two disciples of John who started to follow Jesus. One of these two disciples was Andrew, the brother of Simon Peter, a native of Galilee (cf. John 1:44). John 4:1-3 suggests that the appeal of Jesus' baptism even came to overshadow that of John the Baptist. The Synoptic tradition also conveys information about the extent to which the early Jesus-movement was initially connected with the group of disciples led by John the Baptist. The fact that Herod Antipas's alarm about the activity of Jesus is related to the fact that Jesus was taken for John the Baptist raised from the dead (Mark 6:14; Matt 14:2; Luke 9:7-9) is highly relevant. The impression of Jesus' role as the leader of a baptist movement during his early ministry is endorsed by the fragment from *P.Oxy. 1224*. This fragment presents Jesus' ministry as a 'new teaching' and a 'new baptism', perhaps in contrast to the teachings of the scribes (cf. Mark 1:22.27 par.) and the baptism of John.¹⁹¹

The evidence for divergence between Jesus and John the Baptist in a later stage, when Jesus had departed to Galilee,¹⁹² however, came to determine Jesus' ministry as distinguished from John's baptism of repentance for forgiveness of sins. A Jesus-tradition in Q (Luke 7:18-35 / Matt 11:2-19) illustrates the complicated relation between John the Baptist and Jesus, starting with the question from John the Baptist whether Jesus was the one to come or that one should look for another Messiah. Jesus' reaction typifies John as a messenger, a prophet who prepares the way for the kingdom of God. Interestingly, the saying of Jesus that 'among those born of women none is greater than John; yet he who is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he' (Luke 7:28 / Matt 11:11)¹⁹³ also figures in *Thomas* 46. Yet *Thomas* 46 introduces a somewhat different version of this saying, which may point to its independence from Q. Among other differences, the version of *Thomas* 46 refers to a timescale from Adam until John the Baptist and stresses a child's acquaintance with the kingdom and its superiority to John. This overlap of Q material with a saying in *Thomas* strengthens the idea that this evidence in Q comprises a pre-70 CE tradition.

¹⁸⁸ B.D. Chilton, 'John the Purifier', in idem & C.A. Evans, *Jesus in Context. Temple Purity, and Restoration* (AGJU 39; Brill: Leiden [etc.]: 1997) 203-220 denies such a challenging role to John's baptism, but bases this position partly on the assumption that the circumscription εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν is an "anachronistic assignment to John of an element of the language of catechesis within early Christianity" (215).

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Webb, 'John the Baptist and His Relationship to Jesus', 185-186 and 214-229.

¹⁹⁰ Tomson, 'If this be from Heaven ...', 129-132 refers to the idea that Jesus had been a disciple and participant in the movement of John before he started his own mission.

¹⁹¹ We may infer from the context of this fragment – 2v col. 1 followed by 2 v col. 2 – that it concerns Jesus' ministry. Note that Mark 1:27 also relates a 'new teaching', διδασχὴ καινή, to Jesus.

¹⁹² The canonical Gospel accounts of the beginning of Jesus' ministry in Galilee are very different. Mark 1:14 and Matt 4:12-17 refer to John's imprisonment as the point after which Jesus went into Galilee. Luke 4:14 relates the beginning of Jesus' ministry in Galilee after Jesus' temptation in the wilderness. John 4:1-3 suggests caution against the Pharisees' attention for John the Baptist and Jesus as reason for Jesus to depart to Galilee.

¹⁹³ Translation from RSV.

The difference between John the Baptist and Jesus is put in Jesus' own words, according to Luke 7:33-35 / Matt 11:18-19, as a difference from John who did not eat bread nor drink wine. People said that John had a demon, while they argued about the son of man that he was "glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners".¹⁹⁴ The description of the John the Baptist in contrast to Jesus conveys a difference between the observance and non-observance of rites of fasting. A key to understanding this difference may be Jesus' understanding of the kingdom of God and his own Messianic role in it, which cannot be tied to unaltered perspectives on ritual customs.

The issue of rites of fasting also figures in other Jesus-traditions which articulate the difference between Jesus' disciples and John's disciples. According to the Synoptic Gospels, the disciples of John the Baptist agreed with the Pharisees and their disciples in their observance of customs of fasting which the disciples of Jesus did not observe (Mark 2:18, Matt 9:14, Luke 5:33). Luke 5:33 adds the offering of prayers, δεήσεις, to the observance of fasting. Jesus' reaction to the issue of fasting and prayers in Luke 5:34-35 is partly corroborated in *GTh* 104. In both passages, Jesus refers to the figure of the bridegroom whose departure marks the time to fast and to pray. Although *GTh* 104 does not make the context of disagreement between Jesus and John the Baptist explicit, Jesus' answer 'what is then the sin which I have committed?' in *GTh* 104 suggests a difference in perspective.

John 3:25 mentions a controversy between the disciples of John and a Judean about purification (καθαρισμός). Purification was an issue which related to baptism. Thus, purification of the body is implied in Josephus' description of John's baptism (*Ant.* XVIII, § 117). As John 3:26 concerns the comparison between John's and Jesus' baptism, the controversy about purification in John 3:25 should probably also be seen in the light of the differing appeal of the baptist rites of purification of John and Jesus respectively.¹⁹⁵

Logia 6, 14, and 27 in *Thomas*¹⁹⁶ further mention fasting as an issue in the conversations between the disciples and Jesus. These logia, however, do not share with the Synoptic Gospels the context of disagreement between the disciples of John the Baptist and those of Jesus. Nevertheless, Jesus' sayings in *GTh* 6 and 14 are critical about the external, ritualised context of rites of fasting, praying and giving alms. Jesus' saying in *GTh* 27 appears to confirm the intrinsic value of fasting and observing the Sabbath. Thus, the above mentioned sayings of Jesus may also reflect a discussion between Jesus and his disciples occasioned by the disagreement with John the Baptist and his disciples.

The divergence between Jesus and his disciples on the one hand and John the Baptist and his disciples on the other has implications for the subject of attitudes to the Temple. If we take the synoptic tradition about the agreement between John's disciples and the Pharisees as a point of departure, we may infer that John the Baptist and his followers indirectly expressed their adherence to the Temple cult through the rites of fasting and prayer. These rites corresponded at least in part to the religious festivals of the Temple and the sacrificial cult.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁴ Translation from RSV.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. R.E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John (i-xii)* (Doubleday: Garden City, 1966) 150-156 has pointed to the difficulties of the sequence in *John* 3:22-30 in view of different alternative readings in *John* 3:25. If the reading "the Jews" in *John* 3:25 is adopted, John's version starts to run parallel with the synoptic tradition about the matter of fasting on which the Pharisees and the disciples of John agreed. If the reading "Jesus" in *John* 3:25 is adopted, this turns the passage into a *direct controversy* between Jesus and the disciples of John.

¹⁹⁶ Sayings 6, 14 and 27 are in the Coptic *Gospel according to Thomas*; sayings 6 and 27 have also been preserved in the Greek fragments of *P.Oxy.* 654. 32-40 (saying 6) and *P.Oxy.* 1. 4-11.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 14.65-66; 17.165; 18.94 about the 'fast day', ἡ νηστεία, next to the three festivals each year; *Ag. Ap.* 2.282; *m. Ta'an.* 4:2 about a 'division' (מעמד) in Jerusalem, made up of priests, Levites and Israelites, of which the popular representatives gathered in the country towns to engage in Scripture reading and fasting parallel to the daily services in the Temple.

While the religious observance of fasting and prayer tied John and his followers to the Temple cult, John's idea of baptism still suggested a renewal of the religious tradition of mediating repentance from sins and divine forgiveness of sins. With this precedent of religious renewal, John prepared the way for Jesus' ministry.

Since certain Gospel traditions (Matthew 3:5-10¹⁹⁸ and John 1:19-28) attest to the watchful attention paid to John the Baptist by the Jerusalem leadership, we may consider the question whether John's baptism posed a challenge to the established socio-religious and political order. This idea is confirmed by Josephus' account of the execution of John the Baptist. Josephus relates the motivation behind Herod Antipas's execution of John the Baptist to the former's fear for sedition (ἀπόστασις or στάσις):¹⁹⁹ the eloquence and charismatic appearance of John had a great appeal to the Jewish people. This fear for sedition was linked to John's baptism which by itself was a socio-religious phenomenon. It would not be unlikely to assume common interests of the Herodian dynasty and the priestly establishment to suppress any challenge to the traditional religious order expressed by the contemporary state of the Jerusalem Temple cult.

Significantly, Jesus appropriated John's baptism for his purpose of criticising the contemporary state of the Temple cult. This criticism does not necessarily entail that Jesus aimed to undermine the centrality of the Temple, since his view about fasting and praying did not preclude the value of these religious customs as such. In the Synoptic version of Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts from commerce, Jesus referred to John's baptism in the light of a dispute with the priestly authorities. In reaction to the question about authority posed by the priestly leadership, Jesus poses the provocative counterquestion 'was the baptism of John from heaven or from men' (Mark 11:30, Matt 21:25, Luke 20:4). Jesus implicitly contrasts John's baptism to the contemporary Temple cult.

6. Individual Gospel traditions about Jesus and the Temple

6.1 Jesus and the religious practices of the Temple

a. *The healed leper in the Synoptic tradition and P.Eg. 2*

The Synoptic Gospels contain a number of individual traditions in which Jesus adhered to or reacted to certain religious practices of the Temple. Thus, according to the first story of a healing by Jesus in Mark, the healing of a leper, Jesus urges the man whom he has cured to show himself to the priest and to make an offering for his purification according to that which 'Moses commanded' as a testimony for them (Mark 1:43-44). The reference to that which is commanded by Moses relates to the elaborate levitical laws concerning the diagnosis and cleansing of leprosy in which the priest was involved (cf. Lev 13-14). In the case of leprosy, the Mosaic laws prescribed the priestly role as the examination and the healing of the disease (Lev 13-14; cf. Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.281-282).²⁰⁰ Scholarly opinions differ about the question whether Jesus' exhortation to the healed leper not to say anything about his healing to others

¹⁹⁸ Cf. Webb, 'John the Baptist and His Relationship to Jesus', 197 referring to the close connection between the Sadducees, in Matt 3:7, and the Temple. The parallel passage in Luke 3:7-9, which refers instead to 'multitudes', appears to correspond with the longer quotation of Isa 40:3-5 which ends on the salvation of God for all flesh.

¹⁹⁹ Cf. L.H. Feldman, *Josephus in nine volumes* IX, 82-83, 82 n. 4, 83 n. f.

²⁰⁰ Cf. Hagner, *WBC 33A Matthew 1-13*, 196-199 at 198 noting Jesus' unconventional healing of the leper, since, in the contemporary Jewish perspective, "touching the unclean violates the law" (cf. Lev 5:3).

in Mark 1:44a.45 was a later Markan edition related to the messianic secret motif or pre-Markan Jesus-tradition.²⁰¹

Similarly, in Matthew 8:3-4 and Luke 5:14, Jesus sends a healed leper to a priest in order to observe the rulings of Scripture. Luke 17:11-19 further contains a tradition about Jesus' healing of ten lepers whom he directed to the priests.

Papyrus Egerton 2 likewise incorporates a tradition about Jesus' healing of a leper whom he sends to the priests (fragment 1 recto, lines 32-41).²⁰² F. Neiryneck has compared this reference to priests (in the plural form) to Luke 17:14 (cf. section 3.1.2 note 95). Although this papyrus fragment does not convey significantly new details in comparison with the synoptic tradition about Jesus' direction of a healed leper to the priests, it at least constitutes a very early witness to the synoptic version of events.

Jesus' sending of a healed leper to the priest to bring an offering for his purification 'as testimony for them', εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς, in Mark 1:44 raises questions. What testimony does Mark have in mind here and for whom? E.P. Sanders has commented about Mark 1:40-45 that "here Jesus acts in general conformity with the law".²⁰³ Mark's description of Jesus' healing of the leper is, however, analysed in a different way by Thomas Kazen, who concludes that Jesus, though "aware of Jewish conditions, is not operating within a Jewish frame of reference".²⁰⁴

If Jesus' healing of the leper conflicted with contemporary Jewish perceptions about the necessity to keep away from lepers and their contamination, Mark 1:40-45 corresponds with other healing stories, like healing on the Sabbath (Mark 3:1-5), as an example of Jesus' transgressive act of ignoring prescriptions from contemporary legal interpretations. The way Mark has fitted the account of the healed leper into his narrative may reflect his editorial concern of countering the Pharisaic position in a polemical way.

Nevertheless, Jesus' direction of the healed leper to the priest still reflects Jesus' concern for traditional regulations of the Mosaic Law. The fact that Mark 1:44 refers to a 'testimony for *them*' does not necessarily contradict the reference to 'the priest', if the term is read as a collective noun, standing for the priestly authorities.²⁰⁵

b. Purification and the inner Temple court in P.Oxy. 840

Jesus' conflict with the priestly establishment is mentioned very explicitly in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 840*.²⁰⁶ This papyrus text contains a dispute in the Temple court, τὸ ἱερόν, between a Pharisaic chief priest and Jesus about purification. The reference to a Pharisaic chief priest, Φαρισαῖός τις ἀρχιερεὺς, not attested in the canonical Gospels, suggests a link between the

²⁰¹ R.A. Guelich, *WBC 34A Mark 1-8:26* (Word Books: Dallas, Tex., 1989) 75-76 notes that Mark 1:44a may reflect Mark's understanding of a silence command which formed an original part of healing accounts; Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8* (AB 27; Doubleday: New York, 2000) 208 defends the view that Mark 1:44a is "an original part of the tradition"; cf. T. Kazen, *Jesus and Purity Halakhah. Was Jesus Indifferent to Impurity?* (ConBNT 38; Almqvist & Wiksell International: Stockholm, 2002) 100: "if the silencing command is not taken as intrinsic to a Markan messianic secret, it could just as well be seen as belonging to tradition".

²⁰² H. Idris Bell & T.C. Skeat, *Fragments of an unknown Gospel and other early Christian papyri* (Trustees of the British Museum: London, 1935) 10-11 and plate I.

²⁰³ E.P. Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies* (SCM: London, 1990) 2.

²⁰⁴ T. Kazen, *Jesus and Purity Halakhah*, 106; cf. 107-117 about the first-century CE Jewish context of the perception of lepers conveying contamination which should be avoided by keeping a distance from them.

²⁰⁵ Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 18.17 for ὁ Φαρισαῖος λέγει as an example of the singular as a collective noun. See also Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, § 139.

²⁰⁶ Grenfell & Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* V, no. 840; cf. Stroker, *Extracanonial Sayings of Jesus*, 22-23.

Pharisees and the Jerusalemite priesthood in the late Second Temple period.²⁰⁷ The idea of a Pharisaic chief priest is unparalleled. Josephus provides evidence about a Pharisee of priestly descent, *ἱερατικοῦ γένους, Φαρισαῖος καὶ αὐτός*, in *Life* 197. Nevertheless, the idea of a Pharisaic chief priest remains anomalous if not suspect. The dispute about purification reportedly took place in the “place of purity” or sanctuary, *τὸ ἀγνευτήριον*,²⁰⁸ and begins with the chief priest’s reproach that Jesus had not immersed himself and that his disciples had not even washed their feet.

The fact that the chief priest presupposed purification indicates the place in the Temple complex where Jesus and his disciples found themselves. Josephus describes four Temple courts: the outer court open to all people, the second court for all Jews who were undefiled, the third court for male Jews who were ritually purified and the fourth court for the officiating priests only (*Ag. Ap.* 2.103-104; cf. *Ant.* 15.417-419 and *J.W.* 5.184-227).

The chief priest’s emphasis on purification in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus* fragment suggests that Jesus and his disciples were in the third court.²⁰⁹ The comments of the chief priest about his own purification correspond closely to the prescribed situation in the inner Temple court according to Josephus: “Men not thoroughly clean were debarred from admission to the inner court, from which even priests were excluded when undergoing purification” (*J.W.* 5.227).²¹⁰ The ‘place of purity’ or sanctuary is also specified by the presence of the ‘holy utensils’, *τὰ ἅγια σκεύη*, which probably concerned the cult of public worship (cf. *J.W.* 5.562).

Jesus’ answer to the chief priest in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus* fragment is very polemical in that the chief priest’s perspective on purity is associated with all kinds of badness. Significantly, the fragment ends on Jesus’ perspective on cleanness which juxtaposes the ritual immersion of the purification rites of the Temple with the immersion of Jesus and his disciples “in the living water”, *ἐν ὕδασι ζω[ῆς]*. The immersion in the “living water” could well be related to the baptism of the early baptist movement.²¹¹ This would imply a contrast between the priestly authority and the authority of John’s baptism, invoked by Jesus in a way which could correspond with the synoptic account about Jesus’ dispute with the priestly leadership about authority.

The common ground between *P.Oxy.* 840 and other Gospel traditions concerning disputes about purity has been described by T. Kazen as a motivation to give “more weight to inner purity than outer purification”.²¹² This common ground may constitute the historical core of the pre-70 CE tradition represented by *P.Oxy.* 840. The way *P.Oxy.* 840 conveys this dispute could partly reflect a changed post-70 CE perspective to the extent of considering ritual purity polemically as something past and gone. This polemic would then specifically address the Pharisaic-rabbinic movement.

²⁰⁷ Josephus, *J.W.* 2.411-417 mentions priestly experts on the ancestral traditions who came from the midst of the chief priests and the leading Pharisees; cf. *Life* 21, 197.

²⁰⁸ This Greek noun, derived from the verb *ἀγνεύω* (‘to be pure, to keep oneself pure’), does not occur in the New Testament, the Septuagint or in Josephus’ works. The LXX has *ἀγιαστήριον* as a term for the Temple.

²⁰⁹ Cf. BDAG, 12 referring to an identification of *τὸ ἀγνευτήριον* with the ‘inner court, court of the Israelites’.

²¹⁰ Translation from H.St.J. Thackeray, *Josephus in nine volumes* III, 271.

²¹¹ The Greek verb used to signify immersion in this part of *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus* 840 may be derived from *βαπτίζω* and/or *βάπτω*. Theissen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 62 have noted parallels with Matthew 23 and John 4:10f. and 7:37 for this dispute between Jesus and the chief priest about purification.

²¹² Kazen, *Jesus and Purity Halakhah*, 260.

c. Matthean traditions about Jesus and the practices related to the Temple

Matthew comprises certain singular traditions which are related to the cult of the Jerusalem Temple. Below, I will evaluate this Matthean material and deal with the question whether this material constitutes a later transformation of an early tradition.

The Temple Tax

Matthew 17:24-27 highlights Jesus' perspective on the religious obligation to pay the temple tax, τὸ δίδραχμον.²¹³ The collection of this tax by the collectors, οἱ τὰ δίδραχμα λαμβάνοντες, is situated in Capernaum (Matt 17:24).

Jesus is loyal to the payment of the temple tax according to this pericope. This point has provided Donald A. Hagner the argument that Matt 17:24-27 comprises pre-70 CE tradition.²¹⁴ Jesus' comparison of the disciples with the sons of the kings of the earth puts the temple tax in a perspective of freedom without giving offence. Instead of an absolute obligation, Jesus perceives payment of the temple tax as an act of goodwill related to people's means, which in the case of his disciples was their sustenance as fishermen (cf. Matt 17:27).

The priority of moral obligations to cultic offerings

In Matthew 5:22-24, a prophetic message of Jesus stresses the fact that the reconciliation with one's brother is more important than the offering of a gift at the altar. Jesus' emphasis on social justice implies a judgment of transgressors of the commandment 'you shall not kill' as a starting point, and proceeds to a much stricter standpoint with regard to judgment: "But I say to you that every one who is angry with his brother shall be liable to judgment; whoever insults his brother shall be liable to the council, and whoever says, 'You fool!' shall be liable to the hell of fire" (Matt 5:22).²¹⁵

This strict standpoint with regard to the imperative of a peaceful way of living together with one's brother could have affinities with legal passages in the sectarian thought of the Qumran community (cf. 1QS VII; VIII, 2; IX, 19). Thus, we read for example in 1QS VII, 8-9: "And whoever feels animosity towards his fellow for no cause will be punished for (six months) one year. And likewise for anyone retaliating for any reason".²¹⁶

In Matthew 5:23-24, Jesus makes the moral point that a gift, δῶρόν, should be left at the altar in the case of a grudge to a brother, because reconciliation to one's brother has a priority over the offering of a gift. This teaching of Jesus can be related to the prophetic tradition voiced in Hosea 6:6 about the priority of steadfast love to sacrifices and of the knowledge of God to whole burnt offerings.

The theme of the priority of reconciliation above offerings in this Matthean material corresponds with the emphasis on reconciliation and forgiveness of sins in other Jesus-traditions (cf. e.g. Luke 11:2-4; Matt 6:9-15). In my view, the Matthean reference to the priority of reconciliation to offerings in the Temple may reflect authentic pre-70 CE tradition.

²¹³ *Ant.* 18.312 mentions the custom of Diaspora Jews to pay the temple tax, τὸ δίδραχμον; BDAG, 241 notes the equivalence between the two-drachma piece and the half shekel; cf. Hagner, *WBC 33B Matthew 14-28*, 508. for bibliography.

²¹⁴ Hagner, *WBC 33B Matthew 14-28*, 510-511.

²¹⁵ Translation from RSV.

²¹⁶ Translation from García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition I*, 87. Cf. Charlesworth *et al.* (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Rule of the Community* (1996), 44-45 concerning '(six months) one year', ששה חודשים being written on the line and שנה אחת above the line as a possible correction of the scribe.

Korban

Another tradition related to the Temple cult in Matthew is partly paralleled in Mark. This tradition concerns *korban*, a Hebrew word for a gift to God as substitution for another obligation, which figures literally in Mark 7:11. In the context of the passage, Mark 7:9-13, *korban* – the Greek κορβᾶν here is a transliteration of the Hebrew קרבן - is the subject of Jesus' polemic. The parallel passage in Matthew 15:3-6 also contains this polemic of Jesus, but only has the Greek rendering of *korban*, namely δῶρον in Matthew 15:5. An alternative reading of Matt 15:5, according to the *Gospel of the Nazoraeans*, however, has *korban*.²¹⁷

Jesus' polemic forms a reply to the question of the Pharisees why his disciples do not observe the 'tradition of the elders' about washing hands before a meal (Mark 7:5; Matt 15:1-2). Jesus' polemic undermines the authority of the tradition of the elders, ἡ παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, to which the Pharisees appeal. Jesus contrasts this tradition, as a 'tradition of men', ἡ παράδοσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων, to the commandment of God (Mark 7:8).²¹⁸

The parallel traditions in Matt 15:3-6 and Mark 7:9-13 give the impression that *korban* was apparently interpreted in contemporary Pharisaic tradition as a substitution for the capital punishment of transgression of the commandment to 'honour your father and your mother'. Although this representation of *korban* may be part of a polemical hyperbole, contemporary Jewish evidence corroborates the idea that *korban* could replace a religious obligation.

In a biblical context, many references to offerings to the Lord, expressed by the term קרבן, occur in Leviticus and Numbers (Lev 1:2-27:11; Num 5:15 – 31:50). Josephus mentions κορβᾶν as a uniquely Jewish oath (ὄρκος), which is listed by the Tyrians among the prohibited foreign oaths. He translates the term *korban* as 'God's gift', δῶρον θεοῦ (*Ag. Ap.* 1.167). The oath called *korban* was apparently validated through a cultic offering in the Jerusalem Temple. Josephus further mentions the custom of *korban* as a substitute for a religious obligation related to the Nazirite vow (*Ant.* 4.73). In his discussion of evidence from inscriptions related to the issue of *korban*, Joseph A. Fitzmyer has argued that "we have to do with a dedicatory formula in common use among the Jews of the last few centuries B.C. and well into Christian times".²¹⁹ Early rabbinic literature also provides evidence about the usage of *korban* and refers to disputes between the schools of Hillel and Shammai in the Second Temple period about the question what vows are binding, and under which conditions (*m. Ma'as.Š.* 4:10; *m. Ned.* 1:2-4, 2:2.5, 3:2.5, 9:7, 11:5; *m. Naz.* 2:1-3).

In Matthew 23:16-22, Jesus reproves the custom of oaths by the Temple, which are equally related to a cultic gift, δῶρον (cf. Matt 23:18-19). In Matt 23:16, Jesus criticises people whose moral blindness sets a double standard. They claim that an oath by the Temple is nothing and at the same time assign a binding character to an oath by the gold of the Temple.²²⁰ In Matt 23:21-22, Jesus emphasises the binding character of oaths by the Temple: "and he who swears by the Temple, swears by it and by him who dwells in it; and he who swears by heaven, swears by the throne of God and by him who sits upon it".²²¹

²¹⁷ Cf. Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, 113.

²¹⁸ Matt 15:3 contrasts ἡ παράδοσις ὑμῶν to the commandment of God, more directly addressing the Pharisees.

²¹⁹ J.A. Fitzmyer, S.J., 'The Aramaic Qorban Inscription from Jebel Hallet Et-Turi and Mk. 7:11 / Mt. 15:5', in idem, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament in The Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. / Cambridge, U.K. & Dove: Livonia, Mich., 1997) 93-100 [originally published in *JBL* 78 (1959) 60-65].

²²⁰ Cf. Hagner, *WBC 33B Matthew 14-28*, 669 about Jesus' point "that an oath must in every case be regarded as binding (for a similar perspective, see *m. Ned.* 1:1)".

²²¹ Translation from RSV.

Because of the implicit recognition of the indwelling presence of God in his Temple in the above quoted passage, Jesus' teaching appears to focus on the heavy consequence of oaths by the Temple which are in fact equated with oaths by God. Jesus' emphasis on the heavy consequence of such oaths could have affinities with Essene thought. Thus, we read in Josephus' description of the Essenes: "Any word of theirs has more force than an oath; swearing they avoid, regarding it as worse than perjury, for they say that one who is not believed without an appeal to God stands condemned already" (*J.W.* 2.135).²²²

Jesus' polemic against the double standards for oaths by the altar and the Temple further illustrates Jesus' negative perspective on the contemporary priestly establishment rather than on the scribes and Pharisees, as the latter is an element of Matthean edition in Matthew 23. Jesus' polemic against the oaths by the Temple implicitly denounces the pseudo-piety and the hypocrisy of the priestly establishment, which let the double standards untouched.

d. Purity regulations applied outside the Temple cult

Finally, the issue of purity laws should be added to our discussion concerning Jesus and the religious practices of the Temple. As we have seen in one example above, Jesus reacted polemically to the Pharisees who urged him about the custom of the washing of hands (Mark 7:1-5; Matt 15:1-2; cf. Luke 11:38). This custom is called a 'tradition of the elders' which the Pharisees observed according to Mark and Matthew.²²³

Jesus' answer to the Pharisaic requirements of ritual purity focuses on the idea that moral issues instead of ritual custom determine purity or impurity. Thus, we read in Matthew 15:10-11, 17-20 and Mark 7:14-15, 18-23 about Jesus' teaching that whatever goes into the mouth does not defile: by contrast what comes out of the mouth defiles a man.²²⁴ This rule about defilement is explained by Jesus on moral grounds in Matthew 15:18-20: "But what comes out of the mouth proceeds from the heart, and this defiles a person. For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander. These are what defile a man; but to eat with unwashed hands does not defile a person"²²⁵. Jesus' moral perspective on purity and impurity implies a rejection of the customs of ritual purity of the Pharisees along with the hypocrisy of double standards in the contemporary Temple cult.

6.2 Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts from commerce

Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts is reported in all four canonical Gospels (Mark 11:15-18, Matthew 21:12-17, Luke 19:45-46; John 2:13-25). This event is situated in the synoptic Gospel narratives soon after Jesus' entry into Jerusalem which is accompanied by a crowd which acclaims Jesus as the Messiah (Mark 11:1-11, Matthew 21:1-11, Luke 19:28-44). John

²²² Translation from Thackeray, *Josephus in nine volumes* II, 375.

²²³ Cf. Hagner, *WBC 33B Matthew 14-28*, 429-437 at 430, who identifies this Pharisaic custom as part of "the reapplication of the ritual purity of priests in connection with their temple duties to the table conduct of the ordinary family at home", referring to Exod 30:17-21, Lev 15:11, *m. Ber.* 8:2-4, *y. Šabb.* 1.3d and Mark 7:3-4.

²²⁴ Cf. P.J. Tomson, *'If this be from Heaven ...'*, 259-263, 271-272 about the difference between Matt 15:17b and Mark 7:19b, arguing that the phrase 'thus he declared all foods to be clean' in Mark 7:19b, which amounts to a rejection of the biblical dietary laws, is a later anti-Jewish insertion in Mark.

²²⁵ Translation from RSV. The parallel passage in Mark 7:20-23 does not refer to the washing of hands anymore. *GTh* 14 mentions this general rule in connection with the idea of the apostolic mission, after a negative perspective on the rites of fasting and praying and on giving alms.

2:13-25, however, renders an account of Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts at the beginning of the Gospel narrative, followed by various other occasions on which Jesus went up to Jerusalem (e.g. John 5:1, 7:10, 12:12). The event of Jesus' messianic entry into Jerusalem is described in John 12:12-19, apart from Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts in John 2:13-25.

A comparison between the Synoptic chronology and the Johannine chronology poses problems concerning literary criticism. Many scholars have observed tensions in the arrangement of the narrative in John which could suggest a late collection of unfinished blocks of Johannine material by an editor.²²⁶ On the other hand, the idea in John that Jesus went up to Jerusalem more than once during his ministry is quite probable, and the Synoptic Gospels present a stylised chronology in order to give a central place to the passion narrative. Nevertheless, many commentators assign Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts a late stage in the chronology of Jesus' ministry, just before the Passion, thereby giving precedence to the Synoptic version.²²⁷

The relative priority granted to the Synoptic chronology, as indicated above, may be justified by a number of reasons. John's narrative contains such large digressions of teachings of Jesus (e.g. John 14-17) that the chronology seems to recede to a secondary level of importance. John 11:48-53 mentions deliberations by the Jerusalem leadership about the threat to the Temple which Jesus' ministry posed, and the resolution to have Jesus put to death. These deliberations could be related to Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts, since John 2:19-20 comprises a Jesus-tradition about the destruction of the Temple.

The Synoptic tradition conveys a recurring contrast between the expectation of the Temple as a place of the worship of God on the one hand, and the perceived reality of the treacherous abuses of the priestly establishment which sealed the fate of Jesus on the other (Mark 11:17, 14:48-49; Matt 21:13, 26:55; Luke 19:46, 22:52-53). This literary motif is part of the narrative structure of the Synoptic Gospels, unparalleled by John. For a historical understanding of Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts, I will give a critical survey of the main Gospel traditions, that is Mark (on which Matt and Luke depended) and John.

6.2.1 *Mark 11:15-18*

In Mark's version, the clearing of the Temple precincts is directly related to Jesus' teaching which appears to identify the commerce surrounding the Temple cult with unlawful gain, and even robbery. The association of the Temple establishment with illegitimate wealth was a common polemical theme in Essene sectarian circles.²²⁸ Although the clearing of the Temple precincts was a single event, Jesus' teaching in the Temple, mentioned in Mark 11:17, may

²²⁶ Cf. e.g. Conzelmann & Lindemann, 'Literarkritische Probleme', in idem, *Arbeitsbuch*, 368-371.

²²⁷ Cf. Brown, *The Gospel according to John (i-xii)*, 116-118 for a comparison between the Johannine and Synoptic accounts with arguments for and against the precedence of the chronology in the respective accounts; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 567 notes the presence of central elements of the synoptic Passion tradition in John 2:14-22 as an example of analogies between the composition of Mark and John, suggesting John's dependence on Markan traditions.

²²⁸ *J.W.* 2.122 about the Essene contempt for riches and their community of goods, and *Ant.* 18.19 about their exclusion from the regular Temple cult; cf. IQpHab IX, 4-7 about the condemnation of the accumulation of riches by the last priests of Jerusalem through plunder; CD-A VI, 15-16 about sectarian abstinence from 'wicked wealth which defiles' and the 'wealth of the Temple'. See C.A. Evans, 'Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction', in Chilton & Evans, *Jesus in Context*, 395-439 for a survey of 'tradition-critical considerations' and of biblical and contemporary Jewish expectations about the Jerusalem Temple and its priesthood. I agree with Evans' objections against the thesis of E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Fortress: Philadelphia, 1985) 61-76 that Jesus' action in the Temple would symbolise the destruction of the Temple and as such be understood as portent.

well have been a prolonged activity. That is, Mark probably gives a condensed version, which presents the essence of Jesus' prophetic message.

The narrative of Mark about Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts has been taken as point of departure in many scholarly discussions of the historical Jesus and the Temple.²²⁹ Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts is usually situated in the Court of the Gentiles, that is, the outer Court of the Temple.²³⁰ Many commentators have pointed to the fact that the practices of commerce were necessarily related to the conduct of the Temple cult, especially in times of religious festivals.²³¹ Scholarly interpretations of the purpose of Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts diverge, depending on the way in which Jesus' action is related to his message.

Ernst Lohmeyer, in his study about the relation between cult and Gospel, has called Mark's narrative of Jesus' clearing of the Temple a "mirror of all the cult questions".²³² Lohmeyer has interpreted Jesus' action in the light of a prophetic purpose. Lohmeyer connects Jesus' words about the Temple as a 'house of prayer for all the nations' in Mark 11:17 to a prophetic message of eschatological salvation for the nations of the earth.²³³

In fact, only Mark 11:17 contains the part of the quotation from Isaiah 56:7 which refers to "all the nations"; a part which is absent in the other Synoptic Gospels. This implies that the Markan tradition allowed more room for the universalistic message of the prophet Isaiah. Kurt Paesler has, however, questioned the idea that this quotation from Isaiah 56:7 would be part of the message of the historical Jesus, and argues that it must be an editorial addition of a Christian-Jewish community which reinterpreted Jesus' teachings. Paesler's main argument for Mark 11:17c as a pre-70 CE editorial addition consists in his perception that Isa 56:7 does not fully correspond to Markan theology, but rather to a reinterpretation by Christian Jews; they reinterpreted Jesus' action in the light of the early Gentile mission.²³⁴

Craig A. Evans contrasts the suggestion of Mark 11:17 that Gentiles have a place in Jesus' mission to passages in Matthew (Matt 10:5-7; 15:24) and Mark 7:24-30. After a discussion of early Jewish traditions concerning the significance of the Temple for the Gentile world, Evans concludes that the inclusion of Gentiles in Jesus' Messianic mission may have a

²²⁹ Cf. W.D. Davies & D.C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew III Commentary on Matthew XIX-XXVIII* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1997) 133; Paesler, *Das Tempelwort Jesu*, 234 regards the Markan pericope about Jesus' clearing of the Temple as the oldest tradition and thereby as historically more interesting than John 2:13-17.

²³⁰ Cf. E. Lohmeyer, *Lord of the Temple. A Study of the Relation between Cult and Gospel* (ET from the German original, *Kultus und Evangelium* 1942, by Stewart Todd; Oliver & Boyd: Edinburgh and London, 1961), 39-41; E.P. Gould, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark* (ICC; T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1896) 213; R. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium II Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27-16,20* (HTKNT; Herder: Freiburg [etc.], 1977) 197.

²³¹ Cf. Gould, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 212; Paesler, *Das Tempelwort Jesu*, 243 about the necessity of money-changers to change pagan coins with idolatrous images of pagan deities into acceptable money to offer to the Jerusalem Temple; Hagner, *WBC 33B Matthew 14-28*, 600 about the commerce as a 'provision for pilgrims to purchase animals and birds to sacrifice'. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium II*, 199 mentions evidence for commerce on the Mount of Olives related to offerings and sacrifices for the Temple. Cf. B.D. Chilton, 'The Whip of Ropes ([ὅς] φραγγέλιον ἐκ σχοινίων in John 2:15', in idem & Evans, *Jesus in Context*, 441-454.

²³² Lohmeyer, *Lord of the Temple*, 36.

²³³ Lohmeyer, *Lord of the Temple*, 39-41.

²³⁴ Paesler, *Das Tempelwort Jesu*, 238-243 calls Mark 11:16,17a*b a "judenchristliche Neuinterpretation" (242) referring to previous scholarship, 239 n. 51. Paesler observes a tension between the quotation from Isa 56:7 in Mark 11:17b and Markan theology in Mark 13, relying on a previous study by T. Söding (239 nn. 49, 50). Paesler appears to leave two options open with regard to the Christian-Jewish "Neuinterpretation": he refers to the 'reform of the Temple cult' on the one hand (239) and to the 'cleansing of the cult' on the other (241).

background in Jewish traditions. He argues in favour of the authenticity of the Markan tradition.²³⁵

Hans Dieter Betz has pointed to the moral aspect of the Markan tradition in which the purity of the heart with regard to true worship has a priority over the purity of the Temple. Betz further points to the political and commercial compromise to which Herod subjected the Temple; a compromise against which Jesus' action was aimed.²³⁶ Betz makes an interesting point concerning Jesus' opposition against the perceived perversion of the Herodian Temple, drawing on the contrast between the service of God and Mammon. However, his emphasis on the interpretation of Jesus' message concerning the purity of the heart in contrast with the priestly concern for ritual purity may be too much an extrapolation from the prophetic tradition about moral purity. If the priestly concern about purity were totally beyond the concern of Jesus, it would not be understandable why Jesus directs healed lepers to the priest (Mark 1:43-44 par.).

Even if the quotation from Isaiah 56:7 about the Temple as a 'house of prayer for all nations' in Mark 11:17b is a later textual revision, Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts may be explained in relation to the broader context of his teachings. Mark 11:15 and 11:17c provide us some clues about the reason for Jesus' fury about the state of the Temple. As Ezra P. Gould has noted about Mark 11:15, "doves were for the offering of the poor, who were not able to offer sheep and oxen".²³⁷ It is relevant that the traders of doves are specified here. Perhaps Jesus' denouncement of the Temple as a 'hideout for robbers' in Mark 11:17c implied a sharp criticism against the social hierarchy expressed by the commerce of the Temple cult which the priestly establishment apparently allowed to exist. The differentiation of offerings, depending on people's means, marked a social hierarchy. This social hierarchy expressed by the commerce, not the commerce in itself, is also at stake in Mark 12:41-44. Significantly, this pericope is situated in the 'treasury', τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον, of the Temple. At this place, Jesus stressed the priority of the contribution of a poor widow above the lavish contributions of rich people. The inversion of the social hierarchy is also the subject of other sayings of Jesus (cf. e.g. Mark 10:42-45).

Returning to Mark 11:15-17, it should be noted that those who followed Jesus and who probably supported Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts could be people of the lower classes themselves.²³⁸ This idea is strengthened by the references in Mark 11:18 and 12:12 to the tension between the priestly establishment and the crowds which they feared in the event of taking measures against Jesus. Jesus did not only proclaim a message of social justice and religious renewal, but in fact brought about a polarisation between the crowds which had previously been attracted to John's baptism of repentance and the priestly establishment.

Matthean and Lucan revision of Mark's account

Matthew adds to the account of Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts miracles of healing by Jesus in the Temple and the glorification of Jesus as the 'Son of David'. In Mark 11:9-10 this glorification is only related to Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. Matthew 21:9-11 and 21:14-16

²³⁵ C.A. Evans, 'From "House of Prayer" to "Cave of Robbers": Jesus' prophetic criticism of the Temple establishment' in C.A. Evans & S. Talmon (eds.), *The Quest for Context and Meaning. Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1997) 417-442.

²³⁶ H.D. Betz, 'Jesus and the Purity of the Temple (Mark 11:15-18): A Comparative Religion Approach', *JBL* 116/3 (1997) 455-472.

²³⁷ E.P. Gould, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark* (1896), 212.

²³⁸ Mark 11:18 refers to ὄχλος, which according to BDAG, p. 745 may denote "a large number of people of relatively low status in contrast to the rulers".

repeat the theme of Jesus' glorification, which make the idea of a Messianic movement more explicit. Matthew further surrounds the narrative of Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts (Matt 21:12-13) with the account of his healing of the blind and the lame (Matt 21:14f.).²³⁹

Matthew 21:14-17 appears to be focused on the proclamation of Jesus as the son of David, that is, the Messiah as the chief reason why the priestly establishment took offence at him. W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison have, however, noted that this Matthean focus on Jesus as the Messiah in this context reflects the hostility of contemporary Judaism to the "proclamation of Jesus as the Messiah" which the author of Matthew experienced.²⁴⁰ Jesus' healing of the blind and the lame in the Temple court may further be a Matthean insertion, as healing narratives are unrelated to the Temple in all other Gospel traditions.

In Luke's version, Jesus' action of clearing the Temple precincts from commerce (Luke 19:45-46) is followed by an account of Jesus' daily teaching in the Temple (Luke 19:47f.). Luke's version contains a terse version of Jesus' action, without the circumstantial details about those who were engaged in the Temple commerce, which we find in Mark and Matthew.²⁴¹ The Lucan picture of Jesus' popular influence as he was teaching daily in the Temple court is corroborated by and may be derived from references at different places in the narratives of the other canonical Gospels (cf. Mark 14:49a, Matt 26:55c, John 18:20-21).

6.2.2 John 2:13-22

John's version of Jesus' clearing of the Temple creates the impression that the Jesus-tradition was independent from the Synoptic tradition²⁴², and focuses explicitly on the disciples' remembrance of Jesus' ministry. John brings up Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts and Jesus' allusion to the destruction of the Temple just after each other. The Johannine tradition about Jesus' words addresses the Jews as the destroyers of the Temple. Since the Jews' answer in John 2:20 implies the physical Temple of Jerusalem, we may compare this tradition with the prophecy about the destruction of the Temple in the Synoptic Gospels. However, this prophecy is found in a very different place in the narrative structures of the Synoptic Gospels (cf. Mark 13:1-2, 14:58, 15:29; Matt 24:1-2, 26:61, 27:40; Luke 21:5-6).

R.E. Brown has proposed to situate the statement about the destruction of the Temple at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, and to assign the clearing of the Temple precincts a place according to the sequence of the Synoptic narratives.²⁴³ J.A. Fitzmyer has, however, argued that an early dating of Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts is in accordance with the Synoptic tradition about John the Baptist who depicted Jesus as a 'fiery reformer'.²⁴⁴

²³⁹ Both Davies & Allison, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew* III, 140 and Hagner, *WBC 33B Matthew 14-28* (1995) 601 have noted that the access of the blind and the lame to the Temple was probably restricted to the outer Temple court only.

²⁴⁰ Davies & Allison, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew* III, 140; Hagner, *WBC 33B Matthew 14-28* (1995) 602 argues that the citation of Ps 8:3 in Matt 21:16 may "go back to Matthew rather than to Jesus".

²⁴¹ Cf. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIX)*, 1260-1261 has noted agreements between Luke and Matthew, as opposed to Mark, in their common omission of Mark 11:16 and the phrase *παῖσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* in Mark 11:17 from their respective accounts of Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts.

²⁴² Cf. e.g. Conzelmann & Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 366: "keines der synoptischen Evangelien hat Joh im eigentlichen Sinne als "Quelle" gedient"; Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 75: "The author of the Fourth Gospel has used a unique version of the tradition at the beginning, rather than at the end of the story of Jesus".

²⁴³ Brown, *The Gospel according to John (i-xii)*, 118 has explained the transposition of the account of Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts in John in light of the story of Lazarus as the chief motive for Jesus' arrest, "displacing all the other factors that contributed to the tragedy".

²⁴⁴ Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)*, 1264-1265.

On the other hand, the Synoptic tradition of Jesus' question about the baptism of John in reply to the priestly establishment which questioned Jesus' authority (Mark 11:27-33, Matt 21:23-27, Luke 20:1-8) could point to a later dating of Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts. For Jesus' question, "was the baptism of John from heaven or from men", was the more provocative, since the execution of John the Baptist had already taken place.²⁴⁵ This implies that the clearing of the Temple precincts should be contextualised at a later stage of Jesus' ministry.

The perspective of John on Jesus and the Temple is very explicitly determined by a later reinterpretation of Jesus' action and sayings (cf. section 6.7.2). The importance of a later reinterpretation seems to account for the rather thematic presentation of the subject of Jesus and the Temple, and the lack of concern for chronology in this respect. In John 2:13-17, Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts is accompanied by the words *μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου*, 'do not make my Father's house a house of trade' (John 2:16). Jesus' disciples relate this saying to Psalm 69:10, according to John 2:17. In John 2:18-22, Jesus answers the question about a sign to confirm the authority of his ministry with the statement that he will re-erect the Temple in three days when it has been destroyed; a statement which is reinterpreted by the disciples as signifying Jesus' death and resurrection.

6.3 Jesus' teachings in the Temple

In the four canonical Gospels, certain of Jesus' teachings are set in the Temple court. Mark 11:17, 12:35 and Matthew 21:23 refer to the fact that Jesus taught in the Temple complex. Luke 19:47 even mentions Jesus' *daily* teachings in the Temple, and this idea is corroborated by the other canonical Gospels (Mark 14:49a, Matt 26:55c, John 18:20-21). The Synoptic chronology suggests a period extending at least to the seven days of the feast of unleavened bread and Passover for Jesus' daily teachings. However, the contrast between the stylised Synoptic account on Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, exclusively in connection with the Passion narrative and John's narrative of several occasions on which Jesus went up to Jerusalem, allows for the possibility that Jesus taught in the Temple for longer periods of time. John 8:20 mentions a specific location in the Temple complex, that is, the treasury (*τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον*), as the place where Jesus taught in the Temple.

The practice of teaching in the Temple court was not uncommon in contemporary Jewish society. Josephus suggests that teachers of the Jewish Law discoursed in the Temple precincts (*J.W.* 1.648-651; cf. *Ant.* 17.149-155). Josephus even refers to the presence of numerous disciples of an Essene, named Judas, in the Temple court (*J.W.* 1.78).

Certain of Jesus' teachings in the Temple may also have related to the subject of the Temple cult and the priestly establishment. Jesus' words about the widow's offering to the temple treasury in Mark 12:41-44 serve to denounce the hypocrisy of the rich. Just before this, in Mark 12:38-40, Jesus says that the scribes devour widows' houses.

6.4 Parables of Jesus and polemic against the priestly establishment

The genre of Jesus-traditions for which the question to separate tradition from edition is particularly complicated, is that of parables. Parables of Jesus are frequently assigned an allegorical meaning, and may apply to a particular situation and group of addressees in the

²⁴⁵ In the Synoptic sequence of events, John's execution (Mark 6:14-29; Matt 14:1-12; Luke 3:19-20, 9:7-9) is mentioned earlier than Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 18.116-119.

context of the Synoptic Gospels, as they have come down to us. Certain parables are also presented without further explanation, while the Gospel narratives also provide evidence that the meaning of the parables was not always immediately clear to Jesus' disciples.²⁴⁶ In fact, *Thomas 1* posits the issue of interpretation (ΘΕΡΜΗΝΕΙ Δ) of Jesus' sayings as a starting point.

Thus, the question arises to what extent the framework in which Jesus' parables figure in the Synoptic Gospels convey Jesus' message, a later interpretation by Jesus' disciples, or a reinterpretation in the light of post-70 CE circumstances. I will apply this question to the parables of the vineyard and the good Samaritan which in their present context do relate to or address the priestly authorities.

6.4.1 *The parable of the vineyard*

After the narrative about Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts, the Synoptic Gospels relate of a number of confrontations between Jesus and various Jewish movements. Some of Jesus' teachings, including a parable, are sandwiched between the accounts of such confrontations. These events may be situated in the Temple court because of references to Jesus' entering and leaving the Temple (cf. Mark 11:27-13:1; Matt 21:23-24:1;²⁴⁷ Luke 20:1-21:38²⁴⁸).

One of Jesus' teachings concerns the parable about the vineyard and the wicked tenants (Mark 12:1-12; Matt 21:33-46;²⁴⁹ Luke 20:9-19). According to the Synoptic tradition, the Jerusalemite leadership took offence at this parable, as becomes clear from the phrase 'for they knew that he told the parable aiming at them (πρὸς αὐτούς)' in Mark 12:12 and Luke 20:19. Matthew 21:45, referring back to two parables about a vineyard, reads somewhat differently: 'And when the chief priests and the Pharisees heard his parables, they knew that he spoke about them (περὶ αὐτῶν)'.²⁵⁰ Mark 12:12 implies that the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders, previously mentioned in Mark 11:27, were the ones who took offence. Luke 20:19 refers to the scribes and the chief priests as the offended party.

The parable of the vineyard in Mark 12:1-9 and in Matthew 21:33-41 unfolds a perspective on the owner of a vineyard who let it out to tenants. The tenants owed a portion of the produce of fruit to the owner, but instead of giving this to the servants which the owner sent, they maltreated and even killed some of the servants. When the owner sent his own son, the tenants killed him, arguing that the inheritance would then be theirs. Luke 20:9-16 presents the same version except for the fact that it omits the killing of some of the servants.

Since the Synoptic Gospels report that the Jerusalem leadership took offence at this parable, the symbolic meaning which the Synoptic tradition intended to convey should

²⁴⁶ J.R. Donahue, S.J., *The Gospel in Parable* (Fortress: Philadelphia, 1988) 40-46 refers to the 'enigma of Mark 4:10-12', which alludes to the disciples' questions about Jesus' parables and which has been interpreted as a mistranslation in the case of Mark 4:12b, as a saying of the early church, as Markan redaction and by Donahue himself as originating "in the prophetic consciousness of Jesus". Cf. Theißen & Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 285-309 at 287-292 pointing to different interpretations (didactic, historicising, figurative, aesthetic, socio-historical, homiletical) of parables of Jesus in past scholarship.

²⁴⁷ In Matthew 23 we find the Matthean diatribe against 'scribes and Pharisees' which, in this form, has no parallel in the other synoptic Gospels. Parts of this diatribe are related to the subject of the Temple.

²⁴⁸ Luke 20:1 and 21:37-38 stress that Jesus was teaching daily in the Temple.

²⁴⁹ Note that the Matthean version, Matt 21:33-46, relates this as 'another parable', ἄλλη παραβολή, as it is preceded by a parable in Matt 21:28-32 which also mentions a vineyard. Matthew's addition does not necessarily contradict Mark, since the plural ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν in Mark 12:1 may suggest that Mark cites only one example out of several parables spoken by Jesus at this occasion.

²⁵⁰ D.A. Hagner, *WBC 33B Matthew 14-28* (1995) 623 has noted about the Matthean reference to the Pharisees here that it "seems to have been added to intensify their culpability as the religious leaders of the Jewish people".

perhaps be sought in relation to Jerusalem. There are, however, a number of reasons to assume that the Synoptic narrative framework to the parable reflects later reinterpretations and concerns.

First, the conclusion to the parable appears to present a polemical, missionary perspective on the spreading of the gospel mission beyond Israel. Mark 12:9 and Luke 20:16 both conclude that the owner of the vineyard will come to destroy the tenants and give the vineyard to *others*.²⁵¹ The notion of being an inheritor, κληρονόμος, which is important in this parable, was in fact applied to the mission outside Israel to include Gentile converts into the promises of the covenant of God with his people (cf. Rom 4:13-14, 8:17, 9-11). The version of Matthew 21:43, the conclusion of this parable, reveals the context of the mission beyond Israel in an even more explicit way: ‘Therefore I tell you, the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation (ἔθνος) producing the fruits of it’.²⁵²

Second, the image of the rejected cornerstone (Mark 12:10-11; Matt 21:42-43; Luke 20:17-18), which echoes Psalm 118:22 and figures at the end of the parable, may further reflect the later perspective of the missionary Jesus-movement.²⁵³ Mark 12:10-11 may in fact be read as an editorial addition which forms the Markan conclusion to this parable in the light of later experiences of the rejection of the gospel by the Jerusalem leadership. In the Matthean version, the reference to the rejected stone is interwoven with the conclusion about inheritance for another nation (Matt 21:42-43). Luke 20:17-18 identifies the rejected stone as a type of stumbling block. The idea that the later missionary perspective underlies the conclusion to this parable here may further be substantiated by an example from the Acts of the Apostles. The speech of Peter in Acts 4:8-12, addressing the ‘rulers of the people and elders’,²⁵⁴ comprises the image of the ‘stone rejected by the builders which has become the cornerstone’. The cornerstone signifies Jesus Christ in Acts 4:10, and Acts 4:11 states his rejection by the Jerusalem leadership: “this is the stone which was rejected by *you* builders”. This later perspective on Jesus Christ as the rejected stone, which has become the cornerstone, may nevertheless still be a pre-70 CE perspective.

Third, the parable of the vineyard figures in logion 65 of *Thomas* without the narrative framework or setting suggested by the Synoptic Gospels. The subsequent saying in *GTh* 66 concerns the imagery of the rejected cornerstone. Thus, the narrative setting for the parable of the vineyard in the Synoptic Gospels, of which Mark is presumably the oldest source, becomes subject to the question whether it reflects Markan revision or an earlier pre-Markan tradition.

Taking into account the additions which have already been mentioned above, the idea that the Jerusalem leadership took offence at Jesus’ parable of the vineyard is not unlikely. For the parable of the vineyard echoes elements of the song of the vineyard in Isaiah 5:1-7 (cf.

²⁵¹ Cf. the comment of Donahue, *The gospel in parable*, 56 about redaction in Mark 12:9: “When the vineyard is given “to others” in 12:9, Mark had in mind the early Christian community”.

²⁵² Translation from RSV. Cf. Donahue, *The gospel in parable*, 89-91 at 91: “Writing after the period when the temple and the city are destroyed, and when his own community is the nation (with the overtone of “Gentile”, the object of the mission in Matt 28:16-20), Matthew simultaneously warns his community that their status as tenants of God’s vineyard should not be a source of presumption”.

²⁵³ *Contra* C.A. Evans, ‘Are the Wicked Tenant Farmers “Peasants”? Jesus’ Parable and Lease Agreements in Antiquity’, in Chilton & Evans, *Jesus in Context*, 231-250 who favours the antiquity of the entire context and form of the parable as it is preserved in the Synoptic tradition.

²⁵⁴ Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, S.J., *The Acts of the Apostles. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 31; Doubleday: New York, N.Y., 1998) 86 about a “Palestinian source, save for Peter’s speech” underlying Acts 4:1-22; 103-113 at 106 leaving the matter of the historicity of speeches in Acts undecided.

Hos 10:1; Jer 2:21; Ezek 19:10-14), where it stands for the house of Israel.²⁵⁵ The religious authorities in Jerusalem probably recognised such echoes and the transformation of the theme in this parable as polemic. As the rejected servants are often taken to stand for the rejected prophets,²⁵⁶ the Jerusalem leadership was by implication associated with imposture and murder (in the version of Mark and Matthew). This polemic against Jerusalem concurs with other Jesus-traditions in Q, like Luke 13:34-35/Matt 23:37-39.

As much as the parable addressed the Jerusalem leadership, it could have conveyed an implicit polemic by Jesus against the priestly establishment. The regular Temple cult was sustained by offerings from agriculture and was thereby in every way related to the produce of Israel, symbolised as a vineyard. In the parable of the vineyard, Jesus therefore appears to reverse the perspective: the tenants, expected to set apart a portion of their produce for the owner, may here stand for the Jerusalemite authorities. The polemical idea thus voiced could have the purpose of denouncing the corruption of the priestly establishment which represented a wicked stewardship only concerned with its own inheritance even at the cost of bloodshed.

6.4.2 *The parable of the Good Samaritan*

The parable of the 'good Samaritan' is only found in Luke 10:29-37.²⁵⁷ It forms part of the larger travel narrative of Luke (Luke 9:51-19:27), and it has been noted that the parable may fit specifically into Luke's theology.²⁵⁸ It is a disputed question whether or not Luke's parable of the good Samaritan comprises a pre-70 CE Jesus-tradition.²⁵⁹

In Luke's parable, the good Samaritan is the only one to come to the aid of the victim of a robber band, while a priest and a Levite are said to pass on the other side of the road. The parable forms Jesus' answer to the question by a person learned in the Law about who should be considered as one's neighbour. Jesus' parable implies a very negative, polemical picture of priests and Levites who were traditionally considered with high esteem in Israelite society, but who did not come to the assistance of the victim to act as a neighbour. In contrast to this, the Samaritan shows compassion and mercy for the victim.

Joseph A. Fitzmyer has noted the liability of priests and Levites to remain undefiled from contact with an (apparently) dead body, and the hostile schism between Jews and Samaritans.²⁶⁰ In light of these historical circumstances, Jesus' polemic appears to focus on

²⁵⁵ Cf. Davies & Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew* III, 176 n. 9 have noted that the symbolism of the vineyard, standing for Israel, Jerusalem or the kingdom respectively, is fluid. The wicked tenant farmers are, however, invariably interpreted as standing for the contemporary Jewish religious establishment in the commentaries of W.D. Davies / D.C. Allison (176) and D.A. Hagner (624).

²⁵⁶ Davies & Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew* III, 176 n. 12 mention biblical and post-biblical texts in which prophets are represented as 'servants'. Cf. the parallels between the treatment of the servants in the parable of the vineyard and the treatment of prophets, wise men and scribes in Matt 23:34.

²⁵⁷ Cf. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)*, 883 about Luke 10:29-37 as an "example (in rhetoric, *exemplum*)" rather than as a parable. Cf. J. Nolland, *WBC 35B Luke 9:21-18:34* (Word Books: Dallas, Tex., 1993) 586-598 at 586-588 for bibliography. Nolland (591) notes against the idea of Luke 10:29-37 as an example story that "the story is told from the perspective of the needs of the wounded man rather than from the perspective of the Samaritan, which we might have expected for an examples story (contrast 16:1-9)".

²⁵⁸ Cf. e.g. Donahue, *The gospel in parable*, 129-134 about the parable's relation to the theme of 'seeing-having compassion' (cf. Luke 7:13, 15:20).

²⁵⁹ Cf. Nolland, *WBC 35B Luke 9:21-18:34*, 588-591 refers to the arguments of G. Sellin, 'Lukas als Gleichniserzähler: Die Erzählung vom barmherzigen Samariter (Lk 10:25-37)', *ZNW* 65 (1974) 166-189; *ZNW* 66 (1975) 19-60 who has challenged the idea that Luke's parable would comprise Jesus-tradition. Nolland concludes that "recent attempts to identify the parable as a Lukan creation are less than convincing" (590).

²⁶⁰ Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)*, 883.

the heartlessness of the socio-religious reality which the priestly establishment perpetuated. This parable thereby conveys a very sharp polemic against the priestly establishment of the Jerusalem Temple.

Since the canonical Gospels appear to contain conflicting traditions about Jesus' attitude to Samaritans (cf. e.g. Matt 10:5; John 4:1-42), it is difficult to ascertain whether this form of the polemic against the priestly establishment reflects Jesus' words or later tradition in light of later gospel mission in Samaria. Nevertheless, the polemic against the ritual purity concerns as overriding moral obligations may correspond with what we otherwise know of Jesus' polemical criticism against the priestly establishment.²⁶¹

6.5 Synoptic traditions about Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of the Temple

In the Synoptic Gospels, the saying of Jesus about the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple forms part of the narrative of events in Jerusalem leading up to the Passion (Mark 13:1-2; Matthew 24:1-2; Luke 21:5-9). Jesus' statement about the destruction of the Temple is also part of the Passion narrative in Mark and Matthew, as part of the testimonies used in order to convict Jesus guilty (Mark 14:57-58, Matthew 26:60-61). The very fragmentarily preserved logion 71 of *Thomas* could further be related to the theme of the destruction of the Temple.

Can the Synoptic tradition about Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of the Temple be counted among the pre-70 CE Jesus-traditions or should it be considered as an anachronism, an example of *vaticinium ex eventu*? The information at the end of the age in Mark 13:3-37 does not only relate to the destruction of the Temple but also to the situation in which people are urged to flee from Judaea to the mountains (Mark 13:14). This passage in Mark does in fact provide the evidence on the basis of which many scholars have dated this Gospel to the aftermath of the Jewish War. It appears unlikely that the tradition about Jesus' prophecy, as it has been recorded in Mark and other synoptic Gospels, is wholly derived from Jesus' sayings without containing elements informed by the situation after 70 CE.

Apart from the narrative context in which we find the saying about the destruction of the Temple, we have to deal with the question of whether the prophecy about the destruction of the Temple can be connected to the historical Jesus. Kurt Paesler has discerned three scholarly positions with regard to the historical interpretation of the Temple saying in Mark 13:2: an underlying apocalyptic tradition of Israel, a *vaticinium ex eventu*, and an authentic saying of Jesus respectively.²⁶²

Paesler has refuted the position about the saying in Mark 13:2 as a *vaticinium ex eventu* because of the, in his view, implausibly narrow time span between the dating of the written composition of Mark and the *vaticinium ex eventu* as well as the pre-existence of the motif of the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple.²⁶³ E.P. Sanders has further opposed to the idea of Mark 13:2 as a *vaticinium ex eventu* that 'prophecy' written after the event would then have to agree perfectly with the event. This is not the case with Mark 13:2, for it does not refer to the destruction of the Temple by fire.²⁶⁴ These arguments against a *vaticinium ex eventu* are in my view not completely convincing, since the exact distance in time between 70

²⁶¹ Nolland, *WBC 35B Luke 9:21-18:34*, 597 defends the idea that Luke 10:29-37 represents Jesus-tradition: "there is still every reason for thinking that the historical Jesus is the creative source of the parable".

²⁶² Paesler, *Das Tempelwort Jesu*, 76-79.

²⁶³ Paesler, *Das Tempelwort Jesu*, 84-87 mentions Jer 7:14, 26:6.18; Mic 3:12 and especially Hag 2:15 and LXX 2 Kgs 23:15 about the stones of the Temple in the context of the destruction of the First Temple. Cf. 89 and 256 for Paesler's supposition of an Aramaic apophthegm which underlies the Marcan text.

²⁶⁴ E.P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (Penguin: London [etc.], 1993) 256-257 at 257, concludes: "This prophecy, then, is probably pre-70, and it may be Jesus' own". Cf. idem, *Jesus and Judaism*, 71-76.

CE and the date of composition of Mark is hard to determine, and since a *vaticinium ex eventu* need not reveal the event in every detail as long as there is no contradiction.

Attempts to rule out a *vaticinium ex eventu* on the basis of a discussion of pre-70 CE Jewish traditions, which supposedly comprise predictions of the destruction of the Temple, are not convincing in my view either. The dating of certain pseudepigrapha, for instance, is a debatable matter, while certain other cases of predictions are not even clear-cut predictions of the destruction of the Temple.²⁶⁵ It is in my view cautious not to presuppose predictions about the destruction of the Temple as a self-evident historical context for the saying of Jesus.

If there is an authentic, historical core underlying the saying about the destruction of the Temple in Mark 13:2 and parallel passages, how does this correspond with other Jesus-traditions, such as that of the healed leper, which suggest Jesus' respect for the traditional Temple cult?²⁶⁶ E.P. Sanders has interpreted the prophecy in Mark 13:2 as the saying of Jesus in the role of an eschatological prophet.²⁶⁷

The other possibility for an underlying apocalyptic tradition, as categorised above, may still be examined in search of the connection between Mark 13:1-2 and 13:3-37. If Jesus uttered apocalyptic words against the Temple, Jesus' followers may have reinterpreted them and elaborated on the apocalyptic perspective. We have evidence for the reinterpretation of Temple sayings in John 2:18-22. The reinterpretation which came to surround Jesus' words about the Temple appears to determine the narrative context more heavily. The presence of the Temple motif in the Passion narratives of Mark and Matthew (Mark 14:58; Matt 26:61) may further be evidence of an elaboration on and reinterpretation of Jesus' words in light of his death and resurrection.

With regard to the historical context for Jesus' words about the Herodian Temple, a passage in Josephus' works may be of interest for reading Jesus' words about the destruction of the Temple. Herod's expansion of the Temple did in fact leave no stone upon another of the old foundations which he replaced by new foundations. These foundations, however, subsided and had to be raised again in the time of Nero according to Josephus (*Ant.* 15.391). Jesus' words about the Temple could originally have concerned this situation of the Temple which Herod's expansion program had brought about. Since Jesus polemicised against the lack of social justice even in the place of worship, that is, the Temple cult, his polemic may also have extended to the architectural legacy of a cruel and merciless king whose adornments may have been perceived as pseudo-piety.

The reinterpretation of Jesus' words about the Temple by his followers took the destruction of the Temple and subsequent events into account, as is revealed by the entire range of apocalyptic events described in Mark 13:1-37. Nevertheless, the traditions about Jesus' polemic against the priestly establishment, which can be related to the milieu of the historical Jesus, were transmitted in the decades before 70 CE.

²⁶⁵ Cf. e.g. C.A. Evans, 'Predictions of the Destruction of the Herodian Temple in the Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Scrolls, and Related Texts', *JSP* 10 (1992) 89-147, who notes the possibility of interpolations in the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (92-93), the fact that "it is unclear if the Temple itself was expected to be destroyed" in Qumran texts (96), and different dates (before 70 or 80 CE) for the *Lives of the Prophets* (98).

²⁶⁶ Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus*, 256 considers "the few passages in the synoptics that deal with [Jesus attitude to] the Temple and priestly prerogatives" as "favourable".

²⁶⁷ Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus*, 261: "Jesus probably thought that in the new age, when the twelve tribes of Israel were again assembled, there would be a new and perfect Temple, built by God himself".

6.6 Jesus about true worship in John 4:19-26

John 4:19-26 comprises a saying of Jesus concerning true worship in the narrative context of Jesus' conversation with a Samaritan woman. This woman raises the issue of the competing claims of Jerusalem and Mount Gerizim as the true place of worship. Jesus' reaction describes true worship as worship 'of the Father in spirit and truth' (John 4:23-24).²⁶⁸

Although the anachronistic influence of the post-70 CE context is possible,²⁶⁹ as in the passages in the Synoptic Gospels which convey Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple, the focus in this passage in John may be in accordance with Jesus' general prophetic message. Jesus' polemic against the contemporary priestly establishment makes it probable that his emphasis is on true worship rather than on the place of worship.

6.7 The Temple as a metaphor in Jesus-traditions

In some metaphorical ways, the image of the Temple also occurs in Gospel traditions related to Jesus. This usage does, however, reflect the remembrance and reinterpretation by Jesus' followers of the sayings of Jesus rather than a transmission of Jesus' sayings from the milieu of Jesus. We will survey two cases here - Mark 14:58 and John 2:18-22 - which clearly reflect the reinterpretation of Jesus' words in the light of later circumstances.

6.7.1 Mark 14:58

Mark 14:58 points to a charge against Jesus for having said that he would destroy the Temple 'which is made with hands' and build up another, 'not made with hands' in three days.²⁷⁰ This passage is not paralleled in the other Gospels. The contrast between a Temple 'not made with hands' and the actual Temple which was made with hands appears enigmatic. The temple imagery 'not made with hands' may, however, be related to Jesus' body of resurrection, for the time span of three days also occurs in the Gospel narrative about the death and resurrection of Jesus.²⁷¹

Does Mark 14:58 comprise a post-resurrection tradition of Jesus' followers who reinterpreted apocalyptic words of Jesus about the Temple? Or rather does Mark 14:58 constitute a redactional element which fits as a literary motif in the narrative about the Passion and the Resurrection?

The image of another Temple 'not made with hands' in Mark 14:58 is not unparalleled in other New Testament writings concerning the early Jesus-movement. The idea of a heavenly Temple, a 'house not made with hands', as opposed to the contemporary Temple of Jerusalem, made with hands, figures in the speech of Stephen (Acts 7:48-50). The polemical

²⁶⁸ Note that Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 128, 132 considers the statement in John 4:22 that 'salvation is from the Jews' as evidence of an early Jesus-tradition underlying John 4:19-26, presupposing that the "words of Jesus reflect his support of Jewish traditions over against Samaritan traditions" (132).

²⁶⁹ Brown, *The Gospel According to John (i-xii)*, 175-176 writes that the evidence of John 4:4-42 is not supported by the rest of the NT, and addresses the problem of the historicity of John 4:19-26, attributing the composition of this passage to the "Johannine technique of misunderstanding, plays on words, etc."

²⁷⁰ ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω. A minor variant reading of Mark 14:58 has ἀναστήσω ἀχειροποίητον ('I will raise up [another one] not made with hands') for the last part of the verse in stead of ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω.

²⁷¹ Cf. Paesler, *Das Tempelwort Jesu*, 203-227 at 224, who reads Mark 14:58 as a christological reinterpretation of Jesus' cult criticism by the Hellenists; a criticism which was originally inspired by apocalyptic motifs.

contrast between the heavenly Temple and the earthly Temple of Jerusalem is an important theme in Stephen's speech. This speech probably is a Lucan composition, as is revealed by the narrative framework and parallels with other speeches in Acts.²⁷² This does not preclude the possibility that pre-70 CE traditions underlie Stephen's speech. The Lucan author may have drawn on traditions of the Jesus-movement and their attitude(s) to the Temple.

Since the image of a 'house not made with hands' echoes prophetic tradition of cult criticism (cf. Isa 66:1 quoted in Acts 7:49-50), Jesus' words about another Temple 'not made with hands' in Mark 14:58 could perhaps be related to eschatological prophecy. Jesus' criticism of the contemporary state of the Temple and the priestly establishment was motivated by issues of social justice and moral purity, as we have seen. The prophetic message about God's omnipresence as the Creator instead of a limited presence in the earthly Temple served as an exhortation about proper worship. Since Jesus taught about the coming kingdom of God, his perspective on the Temple was probably also influenced by eschatology.

Jesus' followers reinterpreted Jesus' words in the light of his death and resurrection. Jesus' statement about the destruction of the Temple has a prominent place in the accusation of the false witnesses in the Marcan Passion narrative. The evidence of Acts 7:48-50, whose criticism of the Jerusalem Temple as a house 'made with hands' associates it with idolatry, reflects very different concerns, possibly those of Hellenistic circles of believers in Christ.²⁷³

6.7.2 John 2:18-22

The Temple as a metaphor of Jesus' body in relation to Jesus' death and resurrection is most explicitly found in John 2:18-22. In this passage from John, the emphasis is laid on what Jesus' disciples remembered about Jesus as he spoke of the "Temple of his body", *περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ* (John 2:21-22). Thus, John 2:18-22 presents itself as an early Christian-Jewish tradition which was remembered and passed on by the disciples. Jesus' saying about the destruction and rebuilding of the Temple in three days is interpreted in light of Jesus' death and resurrection.

In Jesus' saying about the Temple in John 2:18-22, the Jewish reaction to Jesus' words is the following rhetorical question: "It has taken forty-six years to build this temple, and will you raise it up in three days?" (John 2:20). The architectural temple which is implied in the Jewish reaction was the Temple as it had been expanded by king Herod I.²⁷⁴ Many of Jesus' teachings had also taken place in the Temple. According to Acts, the apostles of the Jerusalem church assembled in the Temple precincts to proclaim Jesus' resurrection from the dead.²⁷⁵

Francis Moloney has noted the possibility that John 2:18-22 was read by its original addressees in light of a post-70 CE context, which would by implication also indicate the possibility of a post-70 CE revision in John 2:18-22.²⁷⁶ Johanna Rahmer has interpreted the

²⁷² The narrative framework relates the threat that Jesus of Nazareth 'will destroy this place' (Acts 6:14). Note the parallel opening of a speech in Acts 7:2 and 22:1, the parallel between 7:52 and 3:14 with regard to Jesus as 'the Righteous one'. See Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 103-113 on the speeches in Acts with bibliography, noting the speeches are introduced at points in the narrative where they serve Luke's "own theological and missionary aims" (107), to which Stephen's speech is not an exception (108). Cf. my section 7.5 below.

²⁷³ Cf. 2 Cor 5:1 where Paul also refers to a 'house not made with hands', though in the context of the faith in the resurrection, without suggesting a polemical contrast with the Temple as a house 'made with hands'.

²⁷⁴ *Ant.* 15.380-425 (speech of Herod in §§ 382-387). §380 calls the Herodian Temple *ὁ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*.

²⁷⁵ Acts 2:46, 3:11, 4:1-4, 5:12; cf. C.K. Barrett, 'Attitudes to the Temple in Acts', in Horbury (ed.), *Templum Amicitiae*, 345-367.

²⁷⁶ Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 79: "At a time when there is no longer a Temple in Jerusalem, believing readers of the Fourth Gospel will experience the presence of the crucified yet risen Jesus as their 'Temple'".

retrospective narrative style of John as comprisingly authentic, and even as ‘autobiographical’ features of christology.²⁷⁷ This christology is characterised by the idea that Jesus’ body incarnated the resurrection of the Temple, according to Rahmer.²⁷⁸ This explicit idea in John 2:18-22 appears to be conveyed implicitly already in Mark 14:58. The relation between Mark 14:58 and John 2:18-22 may point to a connection of Jesus-traditions at an pre-70 CE stage.

7. Early Christian-Jewish encounters with Jewish movements concerning the Temple

7.1 The historicity of Acts

The foregoing sections have mainly dealt with Jesus’ relation to the Temple and the reinterpretation of sayings of Jesus by his early followers. From the historical Jesus and the interpretation of his words by his early followers my discussion will now turn to the attitudes of the early followers of Jesus to the Temple in the decades before 70 CE when the gospel spread from Israel to the diaspora.

For a picture of early Christian-Jewish encounters with Jewish movements concerning the Temple, the Acts of the Apostles may yield important information, provided that the account of Acts is carefully evaluated concerning its historicity.²⁷⁹ The Acts of the Apostles do not present the only picture of such confrontations:²⁸⁰ we may also glean some indirect information about the controversies between the early Jesus-movement and other Jewish movements from the canonical Gospels, as we have seen in our analysis of the image of the ‘rejected stone’ in relation to the parable of the vineyard.²⁸¹

The Book of Acts has received divergent evaluations with regard to its historicity. Acts convey a perspective on both the Palestinian and the Graeco-Roman settings of the growing church and survey the missionary work of the apostles after Pentecost to some extent. Thus, we may agree with the perception of Colin J. Hemer that the Book of Acts “is in some respects the book central to the historical problem of the entire New Testament”.²⁸² Hemer has proposed that Luke’s use of sources consisted of, among other things, contact with surviving witnesses of the Jesus-tradition whose accounts may have led Luke to revise ‘older traditions’, which “accounts for some of the significant ‘L-nuances’ in the Third Gospel”.²⁸³ With regard to the Lucan picture of the Jerusalemite authorities in Luke-Acts, Steve Mason

²⁷⁷ J. Rahmer, “*Er aber sprach vom Tempel seines Leibes*”. *Jesus von Nazaret als Ort der Offenbarung Gottes im vierten Evangelium* (BBB 117; Philo: Bodenheim, 1998) 324.

²⁷⁸ J. Rahmer, “*Er aber sprach vom Tempel seines Leibes*” (1998) 328-329.

²⁷⁹ See L. Alexander, ‘Fact, fiction and the genre of Acts’, *NTS* 44 (1998) 380-399 for a comparative discussion of the boundaries between fact and fiction in ancient literature. Cf. M. Bachmann, *Jerusalem und der Tempel. Die geographisch-theologischen Elemente in der lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums* (BWANT 109; Kohlhammer: Stuttgart [etc.], 1980) about the Lucan adoption of conventional Jewish ideas about the Temple.

²⁸⁰ Cf. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 124-128 with bibliography about the historicity of Acts, there p. 124 noting: “The issue of the historical character of the Lucan account in Acts has been well studied, and it is clear today that a middle ground has to be sought between the skeptical approach and a conservative reaction to it”.

²⁸¹ Cf. e.g. Mark 3:7-8; Matt 10:2-6f. (with reference to *apostles*); Luke 10:1-16 (mission of the seventy); John 4:39-42 (Samaritan followers of Jesus), 12:20-26f. (Gentiles who approached Philip for their desire to see Jesus).

²⁸² C.J. Hemer, ‘Acts and Historicity’, in idem, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1989) 1-29 at 22.

²⁸³ Hemer, *The Book of Acts*, 351.

has pointed to shared assumptions by Luke and Josephus about the influence of the Pharisees and about the existence of a council presided by the high priest.²⁸⁴

For a better judgement of a particular passage in Acts with regard to its historicity, we need to examine the relation between the parts and the whole. For this purpose it is useful to focus on the narrative strategy of Luke-Acts. This narrative strategy uniquely focuses on the transition from Jerusalem to Rome, and it therefore reflects a later perspective of the spreading of the gospel mission beyond Israel. In Luke's words, the gospel mission aimed to spread 'to the end of the earth' (Acts 1:8).²⁸⁵ The important place of Rome as a counterpart to Jerusalem in the account of Acts about Paul's mission (cf. Acts 19:21, 23:11) may further point to a post-70 CE perspective when Roman christianity became more influential, whereas Jerusalem had been destroyed. The reason for Luke's interest in the history of the Jerusalem church (cf. Luke 24; Acts 1-8:1) may have been his ambition to anchor Christian identity in a sense of continuity with the early Jesus-movement in Israel since the crucifixion of Jesus in Jerusalem.

7.2 The early Jesus-movement and the priestly establishment

The first quarter of the Acts of the Apostles focuses on the growth of the early Jesus-movement in Jerusalem from the gathering of the Twelve (Acts 1:12-26) to the persecution of the Jerusalem church (Acts 8:1). This part of the Acts frequently relates the socio-religious significance of the Temple for the early followers of Jesus (cf. Acts 3:1-10, 11; 5:12, 42). In the context of this narrative, Acts 4:1-7 mentions the several confrontations of the early Jesus-movement led by the apostles in Jerusalem with the priestly establishment. At the time of this confrontation, the early Jesus-movement in Jerusalem numbered about five thousand followers according to Acts 4:4.²⁸⁶

In spite of the confrontation with the priestly establishment, the evidence from the Acts of the Apostles suggests a customary attendance of Christian Jews in the Temple (e.g. Acts 2:46, 3:1-3.8-10, 5:20). The Christian-Jewish adherence to the Temple cult is further corroborated by Acts 21:17-25, which refer to the insistence of the Jerusalem church, represented by James and the elders, on the observance of the customary purification rites of the Jerusalem Temple. James' loyalty to the Temple is also revealed at the end of the *Apocryphon of James*, which reports that James went up to Jerusalem to pray. Yet this adherence to the Temple cult may have been perceived quite differently by the priestly establishment, as becomes clear from a tradition in the Akhmim fragment of the *Gospel of Peter* 7:26. This tradition portrays the perception by the Jerusalemite leadership of Peter and his fellows as evildoers who might endanger the Temple by setting it on fire. The hostile perception of Peter and his fellows may correspond with canonical Gospel traditions about Peter's identification as a follower of Jesus through his Galilean accent in the Passion

²⁸⁴ S. Mason, 'Chief Priests, Sadducees, Pharisees and Sanhedrin in Acts', in R. Bauckham (ed.), *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 4 The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich., & Paternoster: Carlisle, 1995) 115-177. Cf. S. Mason, 'Josephus and Luke-Acts', in idem, *Josephus and the New Testament* (Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass.: 1992) 185-229 on the affinities between Josephus and Luke-Acts.

²⁸⁵ The explicit reference to the use of sources in Luke 1:1-4 has led Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 80 to infer about the author of Luke-Acts that he "considered himself a third-generation Christian who inherited a preexisting tradition about the Christ-event itself".

²⁸⁶ Compare to this Josephus' number of *over six thousand* Pharisees during the reign of Herod I, 37-4 BCE (*Ant.* 17.42), and Josephus' and Philo's equal numbers of *over four thousand* Essenes in the early first century CE (*Ant.* 18.20; *Good Person* 75). The size of the Jesus-movement according to Acts 4:4 is therefore considerable.

narrative. Our sources therefore create the impression of an antagonism between the early Jesus-movement in Jerusalem and the Jerusalemite priestly establishment.²⁸⁷

According to Acts 5:17-42, the confrontation with the priestly establishment is alleviated through Pharisaic influence, attributed to the eminent figure of Gamaliel. According to Acts 6:7, many priests in Jerusalem even adhered to the faith in Jesus Christ and thereby added to the growth of the early Christian-Jewish movement. The idea that priests were converted to the faith in Christ does not necessarily mean that they abandoned the priestly services. Converts from the Pharisees probably also continued to belong to the Pharisaic party and its legal views, as Acts 15:5 testify. The analogy of Acts 15:5 may also apply to the case of the converted priests in Acts 6:7.

The reference to priests who embraced the faith in Jesus Christ figures in the narrative context of events at the eve of the persecution of the Jerusalem church. After the episode of the persecution of the Jerusalem church, the Acts of the Apostles hint no further about the possible role of priests in the growth of the early Jesus-movement. Perhaps their role was limited to Jerusalem for a certain period of time, before the missionary Jesus-movement became more and more oriented towards the Diaspora.

7.3 The early Jesus-movement and the Pharisees

Of the three Jewish schools mentioned by Josephus, the Pharisees and the Sadducees are found in the New Testament. The Pharisees figure most prominently in the Gospels and Acts. According to a tradition in the Synoptic Gospels, the disciples of John the Baptist and those of the Pharisees shared certain customs of fasting which were not practised by the disciples of Jesus (see the section about 'John the Baptist and Jesus' in this chapter).²⁸⁸

Indeed, the Pharisees may have been divided in their attitudes to the early Jesus-movement, varying from hostile opposition to sympathy and perhaps even conversion (cf. Acts 15:5).²⁸⁹ Paul the apostle, whose testimony about his previous life in Judaism is unique, may not have been the only former Pharisee who converted to the Christian faith. Matthew 8:19 mentions a case of a scribe, possibly belonging to the party of the Pharisees, who became a follower of Jesus. The division and gradation of attitudes of the Pharisees may correspond in a logical way with the divergence within Pharisaism between moderate and radical wings, associated with the schools of Hillel and Shammai respectively in the early Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition.

The Jesus-movement was not isolated from the surrounding religious culture. It may be inferred from Josephus' exemplary account in his *Life* 7-12 that the education of the three Jewish schools was concentrated in Jerusalem to an important extent. Certain encounters of Jesus with the Pharisees and Sadducees are described in the Synoptic Gospels. Jesus' sharp criticism of the Sadducees for not knowing the scriptures nor the power of God (Matt 22:29; Mark 12:24) seems to put Jesus' reaction on the Pharisaic side of the Pharisaic-Sadducean controversy.

²⁸⁷ Cf. L. Gaston, *No Stone on Another. Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (NovTSup 23; Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1970) 365-369, 368 about Jerusalem and the Temple in the Lucan writings, noting that "predictions of the destruction of Jerusalem are found in this context [i.e. Jewish rejection of the preaching of the church] only", not in the context of Jesus' death.

²⁸⁸ Matt 9:14-17; Mark 2:18-22; Luke 5:33-38. Cf. John 4:1-3 where it is related that the Pharisees were attentive to the fact that Jesus made more disciples than John.

²⁸⁹ Cf. J.A. Ziesler, 'Luke and the Pharisees', *NTS* 25 (1979) 146-157; Wild, 'The Encounter between Pharisaic and Christian Judaism', 105-124; K. Berger, 'Jesus als Pharisäer und frühe Christen als Pharisäer', *NovT* 30 (1988) 231-262.

The polemic against the Pharisees in the canonical Gospels may partly have been the product of the clash between the early Jesus-movement and the Pharisees. Certain traditions in the synoptic Gospels mention disputes between Jesus and the Pharisees. According to Matthew 23:16-22, Jesus denounced the hypocrisy of the scribes and Pharisees in relation to their Temple religiosity. In this passage a sharp criticism is voiced against the dedication formulas and oaths of the Pharisees in their temple religiosity. Albert I. Baumgarten has pointed to the fact that the case of *korban* (קרבן) – the formula of dedication to the Temple – “occupies a crucial place in the debates between Jesus and the Pharisees”.²⁹⁰ In certain Gospel traditions about the teachings of Jesus, the Temple figures in connection to Jesus' denouncement of the hypocrisy of the Pharisees.²⁹¹

In view of other Gospel traditions about friendly relations between Jesus and the Pharisees, we may suspect that the traditions about the denouncement of the Pharisees may at least in part be coloured by later developments and encounters between the early Jesus-movement and the Pharisees. These later developments do not only concern the post-70 CE situation. In this connection, it should be noted that the insistence on a Jewish way of life in relation to the Christian mission to the Gentiles in Acts 15:5 is attributed to the party of Pharisaic believers. This insistence would probably be even stronger among the Pharisees who did not become part of the early Jesus-movement.

7.4 The early Jesus-movement and the Essenes

7.4.1 Commonalities in traditions of cult criticism

Polemic against the contemporary Temple cult and the priestly establishment was not a new, Christian phenomenon, as we have seen. There is a broader Jewish background, both to the criticism of the Temple cult and to the concern about what constitutes worship and idolatry, than what we find in the New Testament. The contemporary Jewish criticism of the Temple cult was not restricted to the ritual purity of the Temple. The fact that Christian-Jewish attitudes to the Temple cannot be understood separately from the (re-)interpretation of Scripture in light of the prophetic traditions is implicit evidence of such a broader background.²⁹²

A broader corpus of texts can be consulted in relation to the temple-theological ideas which pertain to the divergent attitudes to the worship of God. According to Josephus, the Essenes were barred from the regular Temple cult, due to their divergent views on the performance of purification rites (*Ant.* 18.19). Furthermore, in the literature of Qumran, the idea of the defilement of the Temple is connected to the figure of the so-called Wicked Priest.²⁹³ This Wicked Priest is accused of betrayal of the laws for the sake of wealth and of repulsive acts of every kind of impurity (1QpHab VIII, 8-13). The criticism of the Temple in the literature of Qumran is therefore not restricted to ritual matters but also applies to moral issues.

²⁹⁰ A.I. Baumgarten, 'Korban and the Pharisaic Paradosis', *JANES* 16-17 (1984-1985) 5-17 at 5.

²⁹¹ Matt 23:16-22 (denouncement of scribes and Pharisees with regard to their oaths by the temple, the altar and heaven); Luke 18:9-14 (a parable about the prayers of a Pharisee and a tax collector in the temple).

²⁹² E.g. the quotations from Isa 56:7 and Jer 7:11 in Mark 11:17; the quotation from Psalm 69:10 in John 2:17; the quotations from Amos 5:25-27 and Isa 66:1f. in Acts 7:42-43, 49-50. Cf. the collation of quotations from Lev 26:11f., Ezek 37:27, Isa 52:11, Ezek 20:41, 2 Sam 7:14 and 2 Sam 7:8 in 2 Cor 6:16-18.

²⁹³ Cf. 1QpHab XII, 7-8 expressing this sectarian view in a commentary on Hab 2:17a: פשרו הקריה היא ירושלים, “its interpretation is: the city is Jerusalem in which the Wicked Priest did abominable deeds and he defiled the temple of God”.

7.4.2 *The silence about the Essenes in the New Testament*

The encounters of Jesus with the Pharisees and the Sadducees are recorded in the Gospels. However, there is no reference to the Essenes in the New Testament. Nevertheless, the question of a possible relationship or common ground in religious culture between the Essenes and the early Jesus-movement has interested scholars since the nineteenth century²⁹⁴. The ‘nickname hypothesis’ of Constantin Daniel supposes that the term ‘Herodians’ was the polemical term for the Essenes because of their favoured status under Herod.²⁹⁵ However, Willi Braun has rightly stated that the evidence from Gospels, Josephus’ works and the literature of Qumran presented by C. Daniel in favour of his hypothesis is too ambiguous and scant to constitute a sound basis for substantiating the idea.²⁹⁶

Many scholarly studies have been devoted to the subject of the Jerusalem church and the literature of Qumran.²⁹⁷ In recent literature about archaeological finds in Jerusalem, Bargil Pixner and Rainer Riesner have argued for a connection between the Essene quarter of Jerusalem and the first Christian community in terms of their neighbourhood, but Pixner and Riesner also suggest contacts and influence.²⁹⁸ Jörg Frey has questioned the idea that the archaeological evidence firmly points to an Essene quarter in Jerusalem.²⁹⁹ Notwithstanding his caution about direct connections between the Essenes and the early Jesus-movement, Frey refers to the important place of the Essene and Qumran sectarian traditions in the broader Palestinian-Jewish matrix for a historical understanding of the early Jesus-movement.³⁰⁰

²⁹⁴ Cf. G.J. Brooke, ‘The Scrolls and the Study of the New Testament’, in Kugler & Schuller (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls at fifty*, 61-76 for a survey of the interest of New Testament scholarship in the Essenes and the sectarian scrolls of Qumran; 62 about E. Renan’s view in 1891 of Christianity as “an Essenism which had largely succeeded”. Cf. J. Frey, ‘Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments’, in M. Fieger *et al.* (eds.), *Qumran – Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer* (NTOA 47; Universitätsverlag Freiburg / Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 2001) 129-208.

²⁹⁵ C. Daniel, ‘Les “Hérodiens” du Nouveau Testament sont-ils des Esséniens?’, *RevQ* 6 (1967) 31-53; C. Daniel, ‘Les Esséniens et “Ceux qui sont dans les maisons des rois” (Matthieu 11, 7-8 et Luc 7, 24-25)’, *RevQ* 6 (1967) 261-277; C. Daniel, ‘Nouveaux arguments en faveur de l’identification des Hérodiens et des Esséniens’, *RevQ* 7 (1970) 397-402.

²⁹⁶ W. Braun, ‘Were the New Testament Herodians Essenes? A Critique of an Hypothesis’, *RevQ* 14 (1989) 75-88.

²⁹⁷ Among the older literature are S.E. Johnson, ‘The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem church of Acts’, and B. Reicke, ‘The Constitution of the Primitive Church in the Light of Jewish Documents’, in Stendahl (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 129-142 and 143-156; J.A. Fitzmyer, ‘Jewish Christianity in Acts in the light of the Qumran Scrolls’, originally published in L.E. Keck & J.L. Martyn (eds.), *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Paul Schubert* (SPCK: London, 1966) 233-257. Cf. O. Betz, ‘Die Qumrangemeinde und die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde’, in *idem*, *Jesus. Der Herr der Kirche. Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie II* (J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen, 1990) 3-89; B.J. Capper, ‘The Palestinian Cultural Context of Earliest Christian Community of Goods’, in Bauckham (ed.), *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*, 323-356; R. Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem. Neue Funde und Quellen* (Gießen: Basel, 1998).

See the recent review of problematic hypotheses in Frey, ‘Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments’, 129-208 at 133-152, refuting, among other ideas, the specific connection between the ‘Beloved Disciple’ and Essene circles in Jerusalem as supposed by B.J. Capper, ‘With the Oldest Monks ...’ Light from Essene History on the Career of the Beloved Disciple’, *JTS* n.s. 49 (1998) 1-55.

²⁹⁸ E.g. B. Pixner, ‘Jesus and his community: between Essenes and Pharisees’, in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Hillel and Jesus: why comparisons are important* (Minneapolis, 1997) 193-224; *idem*, ‘Jerusalem’s Essene Gateway: Where the Community Lived in Jesus’ Time’, *BAR* 23 (1997) 22-31, 64, 66; Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde*.

²⁹⁹ Frey, ‘Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments’, 133-152 categorises the thesis of a connection with the Jerusalem church on the basis of an Essene quarter in Jerusalem among four ‘problematic models’.

³⁰⁰ Frey, ‘Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments’, 206-208.

In connection with the contemporary Jewish background to a Christian-Jewish perspective on the holiness of the religious community, it is important to note the Essene concept of holiness as described by Philo. In his treatise *That Every Good Person Is Free* § 75 he writes about them: “Their name which is, I think, a variation, though the form of the Greek is inexact, of ὁσιότης (holiness), is given them, because they have shown themselves especially devout in the service of God, not by offering sacrifices of animals, but by resolving to sanctify their minds”.³⁰¹ The emphasis on the sanctification of the mind attributed to the Essenes is another indication of the existence of a more widespread notion of moral purity and sanctification next to the idea of ritual purity within Second Temple Judaism.

In spite of the silence of the New Testament in general on them, the Essenes were part of the religious culture of Palestinian Judaism before 70 CE. The overlap between apocryphal and pseudepigraphical texts preserved in certain manuscript traditions and non-sectarian texts in the literature of Qumran underpins this idea. Commonalities in Essene traditions and traditions of the early Jesus-movement may point to a common ground in certain strands of Palestinian Judaism. Even if references to the part of priests in the growth of the Jerusalem church, as in Acts 6:7, may not provide evidence on which a theory of influences can be built,³⁰² these allusions do suggest a social setting of intra-Jewish contacts. The Essenes also were part of this social setting. The social setting of pre-70 CE Palestinian Judaism provides the historical context with which the early Jesus-movement was in dialogue.

7.5 Stephen and the Hellenists

According to Acts 6:1-8:3, the conflict between the ‘Hebrews’ and the ‘Hellenists’ in Jerusalem formed the impetus for the persecution of the Jerusalem church. More specifically, the polemic against the Jerusalem Temple cult and the priestly establishment conveyed by the speech of Stephen (Acts 7:2-53) led to the persecution.³⁰³

The speech of Stephen is a Lucan composition, if not a Lucan interpretation of that which occasioned the persecution of the Jerusalem church. Nevertheless, a historical source may underlie this composition and interpretation.³⁰⁴ Colin J. Hemer has pointed out that the source for the speech of Stephen could be from the “disciples, or from any of the Seven, among whom the prior position of Philip’s name (after Stephen himself) may be noted”.³⁰⁵

We may infer from Acts 6:1-6 that Stephen was among the Hellenists who ministered the Jerusalem church. The radical polemic against the Temple cult in Stephen’s speech consists in the fact that, on the basis of scriptural interpretation, the very building of the

³⁰¹ κατ’ ἐμὴν δόξαν — οὐκ ἀκριβεῖ τύπῳ διαλέκτου Ἑλληνικῆς — παρώνυμοι ὁσιότητος, ἐπειδὴ κἀν τοῖς μάλιστα θεραπευταὶ θεοῦ γέγονοσιν, οὐ ζῶα καταθύοντες, ἀλλ’ ἱεροπρεπεῖς τὰς ἑαυτῶν διανοίας κατασκευάζειν ἄξιοῦντες. Text and translation from F.H.Colson, *Philo in ten volumes (and two supplementary volumes)* IX (Harvard UP, 1941) 54-55.

³⁰² Cf. Frey, ‘Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments’, 151-152 n. 72.

³⁰³ Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 86 has suggested about the speech of Stephen in Acts 7:2-53 that it is a “Lucan composition, using some inherited Antiochene tradition”.

³⁰⁴ Cf. e.g. the recent study on citations from Amos in Acts and in the literature of Qumran by M. Stowasser, ‘Am 5,25-27; 9,11 f. in der Qumranüberlieferung und in der Apostelgeschichte. Text- und traditions-geschichtliche Überlegungen zu 4Q171 (Florilegium) III 12/CD VII 16/Apg 7,42b-43; 15,16-18’, *ZNW* 92 (2001) 47-63 concluding that a pre-Lucan Testimonia collection probably underlies Acts 7:42b-43 and 15:16-18.

³⁰⁵ Hemer, *The Book of Acts*, 343-344, 415-443 at 427: “the question of the reliability and source of the material in the speeches is far from settled. There remain good reasons for taking them as abstracts of real addresses rather than fabrications”.

The early Jesus-movement and the Temple

Temple is implicitly associated with idolatry. The addressees of the speech are further charged with the persecution and killing of the prophets. This accusation may, however, be a theological *topos* rather than having a connection with historical reality.³⁰⁶

Should this radical way of polemicising against the Temple and the priestly establishment be attributed to the party of the Hellenists, as the account of Acts appears to suggest? In certain older scholarly literature, this polemic against the Temple *per se* as idolatrous is indeed associated with the Hellenists.³⁰⁷ In other literature, the hypothesis of Stephen's supposed Samaritan background has been put forward to account for the radical polemic.³⁰⁸ The problem with these older hypotheses is the fact that they extrapolate the attitude to the Temple from the speech of Stephen in order to apply it to a broader historical context.

In a more recent study, Craig C. Hill has argued that the division between 'Hebrews' and 'Hellenists' is the product of Luke's schematical and ideological presentation.³⁰⁹ According to Hill the ideological presentation of the conflict through the speech of Stephen consists in the fact that "to Luke, Judaism is inherently good but also inherently *not good enough*" (italics of Hill).³¹⁰ Hill finds a historical core in Stephen's polemic against the Jerusalemite leadership to the extent that it corresponds with Jesus' polemic about Jerusalem's killing of the prophets in Luke 13:34-35, if we suppose that this passage comprises early Jesus-tradition.³¹¹

In her recent study on the use of the Temple concept in early Christianity, Gabriele Faßbeck has also expressed reservations about the idea that the speech of Stephen would reflect the theological views of the Hellenists at large. Faßbeck expresses her reservations on the basis of parallels with other speeches in Acts, in particular parallels in temple polemic between Acts 7 and the speech on the Areopagus in Acts 17:22-31.³¹² However, in spite of the very comparable choice of words in Acts 7:48-50 and 17:24-25, the purpose of temple polemic in the Areopagus speech is very different. The Areopagus speech serves to make the audience aware of the fundamental difference between idolatry and belief in the one God rather than attacking the idea of an altar devoted to God *per se*. The speech of Stephen, on the other hand, does attack the institution of the Jerusalem Temple *per se*, thereby aiming to undermine the authority claimed by the Jerusalemite establishment.

³⁰⁶ Cf. O.H. Steck, *Gott in der Zeit entdecken: Die Prophetenbücher des Alten Testaments als Vorbild für Theologie und Kirche* (Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2001).

³⁰⁷ M. Simon, *St. Stephen and the Hellenists* (Haskell Lectures 1956; Longmans, Green, and Company: London, 1958) supports this idea, p. 14 suggesting that the Hellenists were the "disciples of Stephen".

³⁰⁸ Cf. J. Munck, 'Stephen's Samaritan background', in idem, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Doubleday: Garden City, N.Y., 1967) 285-304 elaborating this hypothesis on the basis of the supposed dependence of Acts 7:2-50 on the Samaritan Pentateuch. Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 159 supposes that Stephen may have belonged to a 'Samaritan baptist sect' (that of the Nasarenes) and that "the Hellenists in general were the first evangelists of Samaria".

³⁰⁹ Craig C. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews: reappraising division within the earliest church* (Fortress: Minneapolis 1992).

³¹⁰ Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews*, 76.

³¹¹ Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews*, 77-78.

³¹² G. Faßbeck, *Der Tempel der Christen. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Aufnahme des Tempelkonzepts im frühen Christentum* (TANZ 33; Francke Verlag: Tübingen & Basel, 2000) 90-110 at 91 notes about the supposition that Stephen's speech reflects the Hellenist view about the Temple: "sofern die Rede wirklich diese widerspiegelt"; on page 109 she repeats this reservation, stressing the Lucan character of the composition of Stephen's speech.

There is, however, another argument against generalising about the speech of Stephen to the extent of assuming that it reflects the Hellenists' attitude to the Temple. If the term 'Hellenists' is taken to mean a Greek-speaking Jew,³¹³ the evidence of Acts rather points to disputes and opposition between 'Hellenists' and Stephen (Acts 6:9-11) as well as between 'Hellenists' and Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles (Acts 9:28-29).

The persecution of the Jerusalem church is a turning point in the narrative of Luke-Acts, after which Luke increasingly focuses on the mission beyond Judaea into the Diaspora, notwithstanding the continuing centrality of the Jerusalem church.³¹⁴ In the narrative strategy of Luke-Acts, this turning point also conveys a polemic against the growing dominance of anti-Hellenistic sentiments in Jerusalem and Judaea which appears to be held accountable for the transition of early Christianity beyond Jerusalem and Israel into the Diaspora.

The polemic against the Temple in the speech of Stephen may partly reflect a hindsight perspective after 70 CE. Thus, the passage leading up to this speech comprises the literary *topos* of false witnesses who attribute the threat of destruction of the Temple to Jesus of Nazareth (Acts 6:13-14). This may be compared to evidence in the Gospels (Mark 14:56-58; Matt 26:59-61; cf. John 2:19-20, 11:48). Nevertheless, the persistent polemic against the Temple *per se* in Acts 7:44-53 may reflect the historical reality of a radical confrontation between certain segments of the Jerusalem church on the one hand and the priestly establishment on the other.

8. Summary

Our perspective on the early Jesus-movement and the Temple has led us to distinguish three levels of pre-70 CE tradition: the sayings and actions of Jesus, the reinterpretation of Jesus' sayings by his early followers, and the divergent attitudes to the Temple within the early Jesus-movement apart from Jesus-traditions.

Since our starting point is the textual evidence of early Christian writings as they have come down to us, my historical analysis has been grounded in distinctions between the edited, post-70 CE level of traditions and the possibility of reconstructing earlier (stages of) traditions from the start. At the post-70 CE level, the apocalyptic information surrounding the prophecy of the destruction of the Temple certainly intimates a later perspective on the aftermath of the Jewish War. Polemic which rejects the issue of ritual purity altogether, like *P.Oxy. 840*, appears to identify the Pharisaic-rabbinic movement after 70 CE with the Pharisaic chief priest, that is, with the closed past. This kind of absolute polemic cannot be related to the historical Jesus, in view of other evidence (e.g. the tradition about the healed leper) which attests to Jesus' respect for traditional regulations on purification offerings. I agree with P.J. Tomson that the phrase unique to Mark 7:19b may be a later, Markan addition. Mark 7:19b, Jesus' declaration that all food is clean, may thus constitute another example of the rejection of ritual purity in a post-70 CE context.

At the post-70 CE level, later additions to the parable of the vineyard (Mark 12:1-12; Matt 21:33-46; Luke 20:9-19) should also be mentioned. These additions reflect confrontations with the Jerusalemite authorities who rejected the gospel. Since the 'vineyard' may stand theologically for Israel, the parable of the vineyard probably reflects the idea that

³¹³ Cf. BDAG, 319; I. Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 5 The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. / Paternoster: Carlisle, 1996) 163 n. 57.

³¹⁴ Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 368: "The story of Stephen and especially this speech represent the beginning of Luke's account of the break of Christianity from its Jewish matrix".

the Christian congregations addressed by the Synoptic Gospels inherited the 'vineyard', that is, that they were included in God's covenant of salvation for Israel.

The polemic against the Temple in Stephen's speech in its present ideological context probably also mirrors the post-70 CE perspective of the Lucan author. This becomes clear most of all from Acts 6:13-14 which shares the literary *topos* of false witnesses who accuse Jesus of Nazareth of the destruction of the Temple with Gospel traditions. A historical pre-70 CE core to this polemic may be identified in that it reflects the agonised conflict between certain segments of the Jerusalem church and the priestly establishment.

The retrieval of pre-70 CE levels of tradition depends on a careful weighing of canonical and non-canonical early Christian writings. Some of the non-canonical Gospel traditions add to a fuller comprehension of the historical Jesus and provide details about the Palestinian Jewish matrix of Jesus' attitude to the Temple. This is in my view particularly the case with the Jewish-Christian Gospels and the *Gospel of Thomas* which challenge readers of the canonical Gospels to rethink this Palestinian Jewish matrix of Jesus and the early Jesus-movement. The example of the parable of the vineyard and its narrative setting in the Synoptic Gospels, as compared to *Thomas* 65 & 66, shows that the polemic in the Synoptic tradition against the priestly establishment may well reflect later concerns and experiences of the early Jesus-movement concerning the rejection of the gospel by Jerusalemite authorities.

The Gospel traditions about the Temple as a metaphor mirror later interpretations of Jesus' words by those who proclaimed the gospel of Jesus Christ in the subsequent decades. Apart from the christological intent of these interpretations, the concept of the Temple as a metaphor may have also been related to the background of Jewish culture.

At the oldest level of Gospel traditions, the question of the 'Umwelt' of Jesus' early ministry is highly important. Jesus' Galilean background has been discussed in scholarship with a view to constructing a Galilean revolutionary ethos against the Judaeen Temple establishment or a Galilean peasant ethos with a traditional loyalty to the Temple. Depending on the interpretation of the 'Umwelt' with which Jesus was presumably in dialogue, Jesus' attitude to the Temple has also been interpreted differently. Although the evidence of Josephus suggests no revolutionary hostility of the Galileans to the Judaeen religious institutions *per se*, the indications about Galilean hostility to the Herodian dynasty provide a clue to Jesus' Galilean background. Josephus' description of the building of the Herodian Temple further attests to an implicit polemic against the pseudo-piety which Herod I added to his cruelty. Jesus' polemic against the Temple and Jerusalem may be related to his hostility towards the Herodian dynasty in the light of the prophecy of the destruction of the Temple.

John the Baptist set the precedent for the renewal of religious traditions by mediating forgiveness of sins through his baptism. Jesus appropriated John's baptism for his purpose of challenging the priestly establishment, but at the same time he moved away from the rites of fasting still observed by John's disciples because of his Messianic understanding of God's kingdom. The common ground between the baptist movement and the Pharisees in rites of fasting reveals indirect links which tied the baptist movement to the traditions of Jewish Temple religiosity, since fasting was also regulated in the Temple cult (cf. *Ant.* 14.65-66; 17.165; 18.94; *Ag.Ap.* 2.282; *m. Ta'an.* 4:2).

With regard to Jesus' attitude to the Temple, I have discerned a polemical perspective of Jesus against the priestly establishment. This perspective was rooted in prophetic traditions of cult criticism. Jesus' perspective on the Temple was, however, not exclusively concerned with moral purity at the expense of every concern with ritual, as the Gospel traditions about his reference of a healed leper to a priest testify. The occasional indications in our sources about the earliest Jewish followers of Jesus also suggest the strength of a traditional adherence to the Temple cult in the direct milieu of Jesus.

Part Two

PAUL'S RELATION TO CONTEMPORARY JUDAISM

CHAPTER 4

PAUL'S PREVIOUS LIFE IN JUDAISM

In this chapter, I will discuss questions concerning Paul himself on the basis of Paul's Letters. These questions concern Paul's standpoint in the dialogue with his readers and in relation to the religious background of the apostle.

Focusing our attention on the first phase of Paul's life, the formative influence of Judaism, we can reach a better general understanding of Paul's relation to Judaism. On the basis of this general picture it will be possible to go more specifically into the question how Paul's cultic imagery relates to the Jews and Gentiles who were converted to the faith in Christ. To be sure, Paul did not write his letters with the purpose of leaving behind an autobiography. The rhetorical situations in which Paul writes about his own position and his former Jewish life, need to be taken into account.

Paul's former life as a Pharisee will be situated in the social context of Pharisaic traditions and the social geography of Pharisaic activity. When dealing with this social context, the problem of locating Paul's Pharisaic study of the Law needs to be addressed. An adequate answer to the question about the presence of Jewish traditions in Paul's Letters depends on this groundwork which aims at situating and locating his former life as a Pharisee.

1. Models for reconstructing the social world of Paul's life

Before going into a more detailed discussion of Paul's previous life in Judaism, it may be useful to focus on models of rhetorical and social-scientific criticism, already briefly presented in my Introduction, as well as the new perspectives on Paul's letters which these models may generate in search of the presence and influence of Jewish tradition.

1.1 Rhetorical analysis

From first-hand information of passages in the Pauline letters – 1 Cor 15:9; 2 Cor 11:22; Gal 1:13-14; Rom 11:1; Phil 3:5-6 – we know certain things that Paul himself wanted his readers to know through his letters about his past life in Judaism. Through the monumental study of H.-D. Betz on Galatians, rhetorical analysis has become established in the exegesis of the Pauline letters. Thus the so-called 'autobiographic' accounts or testimonies, among others in Gal 1:12-2:21, also need to be reinterpreted in view of the rhetorical purpose which these accounts have in the respective Letters.¹ Rhetorical analysis which takes into account the setting and the genre of Paul's letters more carefully could even enhance the possibility to analyse with more critical precision the passages from which elements of biographical information can be derived about Paul's position against his opponents.²

¹ H.-D. Betz, *Galatians* (Fortress: Philadelphia, 1979); cf. G.P. Luttikhuisen, *Op zoek naar de samenhang van Paulus' gedachten*. Inaugural lecture (Kampen, 1990) 13-24. J.D.G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (A & C Black: London, 1993) 20 refers to Betz and Longenecker about rhetorical analysis. B.J. Malina & J.H. Neyrey, *Portraits of Paul* (WJK: Louisville, Ky., 1996) 34-63 apply rhetorical analysis to Paul's self-presentation in his Letters as standing in the rhetorical tradition of the 'encomium' giving a model of ancient personality.

² The point made by J.T. Sanders and G. Lüdemann concerning the possibility of gaps and biases even in Paul's autobiographical accounts, mentioned in R. Riesner, *Paul's Early Period* (ET by D. Scott; Grand Rapids, Mich.

The search for information about Paul's life and thought will be a matter of reading between the lines. That is, information may be derived from the reconstruction of the situations in which Paul felt prompted to write his Letters and of the matters about which Paul addresses his readers. Explaining a term coined by Lloyd F. Bitzer, Philip F. Esler has described the 'rhetorical situation' of a (written) communication as comprising three constituent elements: the exigence, the audience, and certain constraints.³ In other words, the process of persuasion involves the issues for discussion which the author has in mind; the readers who have to be persuaded, and the problems to be confronted in persuading the readers.

Rhetorical analysis of Paul's Letters should bring out the issues of argumentation, the common ground in the dialogue with his first readers, and the social group with which Paul identified and the groups which he dissociated from and opposed. Thus, there is a rhetorical context of dissociation from ideas which Paul opposed, and of persuasion concerning the issues which Paul deemed important for his readers. In this rhetorical context, it should not surprise us to come across sharp contrasts which aim to make the readers see the conflict between Paul's ideas and ideas which Paul opposes.

The rhetoric of dissociation and opposition which we find for example in Paul's Letter to the Galatians is related to a rival gospel mission by Paul's opponents (cf. Gal 1:6-9). This rival gospel mission emphasised a Jewish way of life for all converts and challenged Paul's authority as an apostle. This context underlies the passage in Galatians 1:13-2:14 about Paul's previous life in Judaism and his calling and early activity as an apostle of the gospel of Christ. It can, therefore, not be read as an autobiographical account, but it forms an integral part of Paul's rhetoric of persuading his readers of the legitimacy of his gospel. Critical awareness of this rhetorical context should therefore precede an adequate attempt to retrieve biographical information about Paul from his Letters. In the conflict with his opponents, without imposing the whole Jewish law on Gentile converts, Paul identifies with Jews by birth, φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, whose sense of belonging to Jewish tradition is wholly transformed by faith in Jesus Christ (e.g. Gal 2:15-16).

The focus on the rhetorical context in Galatians puts the purpose of Paul's words into perspective and challenges us to approach the question of Paul's relation to Judaism in a new way. This is also particularly true for Paul's words about his 'former life in Judaism' (Gal 1:13-14). The interpretation of Paul's 'former life in Judaism' is a good example of the importance of the rhetorical context of Paul's Letters. If these words concerned Paul's relation to Judaism in general, it would be difficult to understand why Paul identifies himself along with Peter with 'Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners' (Gal 2:15).⁴ Even if this self-definition serves as a mirror to confront Peter with his own behaviour, Paul starts to reformulate this self-definition of Jews by birth in the light of the faith in Christ in Gal 2:16, thereby taking away the insincerity. Paul's assertion in Gal 2:15-16 therefore serves to bridge the gap between the Jewish self-definition of Peter and Paul self-representation.

Paul's description of his former zeal for persecution of the church, which seems to coincide with his extreme zeal for traditions of the fathers (Gal 1:13-14), aims to provide a mirror to his readers. The counter-productive, even destructive outcome of the aim of Paul's opponents to impose the Jewish law on every one is the underlying rhetorical message of Paul. Not Jewish tradition and Judaism *per se*, but this particular destructive force of

& Cambridge, U.K., 1998) 29-30 seems to me artificial, as from the standpoint of rhetorical analysis the explanation for 'gaps' and 'biases' could rather be explained as Paul's deliberate choice of self-presentation.

³ P.F. Esler, *Galatians* New Testament Readings (Routledge: London and New York, 1998) 1-28 at 17.

⁴ Cf. Dunn, *Galatians*, 133 about Gal 2:15: "Paul was looking for common ground with his fellow Jewish believers".

persecution and the imposition of tradition belongs to the past for Paul. Paul's interpretation of the Law in light of the faith in Christ in his Letter to the Galatians has the effect of putting the significance of the Law in a new perspective and thereby undermines the message of Paul's opponents, which was probably based on the centrality of the Law.

1.2 Social-scientific approaches

Social-scientific methods may be helpful for a critical approach to the question of the meaning of Paul's identifications with and dissociations from certain groups in relation to the message which he wanted to communicate. Bengt Holmberg has described the use of sociology for New Testament studies as a method of understanding which takes seriously "the continuous dialectic between ideas and social structures". Holmberg relates the setting for this dialectic to a social world which embodies "the creation of a world of meaning which provided a plausibility structure for its believers".⁵

Holmberg refers to criticism of the fallacies of monocausal "social-historical" interpretation of texts and monocausal "theological" or "traditio-historical" interpretation⁶. Thus, in the application of social-scientific methods to the study of the New Testament, it is important to avoid the pitfall of reducing religious phenomena to matters of social structure and stratification in the first century CE. On the other hand, a historical theology of Paul's Letters cannot be separated from the social and religious issues living among the congregations which he addressed.

A good example of socio-religious issues living among his first readers to which Paul reacts in his writings can be found in the First Letter to the Corinthians 7 and 8. This section starts with the explicit reference to written questions of Paul's audience: "now, concerning the matters about which you wrote", Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε. Interestingly, from the perspective of rhetoric and genre in comparison with ancient Jewish epistolography, Paul has structured his discussion of issues in 1 Corinthians at various points with the introductory phrase περὶ δὲ, namely in 1 Cor 7:25, 8:1, 12:1 and 16:1. These issues concern socio-religious matters at a practical level. The issues are the position of married and unmarried persons (1 Cor 7:25-35), food offered to idols (1 Cor 8:1-13), the variety of spiritual gifts in relation to the unity of the congregation (1 Cor 12:1-11f.) and the contribution for the saints in Jerusalem (1 Cor 16:1-4).

A discussion of practical matters in relation to a socio-religious order among the community of believers also occurs in the contemporary genre of Jewish letters with halakhic instructions. An important example of this genre is the 4QMMT from the literature of Qumran.⁷ In this document, the discussion of separate halakhic issues is each time introduced by the formula *לע*,⁸ a preposition which is roughly equivalent to the Greek *περὶ*. The issues in 4QMMT concern purity regulations, most of all related to the purity of the Jerusalem Temple, which are worked out on a practical level in the form of instructions and exhortations.

⁵ B. Holmberg *Sociology and the New Testament. An Appraisal* (Fortress: Minneapolis, 1990) 3-4. Cf. his chapter 4, 'Correlations between Symbolic and Social Structures', 118-144, on the use and limitations of the sociology of knowledge applied to the study of the relationship between social situations and the expressions of faith in the New Testament.

⁶ Holmberg, *Sociology and the New Testament*, 143.

⁷ Ed.pr. by Qimron and Strugnell, *DJD X*. See chapter 2, section 1.1 on this document.

⁸ 4QMMT B 8, 37, 39, 52, 55 (= 4Q394 3-7, I, 11; 8, III, 7, 9, and IV, 2, 5), 64, 75, 76 (= 4Q396, III, 4, and IV, 4, 5).

The socio-religious issues which Paul addresses in 1 Cor 7 and 8, like the sanctification of unbelievers in mixed marriages and the issue of food offered to idols, suggest that Paul used a Jewish referential framework,⁹ while addressing converts from both Gentile and Jewish backgrounds. Paul conveyed a transformed understanding of the Jewish, biblical tradition of the worship of the one God through the gospel of Christ. The intended relation between Jewish tradition and the gospel of Christ appears to be stated at the beginning of Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians. Through the gospel of Christ, coming from God, the essential socio-religious values of wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption emanate (1 Cor 1:30). The socio-religious values, centered around the presence of God as the source of human life (1 Cor 29-30), stem from the Jewish, biblical tradition of the worship of the one God. Embedded in the gospel of Christ, the source of life comes from God and the way of life of the believers is in Jesus Christ.

Philip F. Esler has recently pointed to the significance of cultural anthropology of the Mediterranean world and the sociology of sectarianism for a thorough historical interpretation of the social world reflected in the New Testament writings.¹⁰ With regard to cultural anthropology of the Mediterranean world, Esler has argued for the importance of models for grasping the cultural divide between our own world and ancient Mediterranean settings. In this connection, he has demonstrated "the importance of honour as a primary value" as one of the characteristic features of the surrounding Mediterranean culture.¹¹ Esler relates the social value of honour to the "competitive and 'agonistic' nature of all social relationships other than those involving kin".¹² According to Esler, a sociological model of sectarianism is useful for New Testament interpretation, since it offers a focus on the process of 'reassertion of traditional values' of the movement, which separated from a larger institution.¹³ The analysis of the respective perspectives on boundary lines from those who have separated on the one hand and from those who stand for the larger institution on the other, is important for our understanding of the social world of Paul and his readers.

In an introduction to a collection of recent studies on 'modelling early Christianity', Esler has defended the use of models in New Testament interpretation as follows:

"Whenever New Testament critics discuss textual features in terms such as 'family', 'class', 'politics', 'power', 'religion', 'personality', 'conscience', or 'boundary-markers' they are employing models, although usually implicit and unrecognized ones deriving from modern experience quite remote from biblical culture, with the inevitable risk of ethnocentric and anachronistic readings".¹⁴

The explicit use of models from social sciences and anthropology can therefore advance an accurate historical interpretation of issues in Paul's letters. David G. Horrell has pointed to

⁹ P.J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law. Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* (CRINT III/1; Assen / Maastricht & Minneapolis, 1990) has compared the genre of and socio-religious issues in Paul's Letters with contemporary Jewish epistolography and studied the presence of contemporary halakha in Paul's Letters. Cf. most recently, M. Bockmuehl, *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches: Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 2001).

¹⁰ P.F. Esler, *The First Christians in their Social Worlds. Social-scientific approaches to New Testament interpretation* (Routledge: London & New York, 1994) 2-3, 13-17, 19-36, 52-69. Cf. P.F. Esler, 'Making and breaking an agreement mediterranean style: A new reading of *Galatians* 2:1-14', *BibInt* III (1995) 285-314 applying a model of mediterranean anthropology to the interpretation of Paul's version of the conflict at Antioch.

¹¹ P.F. Esler, 'Reading Galatians', in idem, *Galatians*, 1-28 at 12.

¹² Esler, *The First Christians in their Social Worlds*, 22-23, 25-29.

¹³ Esler, *The First Christians in their Social Worlds*, 13-14.

¹⁴ P.F. Esler, 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Modelling Early Christianity. Social-scientific studies of the New Testament in its context* (Routledge: London and New York, 1995) 4.

antecedents of scholarly interest in the social world of early Christianity in 'Form Criticism' and the revival of scholarly interest in the social context of early Christianity from the 1970s onwards. In his perspective on recent developments, Horrell discusses the links of the social-scientific approach with historical criticism and literary methods.¹⁵

My discussion of the use of social-scientific approaches and rhetorical analysis has served to introduce a critical perspective on different aspects of the direct context and setting of Paul's Letters. Important information about Paul's contemporary social world can be derived from this context, which also helps shed a different light on the passages concerning Paul's previous life in Judaism. This context is indispensable for getting a sense of the dialogue between the author and his readers, and the world of meaning which is thereby created.

2. Situating Paul's prior life as a Pharisee

2.1 'In regard to the Law a Pharisee'

Before Paul was called to become an apostle, his 'former life in Judaism' had been grounded in Pharisaic study of the Law. This can be deduced from both Paul's Letters and the Acts of the Apostles. The term 'Pharisee' occurs in Philippians 3:5 and in Acts 23:6, in different contexts.¹⁶ My discussion focuses on Paul's own words, and after a detailed discussion of evidence from Paul's letters, I will make some considerations about the value of Luke's information about Paul's life, by way of epilogue.

In his Letter to the Philippians, Paul asserts that he was "in regard to the Law, a Pharisee", κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος. Paul mentions this fact after an enumeration of four markers of identity and descent. These are circumcision on the eighth day, belonging to the people of Israel, being part of the tribe of Benjamin and the linguistic and cultural marker of being a Hebrew born of Hebrews. Paul's list of markers appears to shift slightly from markers of ritual and genealogical descent into markers of cultural and religious activity. Being a Hebrew and a Pharisee entailed education, training and learning. That is, the accomplishments of proficiency in Hebrew or Aramaic, as a language of sacred Scripture or as a native tongue respectively, required schooling. The understanding and observance of the Law by the Pharisees required training and learning.

Beginning with Paul's statement about his Pharisaic past, the subsequent assertions in the list are introduced each time by the phrase κατὰ, 'as for' or 'in regard to'. Thus, κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος is followed by statements, starting with the phrases κατὰ ζήλος, "as for zeal", and κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ, "with regard to righteousness under the Law". These phrases seemingly stipulate issues of importance by themselves. According to these formulas the issues enumerated in Paul's list would be the Law, zeal and righteousness. Being embedded in the rhetoric of this passage, the sequence of assertions, however, points to a dead end rather than to living issues. The already implicit idea of the dead end of 'having confidence in the flesh', ἔχων πεποίθησιν ἐν σαρκί in Phil 3:4, is confirmed explicitly in Phil 3:7, where Paul writes: "[but] those things which were profits for me, I have started to consider as a loss because of Christ".

¹⁵ D.G. Horrell, 'Introduction. Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament: Retrospect and Prospect', in idem (ed.), *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1999) 3-27.

¹⁶ In Acts 23:6 the phrase ἐγὼ Φαρισαῖός εἰμι, υἱὸς Φαρισαίων suggests a genealogical constitutive element for being a Pharisee. Curiously, the legal and genealogical element of Pharisaic identity are found combined in Hippolytus' *Refutation of All Heresies* IX, 28, 3 κατὰ γένος καὶ κατὰ νόμους Φαρισαῖοι καλούμενοι.

Paul's word for 'confidence', the noun *πεποίθησις*, is substantivised from the verb *πίθειν*. The root from which this noun stems also expresses the rhetorical process of persuading as well as the believing and trusting ensuing from persuasion. Therefore, the question of confidence in the flesh is a matter of rhetoric which Paul gives a negative turn. Paul deals with the issue of 'righteousness under the law' in particular. He treats this as a very subjective sort of righteousness, *μη ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου*, in contrast to the righteousness of God through faith in Christ (Phil 3:9). This negative turn might reflect a polemic against the world of meaning created by the Pharisaic teachings of unwritten laws,¹⁷ which probably was Paul's referential framework in his previous way of life as a Pharisee. This does not preclude the possibility that Pharisaic teachings may have influenced Paul's thought.

As a matter of fact, this passage, the only place where Paul speaks about his prior life as a Pharisee, conveys a sharp polemic against other Christian Jewish missionaries who would boast to Gentiles about living according to the Jewish Law.¹⁸ Although the items in Paul's list up, to his assertion "in regard to the Law a Pharisee", could be seen as a set of Jewish identity markers,¹⁹ the list in its entirety in Phil 3:5-6 certainly cannot be read in this way. Paul has subtly woven the negative shift to the persecution of the church, followed by the assertion about blamelessness with regard to righteousness under the Law, into the sequence of assertions, with the intention of expressing a polemic against 'confidence in the flesh'.

Paul's polemic against 'confidence in the flesh' does, however, not mean that all Jewish tradition as such would have become a dead end for the apostle. At various places, Paul identifies with the Israelites (2 Cor 11:22; Rom 9:1-5f., 11:1; Phil 3:5). Voicing his conscience and bearing witness to himself in the Holy Spirit in Romans 9:1, Paul starts a digression on the place of Israel in his theology. This rhetorical context is positive and inclusive, and Paul's statement of conscience could be associated with the emphasis on the integrity of the author's character, the *ἥθος* in ancient rhetoric.²⁰ Far from abandoning his sense of belonging to a Jewish, biblical tradition, Paul expresses the transformed spiritual meaning which this tradition has offered him through his faith in Christ.

In order to interpret this transformed meaning of contemporary religious traditions in Paul's theology, we need to study these traditions by themselves and Paul's exposure to them as formative influences during his previous Jewish existence. The negative rhetorical context of Paul's references to a Jewish way of life was brought about by conflicts with rival missionaries about the place of Jewish tradition in Christian congregations of mixed religious backgrounds.

Returning to our passage in Philippians, Paul seems to imply with the phrase *κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος* that specific traditions concerning the interpretation and observance of Jewish Law formed the constitutive element of self-identification as a Pharisee. According to Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 13.297, the Pharisees distinguished themselves from the other Jewish schools by "passing on to the people certain regulations (*νόμιμα*) from an ancestral succession which have not been recorded in the Laws of Moses".

¹⁷ About the unwritten laws of the Pharisees, see Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 13.297, 408.

¹⁸ Cf. Phil 3:2 at the beginning of our passage, starting with warnings to look out for opponents of Paul's mission, signified by various pejorative descriptions.

¹⁹ Cf. G.D. Fee, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich., 1995) 306-309.

²⁰ For a description of genres of speech in ancient rhetoric and of the threefold Aristotelian model of a speech, containing the components *λόγος*, *ἥθος* and *πάθος*, see G.A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill & London, 1984); on these three components, cf. more recently, R.D. Anderson, *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms Connected to Methods of Argumentation, Figures and Tropes from Anaximenes to Quintilian* (CBET 24; Peeters: Leuven, 2000) 61-63.

At a general level of Jewish Law in biblical tradition, which provided a common ground across sectarian boundary lines, Josephus often uses the following expressions in his works: 'according to the Laws of Moses', κατὰ τοὺς Μωυσέος νόμους,²¹ 'in accordance with their native laws', κατὰ τοὺς πατέριους νόμους,²² and less frequently 'in accordance with the laws of the Jews', κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίων νόμους (e.g. *Ant.* 13.318; 14.258). The first expression usually refers to Jewish Law in the biblical tradition from the internal perspective of socio-religious life in Israel and in Jewish communities in the Diaspora. The latter two expressions can be more hybrid and are often found in official letters, decrees and other documents from which Josephus quotes. These expressions can refer both to civil privileges and rights of legal protection in a Gentile Diaspora environment and to observance of the Jewish customs and religious rites. These religious rites comprised the observance of Sabbaths and religious festivals, and entailed the building of places of prayer, αἱ προσευχαί, according to native custom (cf. e.g. *Ant.* 14.258 concerning Halicarnassus).

Paul's previous life as a Pharisee, while embedded in this general context of observance of Jewish laws and customs, needs to be interpreted in light of historical and literary information about Pharisaic teachings. Josephus' works constitute the only contemporary historical source about Pharisaic beliefs and practices, represented as such in their own right. Apart from this, the Pharisees are mentioned in the literary contexts of the canonical Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, early rabbinic literature and patristic literature, such as the 'philosophumena' in Hippolytus' *Refutation of All Heresies*. The information which can be derived from these texts may further illuminate the Pharisees as a group, and, in a few cases, as individuals. The context of Paul's Letters by themselves, however, gives an important clue to the question of what relationship exists between Pharisaism and Paul's discussion of Jewish traditions at large, in view of Paul's previous Jewish life.

The direct context of Paul's previous identification with Pharisaism is determined by criticism against the Pharisaic world-view as part of a polemic against Paul's opponents who boasted of a Jewish way of life, as we have seen. Nevertheless, Paul's polemic suggests that Jewish traditions did embody a world of meaning for Paul; albeit a meaning that was different from the views of his opponents. In the hypothetical opposite case of the absence of meaning of Jewish traditions for Paul, the elaborate discussions about the Law as an authority, for instance in 1 Cor 9:8-10 and Rom 2:12-13 and 3:31, and the theological digression on Israel in Romans 9-11, would hardly be understandable. In the following section, I will address the question what Paul's statement about his Pharisaic past (Phil 3:5) meant in the context of his other Letters and against the background of what can be known about Pharisees and their traditions.

2.2 Paul's former life in Judaism as a Pharisee and Pharisaic traditions

In his Letter to the Galatians, Paul writes about his "former life in Judaism", ἡ ἐμὴ ἀναστροφή ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ (Gal 1:13). The Greek word ἀναστροφή, which stands for 'life' or 'way of life', implies choice with whom to associate and to have conversations.²³ Through the social dimension of associations, this way of life is conditioned in terms of ideas about proper conduct and the like.

²¹ E.g. in *Ant.* 11.17, 76, 108; 13.74, 79.

²² E.g. in *Ant.* 4.71; 12.142, and in § 145 κατὰ τὸν πάτριον νόμον in the singular; 14.235, 242; 16.163 κατὰ τὸν πάτριον αὐτῶν νόμον in the singular.

²³ The verb ἀναστρέφειν together with the preposition μετὰ τινος meaning 'to associate with someone'. Cf. the Vulgate translation of ἀναστροφή as *conversatio*.

It is my purpose here to show how Paul's former life in Judaism, at least his formative years of exposure to Pharisaic teachings, should be understood in a paedetic context of religious education.²⁴ At the beginning of his autobiographical *Life*, Flavius Josephus, who grew up in Jerusalem (§ 7), writes about his progress in education: "In regard to my education, I advanced with great progress", εἰς μεγάλην παιδείας προύκοπτον ἐπίδοσιν (*Life* 8). The Greek word παιδεία for education comprises upbringing, training and instruction.²⁵ Thus it includes education on primary as well as advanced levels. Josephus attained the advanced level of this spectrum of education. Paul, writing about his zeal for the "traditions of the fathers" in Gal 1:14, introduces this statement with the phrase "and I advanced (προέκοπτον) in Judaism beyond many of my own age". The analogy with Josephus' passage may point to Paul's advanced level of Jewish religious education.

The advances of Josephus' education were apparently most of all related to a thorough knowledge of Jewish regulations. That is the subject about which chief priests and notables came to consult him, considering his learned erudition, τὸ φιλογράμματον (*Life* 9).²⁶ In Josephus' description of his progress in education, a passage of three paragraphs (*Life* 10-12) is devoted to his personal experience with the three Jewish schools of the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Essenes. He writes about his personal experience with them in terms of hard training, σκληροαγωγεῖν, and labouring at many things, πολλὰ πονεῖν, in order to pass through the three courses, τὰς τρεῖς διέρχεσθαι (*Life* 11).

As Josephus writes about the Jewish schools in general, αἱ παρ' ἡμῖν αἰρέσεις (*Life* 10),²⁷ his picture of hard training and toilsome work may not be too atypical. At least, submitting oneself as a novice to any of these three Jewish schools involved a sustained effort of learning and training, possibly for a period of several years. Josephus writes that he started his training within the three Jewish schools at the age of sixteen. He began to lead his (public) life according to the school of the Pharisees, πολιτεύεσθαι τῇ Φαρισαίων αἰρέσει κατακολουθῶν, when he was nineteen years old (*Life* 12).²⁸ The next phase in his life began at the age of twenty-six, when Josephus went up to Rome with a diplomatic mission. Josephus' advanced education as a Pharisee, after the introductory level of a novice, could theoretically span a period of seven or eight years, while the Pharisaic way of life could in fact be a permanent condition. Paul's assertion in Phil 3:5 to have been 'with regard to the Law a Pharisee', κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος, therefore entailed prior education and training as a requirement for any novice to identify with the Pharisees.

Paul's words about his 'former life in Judaism' in Galatians can also be understood in this context of Pharisaic education. Paul mentions his extreme zeal for "the traditions of my fathers", αἱ πατρικαὶ μου παραδόσεις, in Gal 1:14. The traditions which Paul mentions here could well be related to Pharisaic study of the Law. Josephus writes in his *Jewish*

²⁴ I disagree with M. Hengel (in collaboration with R. Deines), *The Pre-Christian Paul* (SCM: London / Trinity Press International: Philadelphia, 1991) 41 who reads Gal 1:13 as an "autobiographical report", since Paul's information stands first of all in the rhetorical context of the issue of which place Jewish traditions should have in the Galatian churches. Nevertheless, Hengel rightly notes that Gal 1:13-14 "can only refer to the study of the law as practised by the Pharisees".

²⁵ Cf. BDAG, 748-749 for references to classical and secondary literature about training, 'Bildung'.

²⁶ συνιόντων ἀεὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν τῆς πόλεως πρώτων ὑπὲρ τοῦ παρ' ἐμοῦ περὶ τῶν νομίμων ἀκριβέστερόν τι γινῶναι. Note the comparative degree of ἀκριβέστερον about Josephus' educational progress.

²⁷ BDAG 27-28 notes parallels to the meaning of αἵρεσις as 'school', namely from Hellenistic schools of philosophy, for instance that of the Stoa (cf. Josephus' *Life* 12).

²⁸ Mason, 'Was Josephus a Pharisee? A Re-Examination of *Life* 10-12', 31-45 emphasises that πολιτεύεσθαι refers to Josephus' "entry into public life"; this does not preclude the influence of (previous) Pharisaic education which, to be sure, Josephus underwent from the age of sixteen years.

Antiquities 13.297 and 408 that the Pharisaic teachings of unwritten laws originate 'from the fathers'. This idea of ancestral traditions is expressed by the phrases ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς, ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων and κατὰ τὴν πατρώαν παράδοσιν respectively. Thus, it may be inferred that Paul's claim to be 'with regard to the Law, a Pharisee', κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος (Phil 3:5), in his time, meant study of the written Law and exposition in accordance with oral traditions, unwritten laws which had been introduced by the Pharisees. As Albert I. Baumgarten has noted in his study of Pharisaic *paradosis*, the very words which designate the source of authority of their teachings are a "self-description of the Pharisees". Thus, these terms also served as an apologetic, legitimating purpose in the context of comparison and dispute with other Jewish groups.²⁹

Interestingly, Paul also occasionally phrases his instructions in terms of traditions which he has received and hands down to his readers, although the source of authority comes from a revelation by Christ. This is the case in 1 Cor 11:2.23. In 1 Cor 11:2, Paul recommends the Corinthians to guarding their traditions just as he delivered these to them, καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε. Paul writes in 1 Cor 11:23 that he received (παρέλαβον) from the Lord that which he also delivered (παρέδωκα) to the Corinthians. 1 Cor 11:23 opens with a section on the Lord's Supper, as Paul delivers it to the Corinthians in contrast to a preceding section with admonitions on this subject (1 Cor 11:17-22).

Paul's reference in 1 Cor 11:2 to traditions which he delivered to the Corinthians comprises more issues, possibly including those he discussed in previous passages. Paul's praise can be understood as a way in which he voices his confidence that the Corinthians, having been persuaded, act in accordance with Paul's instructions. Thus, the traditions, παραδόσεις, in 1 Cor 11:2 may include regulations which stem from Jewish tradition, like the admonition to shun immorality and idolatry. Pharisaic *paradosis*, which has no parallel among other Jewish sects of the time, certainly not among the Sadducees,³⁰ matches Paul's words about traditions closely in form. Rabbinic traditions about the Pharisees further convey a parallel to the description of the transmission of teachings, as expressed by the Greek verbs παραλαμβάνειν and παραδίδοναι. *m. 'Abot* 1:1-2:8 and *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan* chapter 5 discuss the transmission of teachings across generations by the verb לקבל, the equivalent of παραλαμβάνειν, thereby putting more emphasis on the receiving end of Jewish tradition.³¹ Although Paul abandoned his previous zeal for the traditions of the fathers, a continuing influence of Jewish traditions through his former training as a Pharisee, may be reflected in Paul's words about traditions.³²

Paul also refers to fellow people who aimed at advancing in Judaism, that is, in their zeal for the ancestral traditions. In the first clause of Gal 1:14, he talks about his advances in Judaism beyond "many of my own age among my people", πολλοὶ συνηλικιώται ἐν τῷ

²⁹ A.I. Baumgarten, 'The Pharisaic *paradosis*', *HTR* 80 (1987) 63-77.

³⁰ In *Ant.* 18.16, Josephus writes that the Sadducees have no significantly other observance apart from the laws and rather reckon it a virtue to dispute with the teachers of the wisdom which they pursue, πρὸς γὰρ τοὺς διδασκάλους σοφίας, ἦν μετίασιν, ἀμφιλογεῖν ἀρετὴν ἀριθμοῦσιν. Cf. *J.W.* 2.119-161 at 128 about certain Essene prayers handed down from the forefathers, πάτριοί τινες εὐχαί; §§ 134, 150 about the strict hierarchical order among the Essenes. *J.W.* 2.159 seems to imply that Essene traditions, surrounding the study of Scripture, concerned rites of purification and prophetic visions.

³¹ Significantly, *m. 'Abot* 1:1, about the transmission of the Law up to the time of Ezra, focuses on 'handing down', מסר, whereas the subsequent paragraphs emphasise the idea of 'receiving', לקבל.

³² Cf. B.W. Longenecker, 'Contours of Covenant Theology in the Post-Conversion Paul', in R.N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Road from Damascus. The Impact of Paul's Conversion on His Life, Thought, and Ministry* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. / Cambridge, U.K., 1997) 125-146 (126-127) about 1 Cor 8:6 as a reworking of "a central strand of traditional Jewish covenant theology [the *Shema*] in the light of his own Christian convictions".

γένει μου. For Paul, these people, γένος, were the people of Israel, as the list of Philippians 3:5-6, including the phrase ἐκ γένους Ἰσραήλ, shows. The “many of my own age” probably included other students of the Pharisaic teachings of the Law and, in general, people who tried to live up to the teachings of the Law by scribes and Pharisees.

According to Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 18.15, 17, Pharisaic teachings concerned the rites of prayers and worship as well as regulations for political affairs and public matters. Apart from these teachings related to practical matters, in several digressions Josephus focuses his attention on the Pharisaic position in philosophical and theological issues.³³ These issues concern fate and human will; an ethics related to observance of certain commandments, and a moral perspective on life and afterlife.

Because of the influence of their teachings among the townsfolk, οἱ δῆμοι (*Ant.* 18.15), the Pharisees probably also had to be open to issues living in their environment and to ideas from other Jewish groups to a certain extent. Josephus describes the school of the Pharisees as a school which cultivates a state of harmony and agreement within the community, τὴν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ὁμόνοιαν ἀσκοῦντες (*J.W.* 2.166). Their position as the most accurate interpreters of the laws, οἱ μετ' ἀκριβείας δοκοῦντες ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα, and as the leading sect, ἡ πρώτη αἵρεσις (*J.W.* 2.162), probably brought about involvement in disputes and debates and exposure to other ideas. Thus, through his education as a Pharisee, the influence of Jewish traditions on Paul's thought could be pervasive and pluriform,³⁴ even after he had broken off his connections with Pharisaism. This influence is reflected, among other things, by Paul's knowledge and use of Scripture, his use of forms and conventions from the genre of Jewish epistolography, and his use of metaphors from the Jewish Temple service.

The Pharisaic tradition about afterlife may provide a unique background to the idea of bodily resurrection *per se* in 1 Cor 15 in certain respects.³⁵ In spite of the agreement between Pharisaic, Essene and certain Greek philosophical traditions about the perception that the soul is immortal, Josephus writes about bodily resurrection in a typically Pharisaic sense. Both the Pharisees and the Essenes view the afterlife in ethical or moral terms as a reward of the good and a punishment of the wicked (*J.W.* 2.155, 163). Josephus extensively compares the Essene view with the conception of the Greeks (*J.W.* 2.155-156), perhaps the more so because of their fixed belief in a total contrast between the immortality of the soul and the corruptible, impermanent nature of the body.³⁶ The Pharisees, however, maintained that the soul of the good, as opposed to the souls of the wicked, passes into another body after death (*J.W.* 2.163). This basic idea also seems to be reflected in Paul's figurative language about a body which is brought down in weakness and a body which is raised in power (1 Cor 15:43).

Apart from the essential Christian message of Jesus' resurrection, the basic idea of bodily resurrection of the dead found support in Jewish tradition as conveyed by Pharisaic

³³ *J.W.* 2.162-163; *Ant.* 13.172 and 18.12-14.

³⁴ Cf. M. Hengel, 'Pharisaic Study of the Law in Judaism', in idem (in collaboration with R. Deines), *The Pre-Christian Paul*, 40-53, at 44: "The spiritual face of Jerusalem before its destruction was a markedly 'pluralistic' one".

³⁵ Cf. A.F. Segal, 'Paul's thinking about resurrection in its Jewish context', *NTS* 44 (1998) 400-419 who proposes to interpret Paul's idea of resurrection against the background of Jewish apocalypticism, focusing on the comparative evidence for ascension and transformation in apocalypses and visions.

³⁶ Cf. the controversial attribution of the tradition of bodily resurrection to the Essenes in Hippolytus' *Refutation of All Heresies* IX, 27, 1-3. For a critical comparative discussion of Hippolytus' and Josephus' accounts, see M. Smith, 'The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the *Philosophoumena*', *HUCA* 29 (1958) 273-313; C. Burchard, 'Die Essener bei Hippolyt. Hippolyt, *Ref.* IX, 18,2 – 28,2 und Josephus, *Bell.* 2, 119-161', *JSJ* 8 (1977) 1-41, there 31-32, has disputed the reliability of this passage as "keinesweges essenische Tradition", rather perceiving it as Christian influence superimposed on original source-material concerning the Essenes.

tenets. Even the ethical dimension to the Pharisaic idea that only the soul of the good passes into the body,³⁷ seems to have a parallel in Paul's admonitions concerning the inheritance of the kingdom of God. In 1 Cor 6:9 and 15:50, Paul writes that the unrighteous, flesh and blood respectively will not and cannot inherit the kingdom.³⁸

Even though the pluriform traditions of resurrection of the dead, ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν, are at the heart of the gospel of Christ, and although the very term as well as the ramifications are Christian, the Pharisaic tradition is part of the context of the religious culture from which Christian Jews spread their gospel message to the diaspora. It is important to note that the Pharisaic perception of resurrection as the passing on (μεταβαίνειν) of a soul into another body is not without a parallel in Jesus-traditions about eternal life. The saying of Jesus in John 5:24 refers to the eternal life attainable for the believer as follows: "he does not come into judgement, but has passed from death to life"³⁹. The verb used in the last part of this verse is the perfect tense of μεταβαίνειν, the verb which also occurs in Josephus' passage about the Pharisaic view on afterlife. Josephus' digression may, however, constitute an adaptation to the Hellenistic culture of his readers. The connotation of change, in passing from one condition or state into the other, as conveyed by the verb μεταβαίνειν, also figures in Paul's passage on traditions concerning the resurrection of the dead. In 1 Cor 15:51-52, Paul writes about the resurrection of the dead in terms of changing, ἀλλαγῆσθαι, including in the 'we-group' all the faithful and the believers.

The difficulty encountered by the Corinthians concerning the acceptance of the very idea and the nature of resurrection of the dead (cf. 1 Cor 15:12-19, 29-36) is even the subject of a divide between the Jewish schools. For Josephus writes about the Sadducees that they plainly denied any afterlife of the soul, not to speak of the idea of bodily resurrection (*J.W.* 2.165; cf. *Ant.* 18.16). Writing about the Essene tradition concerning the afterlife, Josephus hastens to add that the Greeks hold comparable views on the abode of the afterlife and on the total dualism between the corruptible body and the immortal soul (*J.W.* 2.154-157).

Josephus' Hellenistic representation of the afterlife of the good soul which passes into another body, μεταβαίνειν εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα, appears closely related to the idea of bodily resurrection. It also stands out as unique in a surrounding Hellenised culture, in which the idea of an absolute contrast between the perishable body and the immortal soul was pervasive even among several Jewish schools. In this respect, Jewish traditions about the afterlife illuminate the cultural context for the scepticism and doubts with which Paul's message of resurrection of the dead was encountered among his Corinthian audience. The Pharisaic tradition about the afterlife, which Josephus discusses, is described as a position held by the Pharisees as a group, and not as a saying of one sage. Josephus further gives a general description of the sects of the Pharisees and the Sadducees in his *Jewish War* 2.162-166, summarily pointing to certain features of their 'philosophies'. Novices who submitted themselves to Pharisaic teachings were undoubtedly somehow familiar with the traditions which Josephus outlines as characteristic of the Pharisees. Therefore, in his former life as a Pharisee, the idea of bodily resurrection would probably not have been alien to Paul.

³⁷ *J.W.* 2.163: ψυχὴν τε πᾶσαν μὲν ἀφθαρτον, μεταβαίνειν δὲ εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν μόνην, τὰς δὲ τῶν φαύλων ἀιδίῳ τιμωρίᾳ κολάζεσθαι. Cf. the early rabbinic insistence on the resurrection of the dead in *m. Sanh.* 10:1 (translation H. Danby, *The Mishnah*, 397): "And these are they that have no share in the world to come: he that says that there is no resurrection of the dead prescribed in the Law, and [he that says] that the Law is not from Heaven, and an Epicurean", possibly stemming from early Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition.

³⁸ 1 Cor 6:9: Ἦ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἄδικοι θεοῦ βασιλείαν οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν;

1 Cor 15:50: Τοῦτο δὲ φημι, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσαι οὐ δύναται.

³⁹ Translation from RSV.

Our example has served to show the relevance of Pharisaic education and even specific Pharisaic traditions for the contemporary context of Paul's letters. Although Paul abandoned Pharisaism and although he seems to criticise the world-view of the Pharisees, Pharisaic teachings play a part in the context of the religious culture from which Paul communicates certain traditions to his Hellenistic readers. The leading position which Josephus ascribes to the Pharisees may also provide a background for the straightforward way in which Paul counters 'whatever any one dares to boast of' (2 Cor 11:21-22; cf. Phil 3:4-6). The Pharisaic *paradosis* had primarily provided the educational basis for Paul's eloquent knowledge of the Law. The prominent public status of the school accounts for the strong social identity of the Pharisees⁴⁰ as well as for Paul's severe polemic against 'those who boast of the flesh'.

2.3 Pharisaic traditions and the social geography of Pharisaic activity

Having discussed Paul's former life in Pharisaism as a form of religious education, we need to focus on the question what can be known more specifically about Pharisaic education in a Palestinian Jewish context. Throughout Josephus' works, the activity of the Pharisees is mentioned in the geographical setting of Israel,⁴¹ but never explicitly in connection with the Hellenistic Diaspora. The Acts of the Apostles likewise only mention the Pharisees in the contexts of speeches and deliberations which were supposedly delivered in Jerusalem and Caesarea (Acts 5:34, 15:5, 23:6.8.9, 26:5). However, when we turn to the narrative sections on missionary voyages in the diaspora, the Pharisees have totally disappeared from the scene.

The Hellenistic Jewish author Philo of Alexandria does not even mention the Pharisees in his many treatises. The Essenes, on the other hand, are described in a comparative framework of religious movements of morality and compared with the sect of the Therapeutae, found around Philo's own city, Alexandria.⁴² The Roman geographer Pliny the Elder (23-79 CE) also knew about the Essenes (*Natural History* 5.73), which is only another indication that the Essenes had a legendary name which was widely known in the Graeco-Roman world.⁴³ The movement of the Pharisees, more intricately associated with the Palestinian Jewish body politic, apparently appealed less to the imagination of Hellenistic Jews who would not stay in Israel for longer periods of time. Apparently, the imagination of Hellenistic Jewish writers, who had been born and educated in a Diaspora environment, did not necessarily follow the Pharisaic traditions of interpretation of Jewish laws closely. Philo, for instance, made his own allegorical interpretation of the Law, in which ideas of Hellenistic philosophy were echoed. Even if Philo's work cannot be taken as evidence for the influence of Pharisaic traditions in the Hellenistic Diaspora at large, the silence of our sources about permanent Pharisaic activity in the Diaspora reduces the probability of institutionalised Pharisaic education outside Israel to a hypothetical idea.

⁴⁰ Cf. J. Jeremias, 'The Pharisees', in idem, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 246-267, at 266-267.

⁴¹ In direct connection with the rule of Jewish sovereigns and kings over Israel or in a digression within that setting: *J.W.* 1.110-112, 571; 2.117-119, 162, 166; *Ant.* 13.171-173, 288-289, 292-298, 408-410, 415, 423; 15.370; 17.41, 44, 46. In connection with Roman rule over Israel, *Ant.* 18.4, 11-15, 17, 23. In connection with Jerusalem *J.W.* 2.411; *Life* 10, 12, 21, 191; *Ant.* 13.401, 405; 15. 3. Cf. *Life* 197 (Galilee).

⁴² *Good Person* 75f.; *Contempl. Life* 1-2f., 21-22.

⁴³ Cf. the observation about Josephus' extensive digression about the Essenes by Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 39: "like other ancient historians (going back to Herodotus), Josephus tended to focus on the different and exotic because he was writing to entertain his audience".

Jewish education in the Hellenistic Diaspora as well as in Israel, apart from the basic skills of reading and writing, probably entailed knowledge of the laws, τὰ περὶ τοὺς νόμους, and the deeds of the forefathers, τῶν προγόνων αἱ πράξεις. This may be inferred from Josephus' treatise *Against Apion* 2.204. In the same treatise, however, Josephus also writes that the administration of the laws has been entrusted to superintendents with expert knowledge of the laws, ἐπιστάταις οἱ ἐμπειρίαν ἔχειν τῶν νόμων ὑπισχνούμενοι (*Ag.Ap.* 2.177). This smaller group of professional legal experts could perhaps be found in various Jewish communities, both in Israel and the Diaspora. In fact, larger Jewish communities probably had assemblies and legal bodies of their own for the communal life and the adjudication of controversies and lawsuits.⁴⁴

The context of Josephus' statement about the superintendents suggests that most of the expert knowledge of the laws was concentrated in Israel. For in *Against Apion* 2.187, Josephus ascribes to the priests, οἱ ἱερεῖς, the appointed duties of general supervision, the adjudication of disputes and the punishment of those condemned. This description of strict superintendence of the Law could be relativised as the description of an ideal situation. However, the *Jewish War* 2.417 mentions priestly experts on the traditions who defended the status quo of the order of sacrifices in the Temple, including sacrifices of foreigners. Many laws were precisely related to the rites of worship of God. Laws referring to priestly functions were not limited to cultic duties in biblical law. For example, a law concerning the punishment of false witness in Deuteronomy 19:16-21 also mentions priests, next to judges, in the process of the adjudication of the case. Josephus also includes juridical matters among the duties of priests. The Pharisees maintained relations with the chief priests, as can be derived from Josephus' *Jewish War* 2.411. The Pharisees formed the socio-religious establishment producing the priestly experts from their midst. The shared interests of the Pharisees and the chief priests confirms the fact that permanent Pharisaic activity was anchored in the geographical setting of the land of Israel, with Jerusalem as the holy city in which the Temple service was conducted.

Several scholars have noted that the movement of the Pharisees originated among a group of lay scribes, who were experts in religious laws.⁴⁵ Among the New Testament writings, Matthew, Mark, and Luke-Acts mention scribes and Pharisees together.⁴⁶ In Mark 2:16 and Acts 23:9 the respective phrases οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων and τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων τοῦ μέρους τῶν Φαρισαίων further underline the relationship between scribal activity and Pharisaic teachings. Apart from lay experts, there were also priestly experts, as is suggested by the fact that the Synoptic Gospels mention chief priests and scribes together.⁴⁷ Josephus' *Jewish War* 2.417 describes priestly experts, οἱ ἔμπειροὶ τῶν πατρίων ἱερεῖς, as coming from the midst of the assembly of principal citizens, chief priests, and the most distinguished Pharisees (*J.W.* 2.411). Although Pharisees had their lay scribes, they also elaborated influential regulations concerning the priestly rites of worship on the basis of their exposition of the laws, as is revealed in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 18.15.

The organisation of the Pharisees as a movement has been characterised, on the basis of the evidence of rabbinic literature, in terms of communities, חבורות, which identified themselves with literacy and a strict interpretation and observance of the laws in counter-

⁴⁴ Cf. *Ant.* 14.235, 260, for letters and decrees concerning the Jewish citizens of the city Sardis in Asia Minor.

⁴⁵ E.g. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People* II, 388; Jeremias, 'The Pharisees', in idem, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 246-267, 247. More recently, J. Schaper, 'The Pharisees', in *CHJ* III *The early Roman period*, 402-427, 405, argued that "it was the urban lower middle class that provided the soil for the growth of Pharisaism".

⁴⁶ Matt 5:20, 12:38, 15:1, 23:2.13.15.23.25.27.29; Luke 6:7, 11:53.

⁴⁷ E.g. Matt 2:4, 16:21, 20:18, 21:15; Mark 11:27; Luke 20:1.

distinction to the 'people of the land', the עמי הארץ.⁴⁸ Although the Pharisees did, of course, have their boundary lines in terms of their beliefs and practices, it may be inferred from rabbinic as well as New Testament writings that they were relatively open-minded toward outsiders.

In certain contexts early rabbinic literature links the appeal to traditions of former generations to Pharisaic traditions. For example, *m. Yadayim* 4:3-4 comprises a discussion among the Sages about the status of certain offerings from Ammon and Moab and the question whether an Ammonite proselyte could enter the congregation. This discussion is surrounded by appeals to the authority of Scripture and traditions of teachers from former generations. These former generations are in fact those preceding the generation of Johanan ben Zakkai, a main Pharisaic leader in the aftermath of the Jewish War of 66-70 CE. The rabbinic appeal to the continuity of the ancestral tradition which allowed for a relatively open attitude toward foreigners and their contributions is comparable to the appeal to the ancestral tradition of priestly experts accepting sacrifices of foreigners, ἀλλογενεῖς (*J.W.* 2.417). These priestly experts represented the views of the principle citizens, the chief priests and the most notable Pharisees. In the rabbinic tradition of appeals to previous generations of teachers, the teachings of the Pharisees are not much divided from the discussions in *m. Yadayim*, for paragraphs 6-8 mention disputes between the Pharisees and the Sadducees.

In the New Testament, the narratives about Jesus' contacts with individual Pharisees (Luke 7:36-50, 11:37-54 and John 3:1-21) reflect the at times open, but also questioning attitude toward views on moral purity, redemption, the Spirit and other religious subjects which diverged from the Pharisaic perspective. The questioning attitude of the Pharisees toward the Jesus-movement also becomes clear from their request to Jesus to rebuke his disciples (e.g. Luke 19:39). The attitude of the Pharisees toward people from the Hellenistic diaspora may have varied to some extent. Acts 15:5 may reflect the degrees of the Hellenising influence accepted by Pharisaic converts. Association and table fellowship with proselytes and converts from the Gentiles would only be deemed acceptable by them on the condition that they were circumcised and adhered to the Law of Moses (cf. Gal 2:11-14).

The Pharisaic boundary lines of separation from the people and foreigners were partly determined by the strict observance of purity laws, especially in relation to food (cf. Mark 7:3-4). The more severe regulations of purification, which were required for the priests⁴⁹ and to which the Essenes⁵⁰ submitted themselves, attest to the existence of gradations in strictness concerning the observance of purity laws. This is another indication that the social geography of Pharisaic activity was linked with the land of Israel.⁵¹

We may conclude from the above evidence concerning the social geography of Pharisaism that Paul's assertion in Philippians 3:5 that to be of the people of Israel is inherently connected with being a Pharisee with regard to the Law. Pharisees were

⁴⁸ Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 247 characterises Pharisaic *haburot* as "closed communities". Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish sects*, 96-97 refers to *m. Hag.* 2:7 and also stresses the boundary lines of separation from the people drawn by the Pharisees as a sect. Schaper, 'The Pharisees', 420 rather compares the *haburot* of the Pharisees with "private associations modelled on similar institutions in the pagan Hellenistic world".

⁴⁹ Cf. Josephus' *Life* 13-14 about priests as exiled prisoners in Rome, who, in keeping with the pious practices of their religion, supported themselves on figs and nuts.

⁵⁰ Cf. a comparative discussion of sectarian boundary lines in Baumgarten, *The flourishing of Jewish sects*, 99-100 at 99: "The purity boundary lines maintained by the Pharisees, as it emerges from these New Testament passages, was less extreme than that of the Essenes or the Dead Sea Scrolls".

⁵¹ Cf. Hengel (with Deines), *The Pre-Christian Paul*, 29-34 for discussion and rejection of older scholarship (e.g. H.J. Schoeps, G. Strecker) which suggests that there is substantial evidence for the permanent settlement of 'Diaspora Pharisees' with their own schools.

permanently active in the land of Israel and perhaps occasionally present in diplomatic missions or embassies at most. But as versatile as our sources are about Pharisaic presence and activity in Israel, the more significant is their silence about permanent Pharisaic activity in the Diaspora. Paul's identification with the Israelites, who continued to play a part in his message as an apostle, fitted very well in with the social identity of the Pharisees. Thus, even an individual Pharisee like Nicodemus is addressed by Jesus in a rhetorical question as a "teacher of Israel", ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (John 3:10). Mark 7:3-4 suggests that the teachings of the Pharisees about food and related purity laws were followed by the Jewish people in Israel. In this way, the Pharisees as a group were related to Israel.

3. Pharisaism and Palestinian-Jewish schooling

As we have discussed before, the Pharisaic 'traditions of the fathers' served as the means for self-definition. In their respect for the unwritten ancestral traditions the Pharisees distinguished themselves from the Sadducees. Josephus writes the following about them in his *Jewish Antiquities* 18.12: "They show respect and deference to their elders, nor do they rashly presume to contradict their proposals".⁵² This respect for the elders, οἱ ἡλικία προήκοντες, is also reflected in rabbinic literature by the way in which certain sayings are phrased. Thus, for example in *m. 'Abot* 3:9, we find the expression 'Rabbi .. said in the name of Rabbi ..'. The emphasis throughout *m. 'Abot* 1 is on the receiving end of the tradition, as expressed by the verb לָקַח. In the sayings of various sages, as recorded in the first chapter of *m. 'Abot*, the moral imperative to provide oneself with a teacher recurs (*m. 'Abot* 1:6.12.16). Although the historical value of the information in this late (perhaps post-) Mishnah-tractate may be criticised as limited, the tractate does provide important points which corroborate the evidence of Josephus about the Pharisaic respect for the elders and their ideas.

Where were the Pharisaic communities and most of all the Pharisaic schools located? Our sources for answering this question do not only include historical and literary texts but may also be archaeological, in as much as archaeological data can be applied to the identification of infrastructures of religious education. At least, the various traces of degrees and types of Hellenisation, differing between regions, as well as the presence of Jewish institutions such as the synagogue,⁵³ can tell us something about the social environment of Pharisaic education.

From the New Testament writings we can get certain clues about the spread of Pharisaic communities and the concentration of larger Pharisaic communities. Luke 5:17 mentions Pharisees and teachers of the law "having come from every village of Galilee and Judaea and from Jerusalem", ἐληλυθότες ἐκ πάσης κώμης τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ. Even though legendary traditions may underlie the Lucan description of an attendance of Jesus' teachings by Pharisees and teachers of the law, the geographical setting provides adequate information about the spread of Pharisaic communities. It is significant that Judaea and Galilee are mentioned in general, while the naming of specific places is limited to the city of Jerusalem and while not a single place in Galilee is specified in this context. It seems that Judaea with the capital Jerusalem had the larger concentration of Pharisaic communities.

This impression is confirmed by John 4:1-3, in which the apparent opposition from the Pharisees to the baptising activity of Jesus' disciples seems to be the reason why Jesus leaves

⁵² Translation from L.H. Feldman, *Josephus in nine volumes* IX, 11.

⁵³ Cf. E.M. Meyers, 'Recent archaeology in Palestine: achievements and future goals', in *CHJ* III, *The Early Roman Period*, 59-74 at 67-72.

Judaea and departs again to Galilee. This geographical indication implicitly points to the idea that Judaea accommodated the larger concentration of Pharisees.

In his *Life* 197-198, Josephus writes about the Pharisees in Galilee from the context of a deputation from Jerusalem. This deputation consisted of adherents of the Pharisees, people of priestly descent and natives of Jerusalem. The high status ascribed to these identity markers indicates the dominance of the Jerusalemite leadership which imposed itself on Galilee (cf. chap. 3, section 4).

It is important to note that the adherents to Pharisaism, Jonathan and Ananias, who were of lower ranks (οἱ δημοτικοί), took part in the deputation from Jerusalem, according to Josephus' *Life* 197-198. This information suggests that schooling in the Pharisaic traditions was in principle accessible to people of various social levels and that it appears to have been concentrated in Jerusalem and Judaea. On the other hand, the spread of Pharisaic communities in Judaea and Galilee could be explained by the people's needs for religious leadership at a local level. In synagogues or other places of religious gathering, the order of scriptural readings and exposition had to be regulated by literate, educated persons who had a proficiency in biblical Hebrew and who were learned in the study of the laws.⁵⁴

In his recent article about Galilean Judaism and Judaeon Judaism, Martin Goodman has critically examined a set of modern scholarly assertions about the difference between these two forms of Judaism.⁵⁵ Two issues for discussion, 'Torah scholarship in Galilee and in Judaea' and 'Observance of Torah in Galilee and in Judaea', are in a way related to the question of the location of Pharisaic education in a Palestinian Jewish context. In his discussion of early rabbinic evidence concerning the centres of Torah scholarship, Goodman emphasises that the conclusion of the issue is not certain, even though the evidence suggests that the main centres before 70 CE were located in Judaea. According to Goodman, the Galileans "must have had *some* legal experts to deal with practical interpretation in civil case".⁵⁶

Concerning the issue of the observance of the Torah, Goodman notes that the 'people of the land', the עמי הארץ, were as much a Judaeon phenomenon as they were a Galilean phenomenon in juxtaposition to the group of 'associates', חברים.⁵⁷ However, the question about the identification of the latter group of חברים is at least as important for situating and locating Pharisaic education. This question is, however, difficult to answer as there are divergent connotations to the Hebrew term, ranging from friend or associate to fellow-student and member of a religious or charitable association. Albert I. Baumgarten has noted that "doubts concerning the identification of *haverim* and Pharisees bedevil the effort to reach firm conclusions".⁵⁸

In his book on Galilee, Seán Freyne has discussed related issues concerning Pharisaic teachings, Pharisaic *halakhah*, and the observance of their regulations in Galilee.⁵⁹ Freyne has pointed to the necessity of drawing a clear distinction between the pre- and post-70 situations, which also pertains to the differing connotations of the terms עמי הארץ and חברים.⁶⁰ Freyne notes, that "the Pharisees, as a sect, were concerned with extending the holiness of the

⁵⁴ Cf. Luke 4:16-22f. concerning the reading of Scripture in a Palestinian synagogue, in Nazareth of Galilee.

⁵⁵ M. Goodman, 'Galilean Judaism and Judaeon Judaism', in *CHJ* III, *The Early Roman Period*, 596-617.

⁵⁶ Goodman, 'Galilean Judaism and Judaeon Judaism', 603-606 at 606.

⁵⁷ Goodman, 'Galilean Judaism and Judaeon Judaism', 606-608.

⁵⁸ Baumgarten, *The flourishing of Jewish sects*, 97.

⁵⁹ S. Freyne, 'Galilee and the Halakhah', in idem, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian*, 305-334.

⁶⁰ Freyne, 'Galilee and the Halakhah', 305-308.

temple to the everyday life in the world"; an idea which is reflected in rabbinic literature and in New Testament passages like Mark 7:3-4. We may infer from these traditions that Pharisaic education was most likely concentrated in Judaea in the pre-70 CE period.

This assumption does not preclude that Pharisaic teachings were brought to Galilee by local Pharisees. The theory about Pharisaic education as centered in Judaea does not contradict the idea that the influence of Pharisaic traditions extended to Galilee. The Pharisees and the priestly establishment alike had an established position in Judaea and Jerusalem in particular, while Galilee was at the periphery. This would also provide a contemporary background to Judaeans' attitudes toward Galilee as lacking the sophisticated study of the Torah and to the perceived inapplicability of the traditions of Scripture about prophets and messianism to Galilee (John 7:40-52).

In his discussion of possible alternatives to Pharisaism in Galilee, Freyne argues about the relative success of the Pharisaic halakhah in the pre-70 CE period as follows: "As stressed more than once, the dominant ethos there was rural and peasant, and in those circumstances one can readily appreciate why Pharisaism, which had particular appeal with the townspeople according to *Ant* 18:15, that is, among the emerging middle class, would have had little attraction for people from the country".⁶¹

The persistence of indigenous local religious affiliations and practices in Galilee, after Galilee was brought under the rule of the Hasmonaeans, is a point stressed by both Freyne⁶² and Richard A. Horsley.⁶³ Horsley, in his archaeological survey about synagogues in Galilee, refers from the outset to an emerging critical consensus that "no synagogue [buildings] have been found in Palestine for the almost two hundred years following the destruction of the Temple".⁶⁴ Thus, the information to be derived from archaeological data about the environment for the establishment of Pharisaic education is quite limited.

From our discussion of literary, historical and archaeological evidence, we may conclude that a concentration of Pharisaic schooling in Judaea before 70 CE is more likely to have existed than an equal spread of Torah scholarship throughout Judaea and Galilee.

4. The problem: Locating Paul's Pharisaic study of the Law

Paul does not specify the place of his prior Pharisaic study of the Law in his own Letters. However, the speech attributed to Paul by the Lucan author in Acts 22:3-21 situates this Pharisaic study in Jerusalem (Acts 22:3). This silence in Paul's Letters is a serious problem for the study of Paul's previous way of life as a Pharisee. It forms a gap which cannot be filled up by uncritically adding information from Acts about Paul's Pharisaic past.

A critical methodology has been proposed by certain New Testament scholars, addressing the problem of comparing the information in Paul's Letters and in Acts about Paul. Riesner asserted "a 'relative' priority of Paul's Letters before the chronological information contained in Acts".⁶⁵ John Knox, in his book about a life of Paul, expressed this 'relative' priority of Paul's Letters already with his threefold principle of testing the credibility of information only found in Acts. First, the silence in Paul's Letters about the information in

⁶¹ Freyne, 'Galilee and the Halakhah', 329-334 at 333.

⁶² Freyne, 'Galilee and the Halakhah', 329-334.

⁶³ Horsley, *Archaeology, History and Society in Galilee*, 171-175.

⁶⁴ Horsley, *Archaeology, History and Society in Galilee*, 131-153 at 133, quoting an article of L.I. Levine from the *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Explorations in the Holy Land*.

⁶⁵ Riesner, *Paul's Early Period*, 30.

Acts must be insignificant. Second, the author of Acts cannot be assumed to have had a special interest in framing it on the basis of a surmise. Third, the information in Acts cannot be refuted on the basis of any competing suggestion.⁶⁶ When these three criteria are met, according to Knox, the particular item of information in Acts can be considered reliable. Knox's study has received much critical appraisal concerning his introduction of the methodological principle of the priority of Paul's letters for our understanding of Paul's life and work.⁶⁷

Scholarly scepticism concerning the detailed information in Acts 22:3, mentioning Gamaliel as teacher, however, also entails scepticism or even a denial of Jerusalem as the place of Paul's prior schooling in Pharisaism. The radical hypothesis of John Knox rather situates Paul's education in Tarsus and Damascus. Knox's hypothesis discredits the information in Acts about Paul's former life in Judaism; information which is bound up with the story of his persecution of the church.⁶⁸ Knox rejects the circumstantial information of Acts because of its dependence on Luke's "interest in Christianity as the continuation and fulfillment of authentic Judaism and in the city of Jerusalem as the place where the transition took place".⁶⁹ According to Knox, a conception of Paul's life as centered in Jerusalem fitted well in with the narrative strategy of the author of Luke-Acts. It must be granted that the author of Luke-Acts had a specific narrative strategy with certain interests in mind in portraying Paul. This narrative strategy amounts to internal contradictions and also to contrasts with Paul's words which cannot be harmonised.⁷⁰

Other New Testament scholars have evaluated the information in Acts about Paul's previous way of life as a Pharisee in a more positive way. For example, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor⁷¹ and Martin Hengel⁷² have defended the location of Paul's Pharisaic study of the Law in Jerusalem. Murphy-O'Connor's discussion includes references to rabbinic traditions about Torah scholarship in Jerusalem. Hengel and Murphy-O'Connor have approached the question of whether or not Paul in his previous Pharisaic way of life, supposedly located in Jerusalem, witnessed Jesus' ministry and death in different ways.⁷³ In this section, I will focus first on Paul's own words in Gal 1:13-24 about his former Jewish life and his persecution of the church. Subsequently I will discuss Josephus' information about the Pharisees in relation to the question of the possible locations of their schools.

⁶⁶ J. Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press: New York & Nashville, 1950) 34.

⁶⁷ Cf. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life*, vi.

⁶⁸ Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, 33-40 rejects this story in Acts out of hand (36) and calls it the "author's ingenious surmise" to account for Paul's persecution and conversion in Damascus as a Jerusalemite Jew.

⁶⁹ Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, 35.

⁷⁰ J.C. Lentz, Jr., *Luke's portrait of Paul* (Cambridge UP: Cambridge, 1993) 51-56 critically discusses Acts 23:6, noting that the "suggestion that Paul was from a Pharisaic family from Tarsus can hardly be accepted without serious reservations" (54), but leaves "the riddle of Paul's formal Pharisaic background" "to others" (51).

⁷¹ Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life*, 54f.

⁷² Hengel (with Deines), *The Pre-Christian Paul*, 18-39 at 22-23, 34, 38 discusses and rejects W.C. van Unnik's thesis that Jerusalem was the place of both Paul's upbringing and education to the exclusion of Tarsus, published in W.C. van Unnik, 'Tarsus or Jerusalem. The City of Paul's Youth' and 'Once Again: Tarsus or Jerusalem', in idem, *Sparsa Collecta. The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik* 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1973) 259-320 and 321-327.

⁷³ Hengel (with Deines), *The Pre-Christian Paul*, 63-65, at 63: "it is very possible, indeed almost probable, that the younger Saul even witnessed Jesus' death – perhaps from the distance of the Greek-speaking Jews"; however, Hengel leaves the matter whether or not 2 Cor 5:16 suggests Paul's personal connection with the earthly Jesus an 'open question' (64) and stresses that a crucified Messiah constituted a religious stumbling block for the former Pharisaic Paul. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life*, 61-62 states that there is no guarantee that Jesus' death "would have impinged on the attention of a Paul passionately committed to the study of the Law" and warns against presumptions about "what Paul should or should not have written" (61).

4.1 Interpretation of Galatians 1:13-24

4.1.1 Paul's silence about the place of his Pharisaic education

In his discussion of Paul's Jewish education, Knox argues that Paul's silence about Jerusalem as the place of his education is significant, for Paul could have mentioned it on various occasions, when referring to his previous Jewish life. Paul's silence about Jerusalem is for Knox the more significant in view of the place of Paul's persecuting activity, which in his interpretation of Gal 1:22-23 cannot have been Jerusalem or Judaea.

By further casting doubt on the information of Acts on the basis of evidence in Gal 1:11-24, Knox emphasises that Paul writes about *visits* to Jerusalem, whereas he writes about Damascus that he *returned* there. This suggests, according to Knox, that Damascus was his home.⁷⁴ It is however important to note that Paul's references to Jerusalem and Damascus serve to give an impression of his early apostolic activity rather than a historical account about his former Jewish schooling. Damascus was the place of Paul's conversion, his calling as an apostle. The neighbouring regions of Syria and Cilicia, in which his birthplace Tarsus was located, were probably also a home for him in terms of social support for his apostolic commission given by Christian congregations there. This can be inferred from Gal 1:17, 21.

The reason for Paul's silence about Jerusalem in connection with his Jewish education is, in my view, to be explained precisely by his breakaway from his 'former life in Judaism'. Paul had no interest in exhaustively informing his readers about his Jewish education, and about who exactly would have been his fellow students and his teacher(s). He had to mention some basic elements of his pre-Christian and early apostolic activity to frame his own story and to come to terms with the threat of his opponents who challenged his mission and perhaps also his integrity. Paul's readers were also already familiar with his former activity as a persecutor ('*You have certainly*⁷⁵ *heard of my former life in Judaism*', Gal 1:13a). Since the opponents derived their authority from the circle around James, that is, from an influential party within the Jerusalem church (Gal 2:12), stressing a pre-Christian connection with Jerusalem would defeat Paul's purpose of defending his own position. Paul wanted to persuade his readers that his apostolic commission did not depend on the authority of the Jerusalem church. This is clear from Paul's representation of his own calling as an apostle in Gal 1:15-17, where he stresses that his earliest period as an apostle was disconnected from any contacts with the Jerusalem church and the other apostles.

Furthermore, the rhetorical context of Gal 1:13-2:10 at large concerns the issue of how Paul's mission to the Gentiles came into being after his conversion. Paul wants to stress this apostolic activity as independent from the Jerusalem church. It was neither relevant nor appropriate to Paul's purpose to digress at length about his former life in Judaism. Such a digression would rather have served his opponents and those siding with them in their rival mission who undermined Paul's mission and integrity (Gal 1:6-9; 5:1-12). Paul's opponents wanted a gospel preached which was in entirely keeping with the Jewish Law. They probably had a picture of Paul in mind as a former persecutor and apostate from the Jewish Law (cf. Gal 5:10-12; Acts 21:20-22). Jerusalem was the seat of Jewish religious authority before 70 CE (cf. Josephus' *Life* 7-8, 21, 190-198);⁷⁶ a situation which supported the case of Paul's opponents rather than Paul's case in this context.

⁷⁴ Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, 36.

⁷⁵ See BDAG, 189-190; cf. Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, § 452.

⁷⁶ Z. Safrai, 'The Role of the Jerusalem Elite in National Leadership in the Late Second Temple Era', in Poorthuis and Safrai (eds.), *The Centrality of Jerusalem*, 65-72 in spite of his critical notes about Josephus' at times misleading Jerusalem-centered perspective, maintains that Jerusalem "was the center for the study of the Torah" (67) and that the Jerusalem council served as a 'national council' (71).

The difficult position in which Paul found himself, while denouncing such opponents as 'false brothers' (Gal 2:4; cf. 2 Cor 11:5.12-15.26), was that he also had to oppose influential circles of the Jerusalem church. According to Gal 2:11-14, the group of James had a dominant influence in preaching a Jewish way of life, which led Peter and even Paul's fellow worker Barnabas to dissociate from Gentile converts who did not observe Jewish customs.⁷⁷

Paul's account of subsequent events in Gal 1:12-2:21 emphasises the initial agreement between Paul and leading persons of the Christian church, whenever Jerusalem is mentioned. Paul's discussion of visits to Jerusalem should, therefore, not be read as a complete account of how often and when for the first time in his whole life, also before his calling as apostle, Paul visited Jerusalem for a short or longer stay. Paul mentions Jerusalem in relation to his initial agreement with the other apostles about the gospel mission (Gal 2:1-10).

Apart from this agreement, Paul deliberately dissociated from any human subordination in his apostolic commission, for he writes in Galatians 1:16-17, "in order that I would preach him among the Gentiles, I did not confer with flesh and blood, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me". The fact that Jerusalem is mentioned here already, albeit to deny that Paul visited Jerusalem at that point, displays the importance of Jerusalem in the social world of Paul's readers. Jerusalem was also relevant for Paul. A sense of the significance of Jerusalem continued from Paul's former life in Judaism to his perspective as an apostle of the faith in Christ. In Romans 9:4 he writes that the worship, that is, the worship in the Temple, belongs among other things to the Israelites; a group to which Paul still reckons himself (2 Cor 11:22; Rom 11:1).

It is significant that Paul already had the plan to preach the gospel among the Gentiles, but there is no sign of agreement about this with Peter and other apostles at the first visit of Paul after his calling as an apostle (Gal 1:18-24). Only by the second post-conversion visit to Jerusalem, Paul, accompanied by Barnabas and Titus, explicitly mentions an agreement on their apostolic mission with James, Peter and John. On the part of the Jerusalem church, it apparently took time to recognise an apostle in the former persecutor of the church,⁷⁸ and even then the initial agreement on apostolic mission was broken later on (Gal 2:11-14).

4.1.2 Gal 1:22-23 in the argument about the location of Paul's former life as a Pharisee

Gal 1:22-23, which in Knox' interpretation excludes both Jerusalem and Judaea as a place of Paul's former persecuting activities, should in my view be read differently. In Gal 1:18-24, Paul contrasts his direct contact with the apostles Peter and James to his not being known by sight to the churches in Judea, who only had an impression about Paul from hearsay. Paul thus stresses that only the apostles Peter and James were involved in his first post-conversion contacts with the Jerusalem church.

Paul also opposes the Jerusalem church to the churches in Judea in another passage, Romans 15:31. Although Rom 15:31 mentions the churches of Judea and Jerusalem side by side, as they were apparently regarded older and normative among the believers in Christ in the Diaspora, there is a marked difference in Paul's apprehension of them. He contrasts the

⁷⁷ Cf. Justin Taylor, S.M., 'The Jerusalem Decrees (Acts 15.20, 29 and 21.25) and the Incident at Antioch (Gal 2.11-14)', *NTS* 46 (2001) 372-380 who interprets the initial difference between Peter and James concerning (non-)association with the Gentiles as motivated by prescriptions from Lev 17-18 for conditional association with Gentiles and by 'Noachide commandments' about the separation between Jews and Gentiles respectively.

⁷⁸ Cf. N. Taylor, *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem. A Study in Relationships and Authority in Earliest Christianity* (JSNTSup 66; Sheffield AP: Sheffield, 1992) 77 who notes that Paul's visit to the Jerusalem church would be "feasible, especially if the former community had also been victim to his persecution" (the other community being the church at Damascus).

‘unbelievers in Judaea’, οἱ ἀπειθούντες ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, to the ‘saints in Jerusalem’, οἱ ἄγιοι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. This is an extreme difference between the two groups of Christian Jews perceived by Paul as separated from each other as holy and unholy, believers and unbelievers.

The occasion which gave rise to Paul's polarised idea probably had to do with the challenge which other missionaries posed to Paul's mission by insisting that every convert should observe the Jewish Law. Among those missionaries were probably also ‘unbelievers in Judaea’; a polemical term employed by Paul. Missionaries from Judaea were probably among those people who came to Antioch and insisted on a way of life according to the Jewish Law which should also be applied to converts from the Gentiles (Gal 2:11-14). As Judaea and Jerusalem were polarised in Paul's gospel mission to the Gentiles, it is, therefore, nor self-evident to assume that Judaea and Jerusalem would have been one and the same for Paul in his former persecuting activity against the church.⁷⁹

Although Paul was not known by sight to the churches of Judaea, this is not said in relation to the church of Jerusalem. Paul only writes that, on the occasion of his first post-conversion visit to Jerusalem, he merely saw two of the apostles, visiting, ἱστορήσαι; Peter first of all (Gal 1:18). Paul's statement about his contact with only two of the apostles⁸⁰ does not automatically imply that he did not talk to other Christians who were not apostles. Paul's point concerns the human authority of leading figures in the church on which, he insists, his gospel mission does not depend. It should further be noted that Gal 1:23 describes a plurality of those formerly persecuted. Because of the contrast between the Jerusalem church and the Judaeian churches in Paul's Letters, it is in my view a premature conclusion to read Gal 1:22-23 as contradicting and excluding the idea of a Jerusalem-based persecution of the church by Paul.

4.2 Paul's Jewish Background and his Former Persecution of the Church

As Paul's Jewish background is bound up with the story of his former role of persecutor of the church, it is important to focus our attention on whether further specified answers can be given to the question of who were persecuted and how the persecution could be organised. In Gal 1:13, Paul writes that he persecuted the church of God violently and tried to destroy it; a stronger statement than in Phil 3:6 where he summarily writes “as to zeal a persecutor of the church”. It should be noted that both passages, Gal 1:13 and Phil 3:6, refer to the ‘church of God’, ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ, in the singular. Contrary to this, Paul writes in Gal 1:22 about the ‘churches of Judea’ in the plural. The singular could simply stand for nascent Christianity as such, but it could also denote the church of the saints in Jerusalem. This was the ‘church of churches’, of whom Paul considered James, Peter and John to be the pillars (Gal 2:9).

The hearsay reaching the churches of Judaea, “he who once persecuted us, is now preaching the faith he once tried to destroy” (Gal 1:23), probably concerns formerly persecuted Christians of Jerusalem who had fled and returned. The conversion of a former persecutor to a preacher of the gospel was also good news for churches to whom Paul was not known by sight. Paul writes that the churches of Judaea glorified God for this (Gal 1:24).

⁷⁹ *Contra* Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life*, 54 who, in criticising Knox' position, rather follows Knox in the assumption that the Holy City and the countryside should be considered together. He, paradoxically, refers to Rom 15:31 as precluding a distinction between Jerusalem and Judaea.

⁸⁰ For the designation of James, the Lord's brother, as an ‘apostle’ (Gal 1:19), cf. 1 Cor 15:7.

Paul's motivation as persecutor of the church was his zeal (Phil 3:6); probably a zeal for keeping Jewish culture uncorrupted by any perceived outside threat.⁸¹ Paul's zeal was different from the Pharisaic keenness for the ancestral traditions (Gal 1:14). The Pharisees are reported to have had disputes with Jesus in the Gospels (e.g. Matt 19:3f.; Luke 5:17f.), but other Gospel traditions also refer to Jesus' connections with several Pharisees. According to Luke 7:36, a Pharisee invited Jesus to eat with him, while John 3:1f. and 7:50f. inform us that the Pharisee Nicodemus had friendly relations with Jesus. The author of Luke-Acts even attributes words of caution against persecution of the Christians to a highly reputed Pharisaic teacher of the Law, Gamaliel (Acts 5:34-39). Pharisees were not likely to be moved to zeal for persecution.

In this connection, it is important to point to the apparent internal contradiction in the narrative of Acts, which seems to postulate the prudent teacher of the Law, Gamaliel (cf. Acts 5:34-39), as the personal teacher of Paul, the former persecutor of the church, in Acts 22:3.⁸² The phrase "at the feet of" Gamaliel may, however, be a figurative expression standing for education in a school named after its most famous teacher (cf. *m. 'Abot* 1:4).

4.2.1 *The Context of Persecution of the Church*

What specific occasion(s) motivated Paul's persecution of the church? Paul says nothing about this in his Letters. The narrative of Acts, which presupposes a Jerusalem-based persecution, does however give certain information about this. The evidence in Acts 8:1-3 suggests that Paul's former persecuting activity was concentrated in Jerusalem, from which some people fled to Judea and Samaria, while others stayed. According to Acts the earliest context for large scale persecution of the church followed in the wake of Stephen's death.⁸³ The picture in Acts of the dispersion of all except the apostles may, however, be tendentious.

It is likely that the so-called Hellenists were mainly the victims of persecution, because the persecution of the church is mentioned in the aftermath of growing conflicts between 'Hebrews', 'Εβραῖοι, and 'Hellenists', 'Ελληνισταί (Acts 6:1). Paul called himself a 'Hebrew of Hebrews' in Phil 3:5, and his zeal or persecution of the church may well have been related to this conflict between the interests of Hebrews and Hellenists.⁸⁴ Even though the terms Hebrews and Hellenists may reflect the schematic ideological agenda of the author of Acts, as Craig C. Hill has argued (see chap. 3, section 7.5), they may testify to a fundamental division within the early Jesus-movement about the direction and purpose of the gospel mission. Acts 11:20 explicitly mentions the presence of the Hellenists rather than the Hebrews in Antioch; the place where the gospel mission to the Gentiles became the issue of debate within the early church.

⁸¹ Cf. T. Seland, 'Saul of Tarsus and Early Zealotism. Reading Gal 1,13-14 in Light of Philo's Writings', *Biblica* 83:4 (2002) 449-471, there p. 470 about Paul's action as a zealot who persecuted those who were posed a threat to the "social cohesion" of Judaism, but also emphasizing that "the Judaisms at the time were generally tolerant".

⁸² Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life*, 53 calls this "Luke's concern to bind Paul as closely as possible to Jerusalem". Cf. F.F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (NICNT, rev.ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich., 1988) 415 interpreting the reference to Gamaliel in Acts 22:3 as the name of the head of the school, standing for the 'school of Gamaliel'.

⁸³ Note that the earliest reference to Saul the Pharisee occurs at the point in the account of Acts when Stephen is stoned, in Acts 7:58, shortly before the account of the persecution (Acts 8:1-3, 9:1-2). Saul is called a 'young man' in Acts 7:58. Neither Acts nor Paul's Letters provide conclusive evidence about the question of a personal connection of Paul with the earthly Jesus. Paul's Letters rather provide connections with the teachings of the earthly Jesus; for a survey of this discussion, see e.g. D. Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. / Cambridge, 1995).

⁸⁴ Cf. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 80-81 distinguishing the churches of Judea as "likely to be more traditionally Jewish in their view of the new sect" from the Hellenists.

The Hellenists brought in the more Hellenising influence with elements from a Gentile cultural environment which could clash with Jewish legal perspectives.⁸⁵ The crisis of Hellenisation during the Maccabean period had probably become part of the collective memory of Palestinian Judaism, so that negative sentiments about Hellenisation as a threat to Jewish tradition came to the surface, especially at times of aggravating tensions and conflicts.⁸⁶ The mixture of Jewish and Gentile influences, in which incompatible interests collided, gave rise to conflicts which probably induced Paul, in his former life in Judaism, to support persecution. This is implied in Gal 1:23 with the hearsay about Paul “now preaching the faith he once tried to destroy”. This preaching of the faith addressed Jews and Gentiles (cf. Rom 1:16; 1 Cor 1:22-23; Gal 3:28).

Paul also writes about the radical zeal of a specific group of Jews who had an active interest in keeping the Jewish and Gentile spheres of influence apart. It can be inferred from 1 Thess 2:14 that among radical movements of zeal for the cause of the ‘Hebrews’, certain Jews had an interest in preventing Paul from saving the Gentiles by preaching the gospel to them (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ ἡμᾶς ἐκδιωξάντες κωλυόντες ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἔθνεσιν λαλῆσαι ἵνα σωθῶσιν). In connection with the oppressive hindrance by such a radical group of Jews, Paul mentions the sufferings of the “churches of God in Christ Jesus which are in Judaea”. Paul may have heard about the sufferings of these churches of Judaea when he was in Jerusalem having contact with Peter and James. This radical Jewish movement which had an aggressive interest in the separation between Jews and Gentiles could constitute the basis for Paul's former persecution of the church.

The evidence provided by Flavius Josephus corroborates the idea that there was a radical Jewish movement which vied for aggressive means to achieve their goal of theocracy and independence from foreign rule with its Hellenising influence. According to Josephus' works, priestly circles who were against Gentile and Hellenising influences on Jewish tradition as well as movements with an extreme zeal for the Law on the fringes of Pharisaism could count on a growing number of ready supporters for action. Josephus writes about this radical movement, *faute de mieux* called the ‘Fourth Philosophy’, that its followers, apart from their militant zeal for theocracy, “agree in all other respects with the opinions of the Pharisees”, τὰ μὲν λοιπὰ πάντα γνώμη τῶν Φαρισαίων ὁμολογοῦσι (*Ant.* 18.23).⁸⁷

In Josephus' account of the events which gave rise to the Jewish War, this movement with its appeal of novelty formed an uncontrollable challenge to the body politic, ἡ πολιτεία, that is, the Jewish Sanhedrin, thereby “planting the seeds of troubles which eventually overtook it”.⁸⁸ By siding with or joining such a radical Jewish movement in his former life in Judaism, Paul's Pharisaic zeal for the Law could turn into zeal for religious persecution.

The last item on the list for ‘confidence in the flesh’ in Philippians 3:5-6 could also be interpreted as a polemical warning to others that the zeal for the Law, which was a dead end in Paul's previous life as persecutor of the church, was also a dead end in the teachings of

⁸⁵ ‘Hellenising influence’ therefore did not concern the Greek language *per se*, since, as M. Hengel, ‘Greek-speaking Jerusalem and Greek Synagogue Education’, in idem, *The Pre-Christian Paul* (London & Philadelphia, 1991) 54-62 has convincingly demonstrated, the pre-Christian Paul who took pride in being a ‘Hebrew of Hebrews’ could have been exposed to Jewish Greek in the context of Greek synagogue education in Jerusalem.

⁸⁶ 2 Macc 4:13 ἦν δ' οὕτως ἀκμή τις Ἑλληνισμοῦ καὶ πρόσβασις ἀλλοφυλισμοῦ διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἄσεβοῦς καὶ οὐκ ἀρχιερέως Ἰάσωνος ὑπερβάλλουσας ἀναγκεῖαν, relating this ‘adoption of foreign ways’ to neglect of the traditional cultic service in the Temple (v. 14 f.).

⁸⁷ *J.W.* 2.409-410; *Ant.* 18.1-10, 23 identifies Judas the Galilean as the leader of the ‘fourth philosophy’; cf. Acts 5:37. This movement was founded in revolt against Quirinius' census of 6/7 CE, which according to its followers would lead to ‘downright slavery’, ἀντικρυς δουλεία (*Ant.* 18.4).

⁸⁸ *Ant.* 18.9 τῶν αὐθις κακῶν κατελιφθῶτων ῥίζας ἐφυτεύσαντο.

Paul's opponents. This polemical warning puts Paul's opponents implicitly in the camp of the aggressive and radical Jewish movement designated by Josephus with the collective noun of the 'fourth philosophy'. Moreover, Josephus states that in Judaea under the procuratorship of Felix (52-60 CE) terrorist and revolutionary movements arose.⁸⁹ This was during a period in which Paul wrote many of his Letters.

Paul's former zeal for religious persecution can thus be explained against the background of an aggressive and revolutionary zeal for freedom from foreign dominion and Hellenising influences perceived as the cause of all transgressions against the ancestral Jewish tradition. Perhaps the point of being blameless in the righteousness under the Law was even a serious argument in the revolutionary rhetoric: in striving aggressively for the cause of theocracy one would not get blemished under the Law.⁹⁰ Through his conversion to the faith in Christ, Paul counted all of this as a loss (Phil 3:7-8), dissociating from his 'former life in Judaism' with which he could no longer identify. This does, however, not alter the fact that Paul also expresses a sense of belonging to Jewish tradition in his Letters, either explicitly (e.g. in Rom 9:1-5) or in implicit ways.

4.2.2 *The reasons for persecution of the church*

The question about the reasons for persecution of the church brings us also to the question about the place of Paul's persecuting activity. J. Knox has argued that the link between Jerusalem and Damascus in Paul's persecuting activity is part of Luke's conception of "Christianity as the continuation and fulfillment of authentic Judaism and (of) the city of Jerusalem as the place where the transition took place". Thus Knox finds the transition from the initial persecution in Jerusalem to the eventual conversion of Paul in Damascus in the narrative of Acts problematic. In his view the account of Acts can only be the author's ingenious way of filling up a gap. It covers up the problematic transition by providing an answer to the question: "how did it happen that he was in Damascus at the time of his conversion?"⁹¹

Paul writes in Galatians 1:17 that he returned to Damascus after a journey into Arabia. Damascus was the home for the early period of Paul's apostolic mission and the regions of Syria and Cilicia, mentioned side by side in Gal 1:21, were probably known to him from his youth, since he had been born in Tarsus of Cilicia. As much as there is a silence in Paul's Letters about Jerusalem as a place for his former persecuting activity, this is also the case for Damascus. We can only infer from Paul's words in Gal 1:15-17 that his revelation and calling as an apostle to the Gentiles are related to his stay in Damascus. The traditions of the fathers which he championed in his former life in Judaism (Gal 1:14) were, however, a matter of education.

With regard to Paul's idea of the source for authority, there is no bigger contrast than that between human teachings and the gospel which he preached as an apostle. Paul writes in Galatians 1:11-12 that the gospel of Christ was not taught to him by others but came to him through divine revelation. Thus, Galatians 1:15-17 cannot be read as by extension also locating Paul's 'former life in Judaism' (Gal 1:13-14) in Damascus.

⁸⁹ J.W. 2.252-260 calls the terrorists 'Sicarii', σικάριοι. Cf. Acts 21:38 where in the tumult around the arrest of Paul, a question out of concern for the public order is put in the mouth of the Roman tribune. He is found asking whether Paul could be the apparently fugitive Egyptian revolutionary leader of four thousand Sicarii.

⁹⁰ Cf. the rhetoric of the 'Fourth Philosophy' in *Ant.* 18.5 about 'necessary bloodshed' for their cause: καὶ τὸ θεῖον οὐκ ἄλλως ἢ ἐπὶ συμπράξει τῶν βουλευμάτων εἰς τὸ κατορθοῦν συμπροθυμεῖσθαι μᾶλλον, ἂν μεγάλων ἐρασταὶ τῇ διανοίᾳ καθιστάμενοι μὴ ἐξαφίονται φόνου τοῦ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.

⁹¹ Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, 38.

4.2.3 From Jerusalem to Damascus

If it is assumed that the organisation of persecution of the church started as a persecution against the Hellenists in Jerusalem, then there may be a reason why Paul would travel to Damascus. According to the narrative of Acts, the persecution in Jerusalem caused the church to become scattered, and perhaps daunted and disunited for some time. Damascus was a city with a sizeable Jewish community. The reason for Paul, in his former role of persecutor, to travel to Damascus would consist in taking precautionary measures against those who could threaten to Hellenise Jewish custom there to an impermissible extent from the viewpoint of the revolutionary Jewish groups.⁹²

The spreading of measures against Hellenising influence in Jewish communities outside Judaea is not such a strange assumption: it can be concluded from Gal 2:4-14 that the opponents to Paul's later apostolic mission, who probably came from Jerusalem, even reached Antioch with their mission against Gentile influence in the Christian-Jewish church.⁹³ These opponents apparently had enough influence to persuade others into having converts from the Gentiles live according to Jewish custom or, if that was not possible, in keeping Jewish and Gentile converts separate from one another. Antioch was a city located even further to the northern part of Syria than Damascus. Damascus was, however, the place where Paul was called to become apostle of the faith in Christ, when, in Paul's words, "He who had set me apart before I was born, and had called me through His grace, was pleased to reveal His Son to me" (Gal 1:15-16).

4.3 Jerusalem in Galatians 4:21-31 and Paul's former persecution of the church

Although Paul does not explicitly mention Jerusalem in connection with his former life in Judaism in his Letter to the Galatians, Jerusalem figures in an allegory in Gal 4:21-31. Even though it is the 'heavenly Jerusalem' (Gal 4:26), it points to the significance of Jerusalem for Paul.⁹⁴ No other city is thus transfigured in an allegory. Of course, the contrast with the earthly Jerusalem (Gal 4:25) implies first of all a polemic against the influence of Christian Jews who insisted that converts in Galatia should live under the Jewish Law. This section starts with an exhortation against those who want to be under the Law (οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, Gal 4:21), whom Paul addresses here in the first place.

Paul's polemic against the earthly Jerusalem could also point to the difference with his 'previous life in Judaism', that is his previous life under the Law as a Pharisee, with which Paul had broken (Gal 1:13). As he writes in 1 Cor. 9:20, μὴ ὢν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον, Paul the apostle is no longer under the Jewish Law, but under the Law of Christ (1 Cor 9:21). However, in his previous life as a Pharisee he would have had opportunities of fellowship and discussion with teachers and students of the Law most of all in Jerusalem, for Jerusalem was the place where the teaching on the 'seat of Moses' was concentrated and disseminated at the time.⁹⁵

⁹² Cf. M. Hengel & A.M. Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien. Die unbekanntes Jahre des Apostels* (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1998) 85-97 about the history and ideological traditions which linked Damascus with Israel; 147-152 on the 'mission of the Hellenists outside Palestine', attributing to them the mission of opening Jerusalem up for the Hellenised Syrians, Phoenicians and Arabs (147).

⁹³ Cf. P.F. Esler, 'Making and Breaking an agreement mediterranean style: A new reading of *Galatians* 2:1-14', *BibInt* III (1995) 285-314 identifying Paul's opponents in Gal 2:1-10 and 2:11-14 as one and the same group.

⁹⁴ Cf. Dunn, *Galatians*, 253 who discerns affinities between Paul's concept of the 'Jerusalem above' and the heavenly Jerusalem in Jewish apocalyptic thought.

⁹⁵ Matt 23:2 in a polemical reference to οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι; cf. Mark 12:38-40.

The slavery which revolutionary Jewish groups, who had an unconquerable passion for liberty in recognising only God as their leader and master (*Ant.* 18.4-5, 23), expected when Jewish and Gentile interests would mix, is freedom for Paul after his conversion to the faith in Christ. For Paul the aggressive zeal for the Law amounted to slavery. As Paul writes to the Galatians, they should not let themselves be troubled by Christian Jews who would judge them negatively (Gal 5:10), for the exhortation of Paul's opponents probably had produced an unsettling effect among the Galatians.

The contemporary, earthly Jerusalem, which apparently was central to authoritative persuasion for Paul's opponents in their preaching of the necessity of circumcision (Gal 1-12), is identified with slavery in Paul's allegory. Thus, the contemporary Palestinian background of the emergence and activity of the revolutionary movement of the 'Fourth Philosophy' probably affects Paul's polemic against the Christian Jews who would try to persuade Gentile converts to live under the Law. In Paul's view, the obligation to observe the entire Law is a reason to separate such a person from faith in Christ (Gal 5:2-6).

Jerusalem nevertheless continues to have a place in Paul's theology. In Galatians 4:26 Paul writes: "but the Jerusalem above is free, and she is our mother". After a quotation from Isaiah 54:1 by way of a proof-text in Gal 4:27, Paul stresses the patrilineal descent as 'children of promise', *κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα*, in Gal 4:28. With this he returns to the beginning of the allegory about the two sons of Abraham in Gal 4:22. The allegory of the two sons of Abraham comprises a warning against those who would judge Gentile converts as lawless from the point of view of the Jewish Law.

Paul's former life in Judaism, which led him to persecution of the church, serves as an implicit example for this warning. Paul applies this warning of persecution even to his reading of the biblical story in Gal 4:29-30. He refers to the rivalry between the two sons of Abraham in Gal 4:29: "but as at that time he who was born according to the flesh *persecuted* (*ἔδίωκεν*) him who was born according to the Spirit". Paul quotes from Genesis 21:10 in Galatians 4:30. Genesis 21, however, does not comprise any allusions to the persecution of one son of Abraham by the other. Paul, in his allegorical reading, refers to the contemporary predicament of two gospels, that of Paul and that of his opponents (cf. Gal 1:6-9), which cannot both be the true gospel.

On two levels, Paul's reading of 'persecution' in Gal 4:29 is related to his exhortation against those who, unsettled by negative judgement, would want to be under the Law. First, Paul's own persecution of the church in his former life in Judaism serves as an implicit example of loss for the sake of Christ. The context of the persecution appears to be connected to pressures toward the end that Hebrews and Hellenists, and Jews and Gentiles, were either both to live under the Law or to be kept separated. Paul implicitly refers to his own past road of destruction as a former persecutor, and to the fact that he had been saved by his calling to faith in Christ. Like the one 'born according to the flesh' in Gal 4:29, Paul himself had been born a Jew, 'according to the flesh', as he makes extensively clear in Phil 3:5-6. Moreover, in his 'former life in Judaism' he persecuted the church, which Paul later embraced as a church of converts both Jewish and Gentile. Paul's calling as an apostle also had consequences for his idea about his own life as 'set apart by God before he had been born' (*ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου*).

Secondly, Paul criticises his opponents. In Gal 5:11, Paul argues that he is now persecuted himself for not preaching the circumcision but the stumbling block of the cross. Paul's gospel is according to the Spirit (Gal 5:5). His polemic against his opponents, other Christian Jewish missionaries, is also expressed in Paul's reading in Gal 4:29 of the biblical story of rivalry between the two sons of Abraham. In the life according to the Spirit, Jerusalem continues to have a spiritual significance in Paul's theology as the 'heavenly

Jerusalem'. This is, however, another indication that Jerusalem had been a place of importance already for Paul in his 'former life in Judaism'.

In the above reading of Gal 4:21-31, I have suggested a link between Paul's allusion to the persecution of the church and the contrast between the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem. This link may suggest the very different place Jerusalem had in Paul's previous life in Judaism and in his mission as an apostle of the faith in Christ.

4.4 Contemporary Jewish evidence about the location of Pharisaic education

In their elaboration of divergent views on the place of Paul's former life as a Pharisee, scholars have brought different literary and historical evidence into the discussion. J. Murphy-O'Connor, arguing in favour of Paul's prior schooling in Jerusalem as a Pharisee, has convincingly shown that Paul's birthplace, Tarsus of Cilicia, cannot have had a Pharisaic school of study of the Law at the time.⁹⁶ Knox's argument, which presents an alternative to locating Paul's prior Pharisaic schooling in Jerusalem, is problematic. The schools of rabbinic theology, which according to Knox made Paul's previous education accessible in any 'well-established Jewish community',⁹⁷ were founded only later, in the Tannaitic era after 70 CE. Possible precursors in the Second Temple period, according to a consensus in rabbinic scholarship, were not directly comparable in organisation to the rabbinic school system⁹⁸. Thus, the projection of the rabbinic evidence about schooling back onto the pre-70 period entails a serious problem of anachronism.

Knox's view that Paul received his Pharisaic education can be challenged. While there are many literary references to Pharisaic study of the Law in Jerusalem,⁹⁹ there is no literary, historical or epigraphic evidence about a Pharisaic school or Pharisaic study of the Law in Damascus.¹⁰⁰ Although Damascus had a sizeable Jewish community with several synagogues,¹⁰¹ Jewish education must have been exposed to the Hellenising influence of a pagan environment to a larger extent than schools with an influx of Hellenistic Jewish influence in Israel proper. Moreover, Josephus' account of Herod's building programme, including a theatre and a gymnasium granted to Damascus (*J.W.* 1.422),¹⁰² suggests that the Jewish community in Damascus had a predominantly Hellenistic environment. Damascus is mentioned twice by Paul in his Letters (2 Cor 11:32; Gal 1:17), in both cases in the context of

⁹⁶ Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life* (Oxford, 1996) 52-70 at 53-54. Cf. 52 n.1 quoting Strabo, *Geography* 14.5.13, Murphy-O'Connor shows how unlikely it is that schooling in Tarsus, beyond study of rhetoric, would also comprise the Pharisaic study of Jewish Law and ancestral traditions in particular (cf. Gal 1:14).

⁹⁷ Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, 35-40.

⁹⁸ Cf. H.L. Strack & G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (transl. and ed. by M. Bockmuehl; Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1992) 8-10.

⁹⁹ Cf. Murphy-O'Connor's discussion of passages from the gospels, Josephus and rabbinic literature in his chapter, 'A Pharisee in Jerusalem', in idem, *Paul. A Critical Life* (1996), 52-70.

¹⁰⁰ E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People* II, 127-130 on 'Damascus'. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 68, rather points to Syrian Jews' religious orientation to and relations with Jerusalem.

¹⁰¹ Josephus, *J.W.* 2.561 and 7.368; Acts 9:2; cf. Acts 9:22 τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν Δαμασκῷ, indicative of a settled Jewish community (not immigrants, for that would be μετοικοῦντας).

¹⁰² In Josephus' account of king Herod (37-4 BCE) as benefactor to cities, in *J.W.* 1.401-428, Jerusalem is mentioned first of all in regard to his architectural expansion of the Temple with colonnades (§ 401), while Damascus is included among other cities, like Tripolis, Ptolemais and Sidon, which benefited from Herod's prestigious building program of public works, which included Hellenistic institutions.

the early years of his gospel mission. The basic idea of the narrative in Acts 9:1-30, which situates Paul's conversion and eventual acceptance by certain Christian Jews from the Christian congregation in Damascus, does not appear to clash with Paul's references to Damascus. Damascus is undeniably important for a biography of Paul's early years after his calling as apostle, but the significance of Damascus for adherents of the Pharisaic teachings remains doubtful.

Contemporary Jewish evidence from the works of Josephus appears to confirm the importance of Jerusalem as a main centre of Torah scholarship in the pre-70 CE period. Josephus personally studied the Law according to the interpretation and practical application of the Pharisees for many years.¹⁰³ As Josephus' knowledge of the Pharisees is related to his own study in Jerusalem, it is less likely that Pharisaic schools of study of the Law could have been numerous beyond Jerusalem and Judaea. There is only extensive evidence, in Josephus' works as well as early rabbinic literature, of Pharisaic study of the Law in and Pharisees originating from Jerusalem.¹⁰⁴ The prominent and leading Pharisees, οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων γνωρίμοι and οἱ πρότοι τῶν Φαρισαίων in the *Jewish War* 2.411 and the *Life* 21 respectively, were in Josephus' view to be found in Jerusalem. Jerusalem was the city where one could find a large concentration of schools for the study and exposition of the Torah before 70 CE.¹⁰⁵ On the basis of this circumstantial evidence, the idea of Pharisaic study in Jerusalem as a background to Paul's previous life in Judaism is supported by external sources. The evidence gives credibility to the idea that Paul's previous Pharisaic study of the Law can be situated in Jerusalem.

5. Summary

Reading Paul's Letters from the point of view of a reconstruction of Paul's social world, we may conclude that the place of Jewish traditions in the congregations in Christ was by itself an issue of discussion and polemic between Paul and his fellow missionaries and rival missionaries. The rhetorical context of exhortation and polemic determines the way in which Paul writes about his Pharisaic past in the one passage which mentions this fact: Philippians 3:5-6. Nevertheless, Jewish traditions did have an important place in Paul's Letters, as becomes clear from Paul's eloquent knowledge of Scripture, analogies with contemporary Jewish epistolography, and his identification with the Israelites.

In situating Paul's prior life as a Pharisee against the background of information from Jewish sources about the Pharisees, a clearer view on Paul's previous life in Judaism emerges. This way of life as a Pharisee must be understood in the paideutic context of religious

¹⁰³ *J.W.* 2.162; *Life* 12. Cf. *Life* 1, 7 in which Josephus writes that his family descent can be traced back to priestly ancestors and that he was born and brought up in Jerusalem. Therefore his 'return to the city', εἰς τὴν πόλιν ὑπέστρεφον (§ 12), that is, Jerusalem as his home cannot be compared to Paul's case, who had been born in Tarsus, in a more Hellenised environment, identifying himself as 'Jew by birth and not a Gentile sinner' (Gal 2:15). Jerusalem was not Paul's home by birth and had got a transformed meaning for Paul after his calling as apostle, while Damascus was home for congregational support to his apostolic mission.

¹⁰⁴ *Life* 10, 12, 21, 191; *m. Yadayim* 4:6; *b. Baba Batra* 60 (about Pharisees and food laws related to the Temple cult). Cf. S. Safrai, 'Education and the Study of the Torah', in Safrai & Stern (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century II* (Van Gorcum: Assen / Amsterdam, 1976) 946-947; Jeremias, 'The Pharisees', in idem, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 247-251. See also Safrai, 'The Role of the Jerusalem Elite', 65-72 at 67: "theologically speaking, Jerusalem was considered the source and 'home' of wisdom, and it was only natural that therefore anyone who wanted to study Torah had to come to Jerusalem and live there".

¹⁰⁵ For evidence concerning the concentration of Pharisaic schooling in Jerusalem, see Josephus, *Life* 12, 21, 191, 197-198; Safrai, 'Education and the Study of the Torah', 945-970 at 946-947 on Rabbinic tradition about pre-70 CE Jerusalem.

Paul's previous life in Judaism

education. The traditions which were taught and transmitted by the Pharisees were linked with the geography of the land of Israel.

The silence in Paul's letters about the location of his previous Pharisaic education constitutes a serious problem. Nevertheless, certain indications about the social geography of Paul's previous life in Judaism can be inferred from the interpretation of relevant passages in Paul's Letter to the Galatians. Circumstantial evidence from Josephus and early rabbinic literature endorses the probability that Paul's prior Pharisaic education took place in Jerusalem.

The location of Paul's Pharisaic education in Jerusalem has consequences for our understanding of Paul. It opens up the possibility that Paul may have been exposed to the pluriform influence of traditions circulating in Jerusalemite circles. Paul's past as a Hebrew born of Hebrews, and educated in Jerusalem, further implies connections with Palestinian Jewish culture. It is therefore inadequate to suppose that Hellenistic Diaspora Judaism constitutes the predominant background to Paul's previous Jewish life. This supposition unjustifiably disregards Paul's relation to Palestinian Jewish culture.

CHAPTER 5

PAUL AND THE CONTEMPORARY JEWISH CULTURE OF SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETATION

1. The literary context of temple imagery in Paul's Letters and contemporary Judaism

This chapter will survey the literary context of Jewish scriptural culture contemporary to Paul which may help to understand Paul's relation to Judaism. My historical approach to Paul's cultic imagery takes the possibility of connections with contemporary Jewish ideas about the Temple and cultic worship into account. Jewish ideas about the Temple and its cult were related to the literary context of Scripture. Paul's metaphor of the Temple presents a theological idea. Although the image of a physical Temple of God goes back to the historical reality of the Temple cult, the metaphor of God's Temple may be linked with the broader Israelite tradition of the worship of the one God. Both in Paul's Letters and in contemporary Jewish literature, Scripture as authority is implicitly or explicitly quoted as proof-text in passages with temple imagery. Cultic and theological dimensions of centralised worship are reflected in Scripture and in later exegetical traditions. The comparison between Paul's temple imagery and contemporary Jewish temple theology therefore needs to take the presence and function of Scripture into account.

The literature of Qumran provides the most explicit analogy to Paul's temple imagery with regard to the interaction between temple theology and the use of Scripture.¹ Explicit quotations from Scripture figure in 2 Cor 6:16c-18; a passage which follows the metaphor of the Temple in 2 Cor 6:16b.² Echoes of Scripture may also be discerned in some passages in the First Letter to the Corinthians which comprise cultic imagery.³ With regard to the literature of Qumran, one of the most important texts concerning the image of an eschatological Temple, the *Eschatological Midrash* (4Q174), contains a whole string of quotations from Scripture. In other important texts concerning temple theology in Qumran, like 4QMMT, the *Rule of the Community*, the *Damascus Document* and the *Temple Scroll*, Scripture is cited in the direct context of passages about the Temple and purity regulations.

The contemporary culture of scriptural interpretation plays an important role, not only in a comparison of ideas conveyed by Pauline and early Jewish temple imagery respectively, but also in a reconstruction of the mediation of common Palestinian Jewish values and ideas. The search for the influence of Jewish traditions underlying Paul's temple imagery can best be performed against the background of the contemporary Jewish culture of scriptural interpretation.

¹ In apocrypha, such as the Wisdom of Solomon 9:8, and the Hellenistic Jewish works of Flavius Josephus and Philo, the presence of temple imagery rather applies to the relation between the earthly, physical Temple and the heavenly Temple, the universe or creation, than to a specific religious congregation or sect.

² Cf. M.C. Albl, "And Scripture cannot be broken": *The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections* (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1999) 177-178, terms 2 Cor 6:16-7:1 "a Temple Testimonia Collection".

³ Cf. H.H. Drake Williams, III, *The Wisdom of the Wise. The Presence and Function of Scripture within 1 Cor. 1:18-3:23* (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 2001) 257-300 at 258-268 discussing the presence of Scripture in 1 Cor 3:10-17. As for 1 Cor 6:19, which comprises the metaphor of the body as Temple, the quotation from Gen 2:24 in 1 Cor 6:16 may be noted, and the formal parallel between 1 Cor 6:16 and 1 Cor 6:19 which serves as contrast. To 1 Cor 9:13 compare Num 18:8.31, and to 1 Cor 10:18 compare Lev 7:6.15.

My study of the contemporary Jewish scriptural culture will deal with the first-century CE synagogue, and the Palestinian Jewish synagogue in particular. I will discuss the importance of the synagogue as a place of reading and interpretation of Scripture, and a site of didactic interaction between the Pharisees and the Jewish people for the Jewish scriptural culture contemporary to Paul. On the basis of this socio-religious setting, I will focus on the diversity of languages of Scripture (Hebrew, Aramaic Targum and Greek translation). My survey aims to demonstrate that the diversity of languages of Scripture was part and parcel of the scriptural culture which lies at the basis of Paul's use of Scripture. Finally, attention will be focused on methods of biblical interpretation shared by Paul and contemporary Jewish exegetes. This literary context and socio-religious setting to contemporary Jewish scriptural interpretation will underpin the comparative analysis of Paul's cultic imagery.

2. Synagogal culture and scriptural reading

2.1 The diversity of first-century CE synagogues and synagogal culture

My survey of the diversity of first-century CE synagogues will not present a complete or exhaustive overview,⁴ but rather focuses on certain differences between synagogues in the Hellenistic diaspora and Palestinian Jewish synagogues. These differences may be deduced from literary and historical sources. This survey will mainly concern the regions which can be related to the activities of Paul, as a former Pharisee and as an apostle of the Christian faith.⁵ Through a reconstruction of the diversity of first-century CE synagogues we can get a sense of the differentiation within synagogal culture and an idea about the kind of culture to which Paul, in his previous way of life as a Pharisee, was affiliated.

2.1.1 The context of the Hellenistic environment in the diaspora

In his *Jewish Antiquities*, Flavius Josephus refers to places of Jewish religious assembly in the context of his quotation of decrees written from the Hellenistic and early Roman legal perspectives. For instance, a decree from the time of Julius Caesar's rule addresses the magistrates, council and people of Parium to give Roman support to the appeal by the Jews in Delos and neighbouring Jews. This decree mentions the protected status of the 'religious societies', θιάσοι, of the Jews (*Ant.* 14.213-216). Such 'religious societies' provided the social setting for customary Jewish gatherings and special occasions of religious festivals, κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ἔθη καὶ νόμιμα συνάγεσθαι τε καὶ ἐστιᾶσθαι (*Ant.* 14.216). The language of this decree expresses the pagan context of the Hellenistic environment. For the very terms θιάσος and ἐστιᾶσθαι could easily be associated with a company devoted to a mystery cult and to the banqueting near a shrine of household gods respectively. Thus, a pagan Hellenistic culture invests the very language which describes the protected status of Jewish customs in a Hellenistic city.

⁴ See for a recent overview, L.I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue. The First Thousand Years* (Yale University Press: New Haven & London, 2000) and Binder, *Into the Temple Courts*, with 'Select Bibliography' (501-566). Cf. H. Bloedhorn and G. Hüttenmeister, 'The synagogue', in *CHJ III The early Roman period*, 267-297; S. Fine (ed.), *Sacred Realm: The Emergence of the Synagogue in the Ancient World* (New York and Oxford, 1996); D. Urman and P.V.M. Fleisher (eds.), *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery* 2 vols. (Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1995); L.I. Levine (ed.), *Ancient Synagogues Revealed* (Jerusalem, 1981); E. Schürer, 'School and Synagogue', in idem, *The History of the Jewish People* II, 423-453.

⁵ My survey of synagogal culture only provides a partial picture; cf. Binder, *Into the Temple Courts*, 227-341 for a survey of 'Diaspora Synagogues' including also Egypt, Cyrenaica, Cyprus, and the Bosphorus Kingdom.

The expression “according to the ancestral customs and statutes”, κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ἔθη καὶ νόμιμα, identifies the protected activities as Jewish. This element of legitimisation by Jewish laws and statutes recurs in other decrees cited by Josephus.⁶ The decree concerning Parium provides an interesting comparison with the Jews in Rome with regard to the protected status of Jewish customs and the contributions of money for common meals, σύνδειπνα, and sacred rites, ἱερά, in the cases of both Parium and Rome (*Ant.* 14.214).

2.1.2 Greece and Asia Minor

Josephus also informs us about places of congregation, so-called ‘prayer-houses’, προσευχαί, in the context of a decree concerning the Jews in Halicarnassus, a city in Asia-Minor. These prayer-houses are mentioned along with the protected status of the observance of the Sabbaths and the performance of the sacred rites in accordance with the Jewish laws.⁷ As other decrees also mention the observance of Sabbaths (e.g. *Ant.* 14.245-246, 264), it may be assumed that prayer-houses or synagogues were the places of congregation for the Sabbath.⁸

The presence of Jewish synagogues in Greece and Asia-Minor is explicitly mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles concerning the cities Antioch of Pisidia (Acts 13:15f.), Iconium (Acts 14:1), Thessalonica (Acts 17:1), Beroea (Acts 17:10), Athens (Acts 17:17), Corinth (Acts 18:4) and Ephesus (Acts 18:19). It could be that the presence of a synagogue is presupposed in decrees which stipulate the protected status of Jewish customs in other cities, but there is no certainty about this. At least, sacred rites would probably need to be performed in a less profane setting than for example a market-place or a political forum.⁹

2.1.3 Syria

In the case of major cities in Syria, relationships with Israel, the neighbouring heartland of the Jewish religion of the Second Temple period, could perhaps imply a more cohesive influence of Palestinian Jewish traditions as opposed to Hellenising tendencies. This is at least suggested by the evidence of Acts concerning the relationships between Christian Jews from Jerusalem and Christian missionaries in Antioch (Acts 15), and concerning Damascus (Acts 9:1-2). Even though Luke’s picture of the central place of the Jerusalem ‘Urgemeinde’ in the book of Acts may contain legendary elements, influential ties between the leaders of the Jerusalem church and Christian Jews in Antioch are also presupposed by Paul in his account of events in Gal 2:1-14. In the case of Damascus, Acts 9:2 mention the presence of synagogues, συναγωγαί. Josephus informs us about a synagogue, συναγωγή, in Antioch of Syria (*J.W.* 7.44).

In his *Jewish War* Josephus also writes that the Jewish community of Antioch displayed a strong commitment to the Jerusalem Temple through various gifts and offerings. Another remarkable feature is that Antiochian Jews interested many Greeks, that is, Gentiles,

⁶ E.g. *Ant.* 14.225-227 (Ephesus), 235 (Sardis), 241-243 (Laodicea), 244-246 (Miletus), 256-258 (Halicarnassus), 259-261 (Sardis), 262-264 (Ephesus).

⁷ *Ant.* 14.256-258, there 258 δεδόχθαι καὶ ἡμῖν Ἰουδαίων τοὺς βουλομένους ἄνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας τὰ τε σάββατα ἄγειν καὶ τὰ ἱερά συντελεῖν κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαϊκοὺς [Ἰουδαίων PF] νόμους, καὶ τὰς προσευχὰς ποιῆσθαι πρὸς τῇ θαλάττῃ κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔθος.

⁸ Concerning προσευχή and συναγωγή, see BDAG, 878-888 under the lemma ‘προσευχή’: “Esp. used among Jews, this word is nearly always equivalent to συναγωγή in the sense of a cultic place”.

⁹ About common meals, σύνδειπνα, cf. the negative precaution in LXX Proverbs 23:6 μὴ συνδείπνει ἀνδρὶ βασιλῆως μηδὲ ἐπιθύμει τῶν βρωμάτων αὐτοῦ. Concerning the gathering place for Jewish affairs as a separate ‘place of their own’ (τόπον ἴδιον), see e.g. Josephus, *Ant.* 14.235, 261 (both about Sardis).

for their religion and included them into their community according to Josephus (*J.W.* 7.45). This information about the open attitude of the Antiochian Jewish community provides an important context for the Christian Jewish mission at Antioch. We also know from Josephus' works that Jewish communities in Syria were numerous, but that Antioch, of all cities in Syria, had the most sizeable Jewish community.¹⁰

2.1.4 Differences between the Syro-Palestinian situation and the Hellenistic Diaspora

Palestinian-Jewish traditions were influential among Jews in Syria, and Aramaic was a spoken language there in the first century CE.¹¹ Because of this, the synagogal culture of the Jews in these regions may have been quite different from the synagogal culture in a less bilingual, more exclusively Hellenistic environment. Thus, in spite of the gradational difference concerning the influence of Hellenistic culture, there must have been a marked difference with regard to the influence of Palestinian Jewish traditions and Semitic languages between Jewish communities in the Hellenistic diaspora and the Syro-Palestinian regions.

Consequently, the synagogal culture may have also been influenced by the language and culture of the Jewish communities and their direct environment. In an exclusively Hellenistic environment, the Greek language may have been predominant, and in a more bilingual environment, Hebrew and Aramaic may have been important for social life and synagogal liturgy to a lesser or greater extent.

The shifting role of Greek and Semitic languages in synagogal liturgy, depending on the language and culture of the congregation, is confirmed in early rabbinic literature¹² and in scholarly literature.¹³ Studies of Jewish inscriptions, synagogal inscriptions in particular, also exhibit this differentiation within synagogal culture between Hellenistic Jewish synagogues and certain synagogues in the Syro-Palestinian regions which were more oriented toward Semitic language and culture.¹⁴

Margaret Williams has pointed to certain differences between inscriptions relating to diaspora Judaism and Palestinian Judaism respectively, in her article on "the contribution of inscriptions to the study of Judaism". According to her analysis, the inscriptions connected to Diaspora Judaism give, among other things, expression to compromises to Graeco-Roman

¹⁰ *J.W.* 7.43 Τὸ γὰρ Ἰουδαίων γένος πολὺ μὲν κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην παρέσπαρται τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις, πλεῖστον δὲ τῇ Συρίᾳ κατὰ τὴν γειτνίασιν ἀναμειγμένον ἑξαιρέτως [δὲ AVRC] ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἦν πολὺ διὰ τὸ τῆς πόλεως μέγεθος.

¹¹ See J.A. Fitzmyer, 'The Phases of the Aramaic Language', in idem, *A Wandering Aramaean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Scholars Press, 1979) 57-84 at 61-62, categorising the dialects of Syria and Mesopotamia among 'Middle Aramaic'. Note also that the Greek term for speaking 'in Aramaic' is Συριστί, both in the Septuagint, translating the biblical Hebrew מִרְרָא, in 2 Kgs 18:26, 2 Esd 4:7, Isa 36:11, Dan 2:4, and in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 10.8. Cf. *Ant.* 1.144 Ἀραμαίους δὲ Ἄραμος ἔσχεν, οὗς Ἕλληνες Σύρους προσσγορεύουσι.

¹² E.g. *m. Meg.* 2:1 (translation H. Danby, *The Mishnah*, 203): "If he read it [the Scroll] by heart, or if he read it in Aramaic or in any other language, he has not fulfilled his obligation. But it may be read in a foreign tongue to them that speak a foreign tongue".

¹³ Cf. S.C. Reif, 'The early liturgy of the synagogue', in *CHJ III The early Roman period, 326-357* at 344: "It was inevitable that the Diaspora synagogue would have a large number of members that preferred Greek to Hebrew and that, even in Judaea, Aramaic would be regarded as the more popular tongue in certain areas".

¹⁴ M. Williams, 'The contribution of Jewish inscriptions to the study of Judaism', in *CHJ III The early Roman period* (1999), 75-93 at 76-77: "Most of the inscriptions, whatever their provenance, are written in Greek. Hebrew and Aramaic texts, though found in fair numbers in Judaea/Palestine and especially Jerusalem, occur but rarely in the Diaspora"; about synagogal inscriptions, cf. Bloedhorn and Hüttenmeister, 'The synagogue', in *Ibidem*, 267-297 at 281: "Normally they are in Greek and Aramaic, and occasionally in Hebrew, while a few are bilingual".

culture, whereas many inscriptions relating to Palestinian Judaism voice a Palestinian-Jewish commitment to the Temple service and priesthood, the Law and statutes.¹⁵ Thus, the differentiation does not only concern language, but probably also the degree of cultural commitment to the Jerusalem Temple cult and purity regulations. The issue of Palestinian-Jewish commitment to the Temple service and priesthood is important in relation to Paul in view of his previous Pharisaic education in Jerusalem.

2.1.5 Synagogues in Israel

a. Synagogues of the people

The synagogues in Israel were located in various cities and villages across Galilee and Judaea. Literary references to Palestinian synagogues occur in Philo, Josephus, Rabbinic Literature and the New Testament. A survey of various synagogues in Galilee and in Judaea, which includes identifications from recent archaeological finds, has been given by Lee I. Levine.¹⁶

In the Palestinian synagogal culture, Jerusalem was the place where members of synagogues from various regions could meet each other and interact. Jerusalem was frequented by foreign visitors especially during the religious festivals, of which the celebration was centered around the Jerusalem Temple. Acts 6:9 mention a great number of Jerusalemite synagogues for congregations of Jews from the Hellenistic Diaspora.¹⁷ The author of Acts named the synagogues according to the region from which the congregation members came. These regions are Cyrene, Alexandria, Cilicia and Asia, of which Cilicia is of special interest to us. The synagogue of Cilicia, ἡ συναγωγή τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας, probably received pilgrims also from Tarsus.¹⁸ According to Acts 22:3, Tarsus is the birthplace of Paul. Acts 6:9, however, also refer to a congregation determined by social class rather than by place of origin, namely the synagogue of the freedmen, ἡ συναγωγή τῶν Λιβερτίνων.

b. Essene synagogues

The issue of the names given to various synagogues brings us to our last point in this survey of the diversity of first-century CE synagogues: sectarian synagogues. Philo of Alexandria mentions the existence of separate synagogues of the Essenes (*Good Person* 81-82). Philo also writes in two places of his works about the dwelling places of the Essenes, from which we may conclude that their settlements were most of all concentrated in Judaea.¹⁹ Philo's mentioning of Essene synagogues is the most evident literary reference, but it is not the only clue we have about sectarian synagogues. In recent scholarly discussion concerning the literature of Qumran, the 'house of prostration', בית השתחות, in the *Damascus Document*

¹⁵ Williams, 'The contribution of Jewish inscriptions to the study of Judaism', 82-83 and 88-89.

¹⁶ Levine, 'Pre-70 Judaea', in idem, *The Ancient Synagogue*, 42-73 discusses, among other places, Nazareth, Capernaum, Tiberias in Galilee; Jerusalem, Masada, Herodium, Qumran in Judaea; and Dor, Caesarea and Qiryat Sefer in the coastal and Shephelah regions. Cf. Binder, *Into the Temple Courts*, 155-204 for a survey of 'Palestinian Synagogues', in Gamla, Masada, Herodium, Capernaum, Magdala, Shuafat, Kiryat Sefer, and Chorazin.

¹⁷ Cf. Bloedhorn and Hüttenmeister, 'The synagogue', 292-293 on the plurality of synagogues in larger towns.

¹⁸ Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 65-66 discusses related passages in rabbinic literature and archaeological finds which could pertain to the so-called synagogue of the Tarsians, i.e. Cilicians.

¹⁹ In *Good Person* 75 Philo mentions ἡ Παλαιστίνη Συρία in general, but this is in geographical contrast to the foregoing survey, §§ 72-74, where he writes about Greece, Persia and India. In *Hypothetica* 11.1, Philo refers to Essene settlements in many cities of Judaea as well as in many villages, grouped in societies of many members.

(CD-A XI, 22), has been interpreted as a title for a sectarian synagogue.²⁰ The existence of sectarian synagogues in the late Second Temple period is a Palestinian Jewish phenomenon, mainly concentrated in Judaea. The concentration of various kinds of synagogues in Jerusalem and Judaea, among which were those of the Essenes, constitutes a marked difference with synagogal culture in the Hellenistic Diaspora.

Josephus' account of his personal experience with the movements of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes through schooling in Jerusalem (*Life* 7-12) shows that the influence of a composite religious culture on an individual Jew was not uncommon. Josephus even writes that the chief priests (οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς) and the leading men of the city (οἱ τῆς πόλεως πρῶτοι) came to receive the more accurate information from him about some particular in the statutes, ὑπὲρ τοῦ παρ' ἐμοῦ περὶ τῶν νομίμων ἀκριβέστερόν τι γινῶναι (*Life* 9). In this, Josephus was probably among the relatively few of outstanding learning and knowledge of the statutes. Josephus' information, however, reinforces the idea of versatility in contemporary debates between Jewish schools about legal issues and other traditions in Scripture. Theological views, which were developed in Jewish schools through study and debate about scriptural interpretation, may also have found their way into the scriptural culture of Palestinian synagogues.

According to Philo, the Essenes regarded their places of worship, which they called synagogues, οἱ καλοῦνται συναγωγαί, as holy places, ἱεροὶ τόποι (*Good Person* 81). This holiness ascribed to Essene synagogues is telling in view of Essene exclusion from the regular Temple cult (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 18.19). By contrast, in Acts 6:13 the Jerusalem Temple is referred to with the words ὁ τόπος ὁ ἅγιος [οὗτος], that is, holy place in the *singular*. Josephus further notes that the Essenes had their own priests to prepare food for them (*Ant.* 18.22). It could be inferred from the combined evidence of Philo (*Good Person* 81) and Josephus (*J.W.* 1.129; *Ant.* 18.19, 22) that, for the Essenes, the holiness of the Temple was in a way conferred on their religious community. The Essenes were barred from participation in the regular Temple cult due to their divergent views on purification rites.

2.2 The liturgy of first-century CE synagogues

2.2.1 Commonalities according to the literary sources

Within the contemporary Jewish culture of scriptural interpretation, the first-century CE synagogue was an important place for the reading and interpretation of Scripture. Flavius Josephus mentions the Jewish custom of assembling every Sabbath to listen to the Law (*Ag.Ap.* 2.175).²¹ The oral element of listening to the Law, ἡ ἀκρόασις τοῦ νόμου, presupposes that the Law was read aloud by certain persons in front of a Jewish congregation.

The impression of liturgical readings from Scripture in the synagogues is corroborated by evidence from the New Testament, not only concerning the Hellenistic Diaspora but also with regard to Israel itself. According to Acts 13:15, the synagogal reading of Scripture comprised the Law and the Prophets, ἡ ἀνάγνωσις τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. The reading of Scripture mentioned in Acts 13:15, reportedly took place in the synagogue of Antioch of Pisidia, in the Hellenistic Diaspora. The consecutive readings from the Law and

²⁰ Steudel, 'The Houses of Prostration CD XI, 21 – XII, 1', 49-68. Cf. L.I. Levine, 'Synagogues', in L.H. Schiffman & J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls II* (Oxford University Press: Oxford & New York, 2000) 905-908.

²¹ *Ag.Ap.* 2.175 ἐκάστης ἑβδομάδος τῶν ἄλλων ἔργων ἀφεμένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόασιν ἐκέλευσε τοῦ νόμου συλλέγεσθαι καὶ τοῦτον ἀκριβῶς ἐκμανθάνειν.

from the Prophets constituted a liturgical practice which is also found in early rabbinic literature.²² Thus, we can get a general sense of the liturgy of scriptural readings in the first-century CE synagogue on the basis of evidence from Josephus' works, the Acts of the Apostles and early rabbinic literature.

According to the picture of synagogal liturgy in Acts 13:15, readings from the Law and the Prophets could be followed by a sermon or inspired words, based on the exposition of Scripture. This sermon, to be held by men learned in the study of the Scriptures, would consist of words of exhortation and encouragement, παράκλησις (Acts 13:15). Παράκλησις is a general term, but it usually has a connotation of appeal and exhortation. There appears to be no direct parallel for this part of synagogal liturgy, as portrayed by the author of Acts, in contemporary Jewish literature. The term παράκλησις as encouragement is, however, a quality attributed to the 'holy books', τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἅγια, that is, Scripture, in 1 Macc 12:9. Thus, a dimension of encouragement is implied in the reading and interpretation of Scripture. Interestingly, Paul also alludes to this dimension of encouragement from Scripture when he addresses his readers in his Letter to the Romans. In Rom 15:4 Paul writes the following about the instruction, διδασκαλία, and encouragement, παρακλήσις, from Scripture: "For whatever was written before, was written for our instruction, in order that by steadfastness and by encouragement of the scriptures we may have hope".²³

At least, some form of exposition of Scripture was probably part of synagogal liturgy. The exposition of Scripture constitutes something more than the act of interpreting or translating (םגר) Hebrew scriptures into Aramaic, which is mentioned in early rabbinic literature (e.g. *m. Meg.* 4:4.6). The oral translation in Aramaic followed the readings of portions of Scripture in the Hebrew original. Nevertheless, Aramaic versions of biblical books from fragments in the literature of Qumran and from rabbinic literature play an important role in ancient biblical interpretation in Palestinian Jewish culture. I will deal with this question more extensively in the subsequent section on the languages of Scripture. The issue of textual and interpretative aspects to Aramaic translation of Scripture is, of course, most important for the study of the Palestinian Jewish culture of scriptural interpretation. In synagogues in the Hellenistic Diaspora, the established Greek translation, the Septuagint, probably provided the main model of the biblical text.

One other aspect of synagogal culture in the late Second Temple period needs to be mentioned here. This aspect concerns the cultic and ritual parts of synagogal liturgy, which may have been related to scriptural culture in certain ways. Josephus mentions 'ancestral prayers and sacrifices to God', αἱ πάτριαι εὐχαὶ καὶ θυσίαι τῷ θεῷ, when a decree of the people of Sardis is cited (*Ant.* 14.260). Probably, the term προσευχή for synagogue was also connected to this aspect of synagogal liturgy. The combination of prayers and ritual offerings to God as ancestral customs is typical of the Second Temple period. After the destruction of the Temple, the Rabbis transformed the liturgical setting of Jewish worship.²⁴

Ritual offerings and gifts of money for the Jerusalem Temple service were apparently a part of the contemporary synagogal culture. The issue of sacrifices is also mentioned in a letter to Ephesus, cited by Josephus in his *Jewish Antiquities* 14.227. Such 'sacrifices' were probably (votive) offerings destined for the Jerusalem temple cult, because the native rites, which probably concerned sacrifice, are specified as 'produce', οἱ καρποί, in the case of a

²² E.g. *m. Roš Haš.* 4:6 (transl. H. Danby, *The Mishnah*, 193): "They begin with [verses from] the Law and end with [verses from] the Prophets"; cf. *m. Meg.* 4:1-5.

²³ ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη, ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν.

²⁴ For a recent overview of the history of synagogal worship and its relations to Scripture, see S.C. Reif, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer. New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History* (Cambridge UP: Cambridge, 1993) 22-87.

letter concerning Miletus (*Ant.* 14.245). Regulations for ritual offerings figure in the Pentateuch. On the other hand, offerings in a figurative sense are mentioned in the books of Psalms and Proverbs, as well as in the Prophets. The synagogal liturgy in the Diaspora was related to the Temple service through the contributions of money and the offerings. Purity laws probably regulated common meals in Jewish congregations, for one decree addresses the issue of 'suitable food', τροφή ἐπιτήδεια, (*Ant.* 14.261).

The scriptural culture of the late Second Temple period, in Israel as well as in the Diaspora, had its socio-religious setting in the gathering of Jewish congregations in synagogues and in pilgrimage to the Jerusalem Temple at the occasion of religious festivals. The reading and interpretation of Scripture and the involvement in ritual and cultic matters took place on a regular basis within the synagogal culture of Paul's time.

2.2.2 Scriptural reading and interpretation in a sectarian context

a. Practices of the Essenes

The Essene synagogues had a developed liturgy. The reading and exposition of Scripture took place in these synagogues on the sabbath, and the exposition of things not understood was entrusted to those of special proficiency, οἱ ἐμπειροτάτοι (*Good Person* 82). Philo attributes elements of philosophy and allegory to the Essene study of Scripture; an attribution which may be coloured by his comparative Hellenistic perspective.

Josephus, who, from his personal background and experience, was more familiar with the Palestinian Jewish situation, uses the verb θεολογεῖν (*J.W.* 2.158) as a term to describe the traditions of the Essenes. Only at the end of his digression on the main Jewish schools does he use the verb φιλοσοφεῖν (*J.W.* 2.166; cf. *Ant.* 18.25), probably in order to conceptualise ideas to his readers who had a Hellenised viewpoint. While the soul was a central subject of their ideas, the theological views of the Essenes were undoubtedly also related to Scripture. Josephus describes the study of Scripture as a heavy component to the Essene schooling in his *Jewish War* 2.159.

Another reference to the Essene liturgy of scriptural readings occurs in Hippolytus' *Refutation of All Heresies* (*Haer.*), whose account of Jewish sects is often taken to rely on Josephus' digression in the *Jewish War*.²⁵ In *Haer.* IX, 22.2, Hippolytus writes that the Essenes are zealous in readings from the Law and the Prophets, σπουδάζουσι δὲ περὶ τὰς τοῦ νόμου ἀναγνώσεις καὶ προφητῶν.²⁶ Since Hippolytus' text runs partly parallel to Josephus' account, it is interesting that Josephus notes in his digression that the Essenes show an extraordinary interest in the writings of the ancients, σπουδάζουσι δ' ἐκτόπως περὶ τὰ τῶν παλαιῶν συντάγματα, followed by a specifying clause (*J.W.* 2.136). In their extraordinary interest in sacred writings, the Essenes are said to single out matters related to the benefit of soul and body. Hippolytus' text appears to be a more general rendering of the writings comprised in the Essene scriptural readings, and does not go into specific issues.

b. Interrelations between the Essenes and the Qumran community

Synagogal liturgy had a significant place in the Palestinian-Jewish schools. The diversity of languages of Scripture played a lively role even in the secluded context of the Qumran

²⁵ Cf. Smith, 'The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena', 273-313 at 274; Burchard, 'Die Essener bei Hippolyt. Hippolyt, Ref. IX, 18,2-28,2 und Josephus, Bell. 2, 119-161', 1-41.

²⁶ Greek text from M. Marcovich, *Hippolytus. Refutatio omnium haeresium* (Walter de Gruyter: Berlin & New York, 1986) 367; cf. 3 and 7 pointing to deficiencies in the earlier critical edition of P. Wendland of 1916.

community.²⁷ The synagogal liturgy of scriptural reading and interpretation also provided the link with didactic interactions between the Jewish schools and the Jewish people and a context in which Jewish traditions could become widely shared.

Passages about the Essenes in Philo and Josephus and certain texts in the literature of Qumran, suggest that there were interrelations between Essene groups and the Qumran community as well as intersections between the theological views of the Essenes and the Qumranites. First, Josephus differentiates Essene groups by distinguishing two orders of Essenes (*J.W.* 2.120-159, 160-161). Secondly, the divergent accounts by Josephus and Philo of the settlement of the Essenes in large numbers in every town (*J.W.* 2.124) or in villages (*Good Person* 76) respectively²⁸ implies a differentiation within the Essene movement.

The complicated situation of divergent orders and communities among the Essenes may well be reflected in a description of different groups in the *Damascus Document*. This description distinguishes between those living in camps 'according to the rule of the land', כסרך הארץ (CD-A VII, 6) from the 'assembly', הקהל (CD-A VII, 17) and the 'whole congregation', כל העדה (CD-A VII, 20).²⁹ The Qumran community rather lived according to the 'rule for the men of the community', סרך לאנשי היחד (1QS V, 1), whose precepts were to be guarded by the Community council, עצת היחד (1QS VI, 13-16f.). The different rules mentioned in the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule of the Community* respectively provide evidence that the Qumran community's sense of self was opposed to the stratified Jewish culture of Israel.

In the comparison between the Essenes and the Qumran community, it is important to note that the synagogue was also a place of worship for the sectarian Qumran community. Annette Steudel has interpreted the 'house of prostration', בית השתחווה, in CD-A XI, 22 as a sectarian synagogue in connection with בית קודש in column XII, 1.³⁰ This idea of the synagogue as a 'holy house' corresponds well to Philo's reference to the synagogues of the Essenes as holy places (*Good Person* 81). Liturgical texts among the literature of Qumran, such as prayer texts (e.g. *1QFestival Prayers* and *4QDaily Prayers*) further attest to developed forms of worship, which probably existed in a sectarian synagogal context.

Notwithstanding the closed sectarian character of the Qumran community, with its hierarchical grades of membership,³¹ theological views concerning the presence of God in the religious community may have been developed not so much in seclusion but rather in exchange with and counterposition to the Essenes who lived in settlements throughout the land of Israel. In their picture of Palestinian religious culture, Philo and Josephus both write about the enormous impact of Essene thought and practice across sectarian boundary lines.

²⁷ For evidence of Greek translation of Scripture in Palestine, see a.o. the finds of fragments from Qumran Cave 4 of Greek translations mainly of books of the Pentateuch, recently published in P.W. Skehan *et al.* (eds.), *DJD IX Qumran Cave 4. IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Manuscripts* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1992), and Greek papyrus fragments of biblical texts from Cave 7 published by M. Baillet *et al.* (eds.), *DJD III Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân. Exploration de la falaise. Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q. Le rouleau de cuivre* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1962). Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, S.J., 'The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D.', chapter 2 in *idem, A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Scholars Press, 1979) 29-56.

²⁸ According to *Ant.* 18.19, 22, however, the Essenes depended on agricultural work, γεωργία, for making a living, while city-dwellers' occupations could also be in industries, commerce or politics.

²⁹ Cf. the *War Scroll* (1QM III, 11) for one instance of a 'congregation of Jerusalem', העדה ירושלים.

³⁰ Steudel, 'The Houses of Prostration CD XI, 21 – XII, 1', 49-68. Cf. Levine, 'Synagogues', in Schiffman & VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls II*, 905-908.

³¹ 1QS V-VI; cf. Josephus' description of grades of Essenes in *J.W.* 2.150.

Philo calls this sect a 'congregation of Essenes or holy ones' to whose moral goodness other people are inferior.³² Philo's representation of the theology of the Essenes concerning the existence of God and the creation of the universe, in his treatise *That Every Good Person Is Free* 80, is affected by his Hellenised perspective of a tripartite philosophical system of logic, physics and ethics. Nevertheless, at the point of emphasising that the Essenes were concerned only with ethics, Philo writes that these ethics were based on the 'laws of their fathers', *χρόμενοι τοῖς πατρίοις νόμοις*. In other words, the ethics of the Essenes were grounded in Jewish scriptural culture.

Josephus writes in the *Jewish War* 2.158 that the views of the Essenes "bring about an irresistible appeal to those who have once become acquainted through experience with their wisdom". This appeal may have gone beyond strictly sectarian boundary lines.

2.3 Paul and the contemporary synagogal culture

There is hardly any place in his Letters where Paul distinctly describes the synagogue as an institution. However, Paul does implicitly refer to the synagogal reading of Scripture in his Second Letter to the Corinthians 3:15. He alludes to the contemporary synagogal readings from the Torah as follows: "to this day, whenever Moses is read", *ἕως σήμερον ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται Μωϋσῆς*.³³ From the context of the passage, we may conclude that in Paul's view the contemporary synagogal culture is connected to what he calls the 'old covenant' (2 Cor 3:14). In this connection, Paul quotes Exod 34:34 as a proof-text in 2 Cor 3:16. It is important to note that Paul does not force a rupture between the old and the new covenant. On the contrary, he aims to reinforce and fulfil the original context of the old covenant, as it emerges from Exod 34. Paul stresses the direct contact of Moses with God, which he extends to the entire community of believers (2 Cor 3:18), and revelation through the Spirit rather than mediation through a written code (2 Cor 3:6). He describes the fulfilment by the new covenant as a transformation "from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord who is the Spirit" (2 Cor 3:18).³⁴

The 'reading of Moses' in 2 Cor 3:15 expresses a focus on the Law in such a way that the Law of Moses appears as the most important part of Scripture in Jewish liturgy. This emphasis on readings from the Law in synagogal liturgy is comparable with the passage in Josephus' treatise *Against Apion* which mentions the "listening to the Law" (*Ag.Ap.* 2.175). Paul does not refer to the readings from the Prophets, but it is important to note that the Prophets play a crucial role in Paul's christological use of Scripture. Paul writes in Rom 1:1-2 that the gospel was promised beforehand by the prophets in the holy Scriptures. Paul's allusion to the 'reading of Moses' in 2 Cor 3:15 does not necessarily constitute a polemic against synagogal scriptural culture *per se*, as is indicated by his advice to the Corinthians to take his example in not giving offense to Jews, Greeks or the church of God (1 Cor 10:32-33). Even if 2 Cor 3:15 were interpreted as Paul's attempt to distance himself from the Jewish synagogal culture, his reflection on the 'reading of Moses' reveals Paul's acquaintance with this culture through his Jewish background.

³² Philo, *Good Person* 91, *ὁ λεχθεὶς τῶν Ἑσσαιῶν ἢ ὁσίων ὄμιλος, πάντες δὲ ἀσθενέστεροι τῆς τῶν ἀνδρῶν καλοκἀγαθίας γενόμενοι*.

³³ Cf. Philo, *Spec.Laws* 4.132 about Moses as a spokesman of the particular laws of the whole legal corpus, νομοθεσία (cf. Rom 9:4), that is the Pentateuch; cf. *m. Yoma* 3:8, 4:2, 6:2 for quotations from the Pentateuch in rabbinic tradition introduced as "the Law of your servant Moses".

³⁴ Translation from RSV. The phrase *ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν* in 2 Cor 3:18 may be connected to Paul's discussion of the *glory* of the new covenant which surpasses that of the written code in 2 Cor 3:7-11.

According to the Acts of the Apostles, Paul's mission started consistently in the synagogues of the places which he visited on his missionary journey.³⁵ Thus, we read in Acts 17:1-2 that Paul went into the synagogue when he came to Thessalonica, "as was his custom", κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός. Moreover, during Sabbaths he would argue from the Scriptures in conversations with other Jews. Yet, this consistent point in Luke's description of Paul's mission could be misleading. It fits in the narrative strategy of the author who suggests a development of Christianity, in the words of John Knox, "as the continuation and fulfillment of authentic Judaism".³⁶

It can reasonably be assumed that, in his previous life as a Pharisee, it was Paul's custom to frequent synagogues. In the Synoptic Gospels Pharisaic attendance of a synagogal service occurs in a polemical context.³⁷ According to Josephus, the Pharisees counted as the leading school and were considered with high esteem as the most accurate interpreters of the Law.³⁸ As a school which provided religious leaders in the land of Israel the Pharisees probably played a prominent role in the synagogal liturgy of scriptural readings and the exposition of Scripture (cf. *Ant.* 18.15). Paul's previous schooling in the Pharisaic study of the Law must have included the unwritten laws of the fathers, αἱ πατρικαὶ μου παραδόσεις (Gal 1:14).³⁹ The teaching of the unwritten laws was part of the Pharisaic exposition of Scripture. As the Pharisees were influential among the townsfolk in Israel, their teachings were probably mediated through the contemporary synagogal culture.

The dissemination of certain religious values and ideas may not have been limited to a one-way didactic interaction between Pharisees and the common people. Expositions of Scripture in Palestinian synagogues could convey ideas and norms which developed out of debates between the pluriform Jewish movements. Paul may have been influenced indirectly by religious ideas and traditions, which were disseminated through the scriptural culture of Palestinian synagogues. This is more likely to have been the case than supposed a segregation of closed movements with a homogeneous system of beliefs and practices.

The idea of debate and social interaction between Jewish schools is confirmed in rabbinic tradition. In the Babylonian Talmud, the disciples of the schools of Hillel and Shammai, the names of two Jerusalemite teachers of the Law around 20 BCE, are said to have lived with one another in mutual esteem and friendship, despite their differences in halakha (*b. Yebam.* 14a-b). The heterogeneous character of the contemporary Jewish traditions was probably also mirrored by the Palestinian Jewish synagogal culture. In the case of certain analogous ideas related to the metaphor of the Temple in Paul and Qumran, such a comparison may be contextualised in the Palestinian Jewish scriptural culture of Paul's time.

Since there was an Essene quarter in Jerusalem,⁴⁰ participation by the Essenes in debates about the interpretation of Scripture may have taken place in the pluriform Jewish setting of the city of Jerusalem. Josephus further refers to the presence of individual Essenes in Jerusalem and in the Jerusalem Temple complex, and to the influence of their visionary

³⁵ Cf. B.J. Koet, 'As close to the synagogue as can be: Paul in Corinth (Acts 18,1-18)', in R. Bieringer (ed.), *The Corinthian Correspondence* (BETL 125; Leuven UP / Peeters: Leuven, 1996) 397-415 at 409 stating about Acts 18:7 that Luke's emphasis on Paul's spatial proximity to the synagogue "is more or less a metaphor for his being as closely connected to the synagogue as can be and that thus Luke makes a point about Paul's desire for a continuing relation to Jews".

³⁶ Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, 35.

³⁷ Matt 12:9-14; Mark 3:1-6; Luke 6:6-11, 14:1-6.

³⁸ *J.W.* 2.162. Note the use of the term οἱ δοξοῦντες for people held in high esteem; this term is used by Paul to designate the leaders of the Christian congregation in Jerusalem in Gal 2:6.

³⁹ Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 13.297 ἄπερ οὐκ ἀναγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς Μωυσέος νόμοις; § 408.

⁴⁰ See Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem*. Cf. my chap. 3, section 7.4.

thought in Judaea (cf. *J.W.* 1.78; 2.113). In the context of the historical narrative of the *Jewish War*, Josephus also mentions the military leadership by an Essene named John (*J.W.* 2.567; cf. §§ 152-153 about the Essene part in the war against the Romans).

Certain theological views of the Essenes concerning the presence of God may have entered the discourse of other interpreters of Scripture and enriched the scriptural culture of Jerusalemite synagogues in adapted or altered forms. The theology of the Essenes was part of the religious culture of shared traditions, at the receiving end of which Paul probably stood during his previous life as a Pharisee. An important way along which theological views concerning the Temple and the presence of God could have reached Paul in his previous life in Judaism was the scriptural culture of Palestinian synagogues.

Paul the apostle names other churches of God in the context of his missionary journeys (e.g. 1 Cor 11:16; 16:1; 2 Cor 11:28), but no synagogues. Thus, we cannot get a clear picture of Paul's relation to the contemporary synagogal culture on the basis of his Letters, apart from what he writes in 2 Cor 3:14-15. Nevertheless, Paul writes that his gospel mission addresses those who are called, both Jews and Greeks (1 Cor 1:24). We may gather that some sort of confrontation with Jewish communities may be inferred from the fact that Paul, among other hardships, underwent five times a Jewish punishment (2 Cor 11:24). Even if Paul visited synagogues frequently during his missionary journeys, he directed his gospel to those who were called among both Jews and Gentiles. These groups could not both be gathering together in the synagogues in the Hellenistic Diaspora, except perhaps in those cases of Jews and Gentile converts to Judaism. Perhaps, Christian Jews and Gentile converts rather assembled in the domestic context of households, as may be suggested by certain evidence in Paul's Letters (Rom 16:5, 10, 14; 1 Cor 16:15).

The liturgy of the Corinthian congregation, which is evoked in 1 Cor 14:26, comprised elements which could have been parallel to traditions in the contemporary synagogal culture. The mentioned hymn (ψαλμός), teaching (διδάχη), and interpretation (ἐρμηνεία) in 1 Cor 14:26 may have included traditions with which Christian Jews were already familiar. Christian Jews may have introduced into their Christian congregations influences from the contemporary synagogal culture, which consisted of certain teachings and the exposition of Scripture.⁴¹ Paul was among those Christian Jews, who brought in the influence of Jewish traditions without imposing a Jewish way of life on the converts from the Gentiles, as his opponents did (cf. Gal 1:6-9, 5:2-12; 2 Cor 11:12-15.22-23). Other Christian Jews, whom Paul considered to be his fellow workers, are for example Aquila and Prisca (cf. 1 Cor 16:19, Rom 16:3). Thus the influence of contemporary synagogal culture affected both Paul's previous life in Judaism and the congregations addressed by him in his Letters.

3. Paul and the languages of Scripture in Second Temple Judaism

3.1 Language and scriptural culture in Paul's Letters

Although Paul calls himself a 'Hebrew born of Hebrews' (Phil 3:5; cf. 2 Cor 11:22), addressing congregations in the Hellenistic diaspora, he naturally had to write in Greek and also quote Scripture in Greek in order to make himself understandable to his readers.

⁴¹ Cf. R. Le Déaut, *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible (Targum)* (Revised edition and ET by S.F. Miletic of *Liturgie juive et Nouveau Testament*, 1965; *SubBi* 5, Biblical Institute Press: Rome, 1982) 28-55 who, on the basis of examples of targumic interpretations which may underlie certain passages in the New Testament, concludes that Jews and Christian Jews heard Bible translations "in the same synagogues" (48). Le Déaut also notes that, in spite of the scholarly work done by J. Daniélou, E. Peterson, L. Goppelt, M. Simon, and H.J. Schoeps, "definite results" have not yet been reached (48).

However, Paul does use words in his Letters which remind us of Hebrew scriptural culture. In the following survey of elements in Paul's language derived from Semitic language and culture,⁴² I do not intend to give only a list of words and expressions, but evidence of the fact that the Semitic scriptural culture is an important background to Paul's use of Scripture.

It may be useful to start with a prominent example of a Pauline term with a background in the contemporary Semitic Palestinian-Jewish culture, that is, the expression 'works of the Law' in Galatians 2:16 and 3:10. Paul's Greek expression ἔργα νόμου has recently been compared with the Hebrew term מעשי התורה in the Qumran text 4QMMT published in 1994.⁴³ Thus at a previously unexpected point, Paul's language resounds theological concepts which were common to the Palestinian Jewish culture of his time.

In connection with the issue of Paul and the observance of the Law, Paul's expression νόμον φυλάσσειν in Gal 6:13 may also be mentioned here. It should be noted that the accusative νόμον has no definite article, even though Paul clearly has the Jewish Law, not just any law in mind. Contrary to this, we find φυλάσσω τὸν νόμον in Acts 21:24, determining νόμος by the definite article. Paul's usage in Gal 6:13 may be influenced by a Semitic background, since the Hebrew equivalent to φυλάσσειν, מרש, does not always have a determined noun as object either. Thus, for example, MT Proverbs 29:18 has the expression שומר תורה, whereas the Septuagint renders this as ὁ δὲ φυλάσσω τὸν νόμον, that is, with the definite article.⁴⁴ Even if the absence of the article in Paul's expression may be due to the fact that it conveys an abstract idea,⁴⁵ the contrast with the Septuagint remains striking and suggests Paul's familiarity with Semitic scriptural culture, independently from the Septuagint.

The language of the Hebrew Scriptures underlies Paul's use of Scripture indirectly in cases of semitisms imported into the biblical Greek of the Septuagint. For example, the quotation from Isaiah 1:9 in Romans 9:29 includes the Greek words for 'Lord of hosts', κύριος σαβαώθ, which remind us of the Hebrew יהוה צבאות. σαβαώθ is not an original Greek word, but transliterates the Hebrew צבאות. A Semitic etymology is also at the basis of proverbial names and expressions in Paul's quotations from Scripture (Rom 9:29.33, 11:4.26, 15:12); names and terms which are related to Israelite history and prophecy, such as Zion, the root of Jesse, Sodom and Gomorra, and Baal. Names for the Devil, σατανᾶς and Βελιάρ in Paul's Letters (1 Cor 5:5, 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11, 6:15, 11:14, 12:7) also stem from Semitic words.

⁴² It should be noted that, in comparison with the attention for the Gospels and Acts, scholarly studies on Semitic backgrounds to early Christianity have usually paid little attention to potential Pauline evidence of Semitisms. A notable exception is W.C. van Unnik, 'Aramaisms in Paul', in idem, *Sparsa Collecta. The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik* 1 (First published in *Vox Theologica* 1943, 117-126; Brill: Leiden, 1973) 129-143. Cf. N. Turner, 'The Style of Paul', in idem, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek IV Style* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1976) 80-100 at 88-99 about Paul's Biblical Greek; M. Wilcox, 'Semiticisms in the NT', in *ABD 5 O-Sh* (Doubleday: New York [etc.], 1992) 1081-1086 for a general survey with bibliography.

See e.g. R.A. Martin, *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents* (SBL: Cambridge, Mass., 1974) for an early attempt to formulate methodology concerning the identification of Semitisms; cf. A. Hilhorst, 'Sémitisme et latinismes', in idem, *Sémitismes et Latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Hermeas* (Dekker & Van de Vegt: Nijmegen, 1976) 36-56 who distinguishes between cases of 'substitution' and of 'importation'. See more recently L.T. Stuckenbruck, 'An Approach to the New Testament through Aramaic Sources: The Recent Methodological Debate', *JSP* 8 (1991) 3-29 and the criticism of Martin's methodological criteria to identify 'translation Greek' in K.H. Jobes & M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Baker Academic: Grand Rapids, Mich. / Paternoster: Carlisle, 2000) 116-117.

⁴³ See chap. 2, section 1.1 about 4QMMT and p. 67 n. 10 for bibliography on 4QMMT and New Testament Studies, in particular Galatians.

⁴⁴ The Septuagint does not incorporate any variant to the Greek expression φυλάσσειν τὸν νόμον which omits the definite article; the definite article generally accompanies the object to φυλάσσειν, also in other cases.

⁴⁵ Cf. Blass/Rehkopf/Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, § 258.

Certain expressions used by Paul could be termed 'Hebraisms'. Thus, the expression ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, found among others in 1 Corinthians 1:29, corresponds quite closely to the Hebrew בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה.⁴⁶ In 2 Cor 1:20, the expression τὸ ἀμὴν τῷ θεῷ πρὸς δόξαν corresponds word for word to Hebrew doxology, for in Isaiah 65:16 a blessing is prescribed as יִתְבַּרַךְ בְּאֱלֹהֵי אֱמֵן, while Jeremiah 10:5 has אֱמֵן יְהוָה. The term καιρὸς εὐπρόσδεκτος, which figures in 2 Cor 6:2 in connection to the 'day of salvation', could be Paul's rendering of a Hebrew expression, עֵת רִצּוֹן, which is found in Psalms 69:14. It can be inferred from the context in Psalms that the Hebrew term is also related to salvation coming from God.

A few transliterations of Aramaic words also occur in Paul's Letters. Thus, in Romans 8:15 the words ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ are mentioned in a liturgical context. The same words are found in Galatians 4:6, also in a liturgical context of exclamation. The transliteration of the Aramaic אבא and the Greek ὁ πατήρ stand side by side in Paul's Letters. These liturgical references in Rom 8:15 and Gal 4:6 could be related to the gospel tradition of the Passion of Jesus situated in Getsemane (cf. Mark 14:36), and could thereby constitute a liturgical remembrance of Jesus' suffering and death connected with the institution of the Lord's Supper.

Furthermore, Paul consistently calls Peter by his Aramaic name Κηφᾶς in his Letters (1 Cor 1:12, 3:22, 9:5, 15:5; Gal 1:18, 2:9.11.14), taking for granted that his readers understood about whom he wrote.⁴⁷ This Pauline usage seems to suggest Paul's proximity to the Aramaic-speaking culture of the early Jesus-movement in the Syro-Palestinian area.

In 1 Cor 16:22 Paul uses the expression μαράνα θά, a transliteration of Aramaic words, without adding any Greek equivalent at all. The expression can be translated as 'Our Lord, come', from the Aramaic מְרַאנָא תְּה.⁴⁸ It is important to note that this Aramaic phrase figures in the closing part of 1 Corinthians where Paul addresses the Corinthians with a greeting by his own hand (1 Cor 16:21-24; 1 Cor 16:21: Ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῆ ἐμῆ χειρὶ Παύλου). This part appears to focus more directly on Paul's own wording rather than on the writing dictated to a scribe by Paul. Romans 16:22 attests for instance to the activity of the scribe Tertius. The presence of an Aramaic expression in this part may further point to Paul's connection with Aramaic-speaking Christianity.

In his article about 'Qumran Aramaic and the New Testament',⁴⁹ Joseph A. Fitzmyer has pointed out the importance of the Aramaic description of God as Lord, מַר, in the literature of Qumran, as the contemporary Jewish background to the designation of κύριος applied to Jesus in the New Testament. Thus the Qumran targum of Job (11Q10 XXIV, 7) comprises the term מַר, but, even more interesting for comparison, the Qumran Aramaic fragments of 1 Enoch 4Q202 III, 14 has מְרַאנָא. This evidence is not only pertinent to the Greek concept of κύριος in the New Testament, but even more so to Paul's Aramaic phrase.

The Hebraisms and Aramaic words in Paul's Letters figure in the context of Paul's theology and in liturgical settings. Their presence, therefore, not only reflects a bilingual orientation⁵⁰ but also Paul's relation to the Semitic scriptural culture. This impression is also

⁴⁶ The Septuagint rather translates the Hebrew expression mostly as ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου.

⁴⁷ Paul does not make any clarifying comment, such as τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ὃ ἔστιν μεθερμηνεύμενον and ὁ ἐρμηνεύεται, as they are used to explain an Aramaic expression of Jesus in Matt 27:46, the Semitic term 'Messiah' in John 1:41 and the Aramaic name of Peter in John 1:42 respectively.

⁴⁸ מְרַאנָא comes from מַר, meaning 'Lord', with the common plural pronominal suffix נָא attached to it. The root of תְּה is אָתָה, a verb which means 'to come'. אָתָה can also be found spelled אָטָה in Jewish Aramaic and Christian-Palestinian according to the dictionaries of KB and of Jastrow respectively.

⁴⁹ J.A. Fitzmyer, 'Qumran Aramaic and the New Testament', *NTS* 20 (1973-74) 382-407.

⁵⁰ Cf. Van Unnik, 'Aramaisms in Paul', 143 who refers to "some Aramaic mental processes in the thoughts of Paul even when he does express himself in Greek".

confirmed when we compare certain ideas and concepts in Paul with Palestinian-Jewish texts. However, the most important in examining to what extent Paul drew on Hebrew scriptural culture are, of course, Paul's quotations from Scripture, with which we will subsequently deal.

3.2 The text of Paul's quotations from Scripture and the textual types of Scripture

In his study about Paul's use and understanding of Scripture, Dietrich-Alex Koch has maintained that Paul's social and cultural background is generally related to Hellenistic diaspora Judaism.⁵¹ This thesis creates the impression that Paul depended on the influential Greek translation of the Septuagint for his quotations from Scripture.⁵² My view that this dependence on the Septuagint is only a relative form of dependence will be substantiated here on the basis of examples of formulas, which introduce quotations, and on the basis of some quotations from Scripture in Paul's Letters.

3.2.1 Introductory formulas to quotations from Scripture

In his argumentation for the Septuagint as the predominant text-type in Paul's use of Scripture, D.-A. Koch stresses a total disjunction with characteristic introductory formulas of citation found in rabbinic, Jewish-Alexandrian and Qumran exegesis.⁵³ The weight of the evidence in favour of the Septuagint as the predominant text type for Paul's use of Scripture does, in my view, not suggest such a total disjunction. Some examples may serve to show the problem with Koch's argument about a disjunction between Paul's use of Scripture and Palestinian-Jewish scriptural culture.

The first example concerns the introduction of a quotation from Scripture with God as the speaker, which is found as a literary and theological usage in the literature of Qumran. Koch has argued that this usage of God as a speaker does not occur in any of Paul's introductory formulas to the citation of (words from) Scripture.⁵⁴ However, considering the context of Paul's quotations from and allusions to Scripture, some examples from Paul's letters do point to an introduction of words from Scripture which are in fact connected to God as a speaker. In 2 Cor 6:2, the idea of God as a speaker is implied by the preceding verse. In 2 Cor 6:16c, the phrase *καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι* introduces a string of scriptural quotations. Even though 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 is considered to be an 'interpolated paragraph' by certain scholars, 2 Cor 6:16c provides a clear-cut case of the introduction of verses from Scripture with God as the speaker. For evidence of this usage we are not exclusively dependent on this one clear-cut instance. In 1 Cor 5:13, Paul uses the words "God judges those outside", *τοὺς δὲ ἔξω ὁ θεὸς κρίνει*, before quoting Deuteronomy 17:7. Thus, the phrase about God's judgment of those outside indirectly introduces the quotation.

⁵¹ D.-A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1986), 32.

⁵² The influence of the Septuagint in the first century CE is attested by Aristobulus as quoted in Eusebius' *Preparation for the Gospel* XIII, 12.2, by Philo in his *On the Life of Moses* 2.5 ff., and by Josephus in his *Jewish Antiquities* 1.3, 10-12. About the later Greek revisions by Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus, see H.B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (revised by R.R. Ottley; Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass., 1989; originally published by Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1914) 29-58.

⁵³ Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums*, 25-32.

⁵⁴ Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums*, 31.

In other cases, the introductory formula may not imply God as a speaker, but the idea that it is the Lord who says it. For example, in Rom 12:19 and 1 Cor 14:21, when a scriptural quotation is introduced by the formula *γέγραπται*, Paul adds the words *λέγει κύριος* after the quoted verse. These words, *λέγει κύριος*, do not figure in the original verse quoted from Scripture. Apart from scriptural quotation, the idea of God as the speaker is present in Paul's Letters in the form of a paraphrase of Scripture: for example in 2 Cor 4:6 with the words *ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν*.

A second example of an introductory formula in Paul's Letters, which in my view is connected to the Palestinian-Jewish background, is the phrase *λέγει ἡ γραφή* (e.g. Rom 4:3, 9:17, 10:11, 11:2; Gal 4:30). Koch juxtaposes this introductory phrase, taken together with the 'impersonal' *φησὶ* in 1 Corinthians 6:16b, to usages of scriptural quotation in both Hellenistic Jewish literature and the literature of Qumran.⁵⁵ This way of introducing Scripture can, however, be compared with the oral aspect of the traditions of the Pharisees; an aspect of Paul's previous life in Judaism which reverberates in his Letters. Paul's introductory phrase *λέγει ἡ γραφή* emphasises the element of speaking, a theme on which Paul produces many variations, such as 'he says in Hosea' (Rom 9:25), 'Isaiah says' (Rom 10:16), 'first Moses says' (Rom 10:19) and 'David says' (Rom 11:9). While Koch argues that the rabbinic scriptural citation formula *רנאמר* in the Mishnah, 'as it is said', has no current Greek equivalent in Paul's Letters, apart from one exception in Rom 9:12b,⁵⁶ I would rather compare *רנאמר* with this citation formula of Paul. Both the Mishnaic and Pauline introductory citation formulas, *רנאמר* and *λέγει ἡ γραφή*, stress the element of oral tradition.

It is important to note that the phrase *λέγει ἡ γραφή* figures less frequently as an introductory citation formula than the phrase *(καθὼς) γέγραπται* in Paul's Letters.⁵⁷ This introductory formula is our last example for comparison with Palestinian-Jewish texts. The Pauline phrase *(καθὼς) γέγραπται* is admittedly compared by Koch to Hebrew introductory formulas in Jewish literature, in particular the literature of Qumran.⁵⁸ In Rabbinic literature, the comparable Hebrew phrase *כאשר כתוב* figures as the introductory citation formula.

In my view, the points of comparison with Hebrew introductory formulas are evidence of Paul's relation to Hebrew scriptural culture. Paul's variations in the pluriform use of citation formulas rather attest to his originality as a skilled writer, who could draw on various literary conventions of citation of Scripture. Paul's variations do not necessarily point to a total disjunction with the Palestinian-Jewish culture of scriptural interpretation. A total disjunction between the literary culture of the Hellenistic Diaspora and the Palestinian-Jewish situation can neither be maintained with regard to the literature of Qumran in view of the finds of Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek texts. In one Greek fragment from the literature of Qumran, the phrase *ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς* could convey a reference to the Scriptures (7Q19 (7Qpap Imprint gr) I recto, 5). The idea of a plurality of Scriptures, *αἱ γραφαί*, also figures in Paul's Letters (Rom 1:2, 15:4; 1 Cor 15:3-4) and in Matthew 21:42.

⁵⁵ Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums*, 32.

⁵⁶ D.-A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums*, 31.

⁵⁷ E.g. Rom 1:17, 3:10, 4:17, 8:36, 9:33, 11:8,26; 1 Cor 1:19, 2:9, 3:19; 2 Cor 9:9; Gal 3:10, 4:27.

⁵⁸ Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums*, 28-30. Cf. Fitzmyer, 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament', *NTS* 7 (1960-1961) 297-333.

3.2.2 Quotations from Scripture

The influential place of the Septuagint among Greek versions of the Bible is corroborated in cases of longer verses in which Paul's quotation exactly corresponds to the Septuagint.⁵⁹ However, the variations in Paul's quotations from Scripture cannot be explained by a model which suggests Paul's exclusive dependence on a fixed Septuagintal text tradition. Paul's quotations which do not correspond with the Septuagint may vary from a different word order to completely different renderings which cannot be 'variations' from the Septuagint.

An example of correspondence with the Septuagint, except for a slightly different word order and verbal equivalents, can be found in Paul's quotation of Exodus 16:18 in 2 Cor 8:15. Paul's quotation has *ὁ τὸ πολὺ οὐκ ἐπλεόνασεν, καὶ ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον οὐκ ἤλαττόνησεν*, whereas the text of the Septuagint has *οὐκ ἐπλεόνασεν ὁ τὸ πολὺ, καὶ ὁ τὸ ἔλαττον οὐκ ἤλαττόνησεν*. In both texts, the same verbs are used in the same tense, and *τὸ ὀλίγον* and *τὸ ἔλαττον* can be considered verbal equivalents.

A case of more variation from the Septuagint presents itself when Paul's quotation appears to be a condensed rendering of two biblical verses. Such a case is found in 1 Cor 3:19, where Paul quotes from the book of Job 5:13 to illustrate his point that the wisdom of this world is foolishness to God. Paul's quotation runs as follows: *ὁ δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν*. In the Masoretic text of Job 5:13 the 'wise men' are also the object of God's power to catch them in their 'wisdom'. Paul's Greek rendering, while containing a different verb which conveys approximately the same meaning as the verb *καταλαμβάνειν* in the Septuagint, probably draws on the previous verse in the Septuagint translation of Job 5:12 for his translation of *πανουργία*. For LXX Job 5:12a has: *διαλλάσσοντα βουλάς πανούργων*. In quoting Psalm 93:11 in 1 Cor 3:20, which otherwise corresponds to the Septuagint, Paul substitutes *σοφοί* for the original *ἄνθρωποι*, thus revealing his exegetical drive to give prooftexts in order to denounce the 'wisdom of the world'.

In other cases, Paul's quotations from Scripture completely differ from the Septuagint and are at times closer to the Hebrew text. Thus the part of Deuteronomy 32:35 quoted in Romans 12:19, *ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω*, comes closer to the Hebrew Masoretic text *לִי נִקְמָה וְשֹׁמֵר* than to the Greek of the Septuagint, which gives a temporal connotation to it: *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω*. There is also a marked difference between Paul's quotation of Isaiah 28:11 in 1 Cor 14:21 and the Septuagintal version of this biblical verse. Paul's reading, *ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χεῖλεσιν ἐτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ*, can be translated as follows: "by those of foreign tongues and by lips of strangers will I speak to this people". The Septuagintal version, however, which has *διὰ φασλισμὸν χειλέων διὰ γλώσσης ἐτέρας, ὅτι λαλήσουσιν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ*, can be translated thus: "It is through a profane sort of lips through a foreign tongue that they will speak to this people". Paul's rendering appears to be an independent interpretation of the Hebrew *כִּי בלעגי שפה ובלשון אחרת ידבר אל-העם הזה*.

Even though these are scattered examples, they do provide evidence that Paul's use of Scripture did not depend exclusively on a fixed Septuagintal text tradition, notwithstanding the importance of the Septuagint in Hellenistic Judaism. To deny a place to other textual versions Greek, Hebrew or Aramaic may be tantamount to negating part of the evidence of Paul's scriptural quotations.

⁵⁹ E.g. Psalms 5:10 & 139:4 quoted in Rom 3:13; Psalms 31:1-2a quoted in Rom 4:7-8; Psalm 18:5 quoted in Rom 10:18; Psalm 68:24 quoted in Rom 11:10; Isaiah 52:15 quoted in Rom 15:21. Isaiah 54:1 quoted in Gal 4:27. Perhaps verbatim correspondence with the LXX of longer verses mainly from Psalms and Isaiah could be explained as part of readings from Scripture in Hellenistic synagogues, which Paul could have frequented.

3.3 Textual theories about Scripture in light of the Dead Sea discoveries

The field of textual study of the Bible has faced a formidable challenge since the Dead Sea discoveries which provided biblical scholars with unique evidence of biblical manuscripts from the Hellenistic and early Roman period.⁶⁰ The first publication of many previously unpublished biblical manuscripts from Qumran since the 1990s⁶¹ has given a new impetus to textual studies and theories concerning the Bible.

In a study of 1961 of the text of Hebrew Scriptures, as it is found in various textual traditions, Shemaryahu Talmon has distinguished synonymous readings from real textual variants. In his survey of examples of synonymous readings, which concern verbs and nouns, Talmon has compared the Masoretic text to the Dead Sea Scrolls. In certain cases, apparent sectarian terminology may reflect an ancient scribal tradition according to Talmon.⁶²

Emanuel Tov has pointed out that the impact of the Dead Sea discoveries on textual studies of the Bible also affects the reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint, that is, the Hebrew text of the Bible on which the Greek translators who created the Septuagint relied. The reconstruction of a proto-text is aided significantly by the evidence of the Qumran scrolls, for which Tov refers to examples from 1 Samuel, Deuteronomy and Numbers.⁶³ His second point concerns the close relation between the Septuagint and certain Qumran scrolls. This textual study of the Bible in light of the evidence from Qumran makes clear that the history of the biblical text is rather fluid and composite at the stages of its development and transmission, and that it defies too rigid categorisations in terms of recensions.

On the basis of Post-Qumran textual theories, Timothy H. Lim recently pointed to the diversity of textual types in the period before 100 CE. At the end of this period, the canonisation of the Hebrew Bible was realised. Lim emphasises the impact of this diversity of textual types of Scripture on our understanding of 'post-biblical exegesis'. These new textual theories should also affect the approach to Paul's quotations from Scripture. Lim proposes a broad view on Paul's interpretation of Scripture, assuming Paul's knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures and his possible reliance on one or more Greek translations, and Aramaic targum. Among his quotations could also be Paul's own renderings into Greek.⁶⁴

The conceptual openness of this approach gives a better methodological starting-point which also leaves room for analysis of non-Greek elements and ideas in Paul's scriptural quotations and theology. A contrary methodological approach would lead to the harmonisation between Paul's use of Scripture and the Septuagint as the absolute model, which was certainly not the case in the first-century CE, even for Hellenistic Jews.⁶⁵

⁶⁰ See recently E. Ulrich, 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text', in Flint & VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls after fifty years. A Comprehensive Assessment I*, 79-100.

⁶¹ E.g. the editions by P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich and J.E. Sanderson of *DJD IX Qumran Cave 4. IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* in 1992, by E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross of *DJD XII Qumran Cave 4. VII: Genesis to Numbers* in 1994, by E. Ulrich and others of *DJD XIV Qumran Cave 4. IX: Deuteronomy to Kings* in 1995, and by E. Ulrich and others of *DJD XV Qumran Cave 4. X: The Prophets* in 1997.

⁶² S. Talmon, 'Synonymous readings in the textual traditions of the Old Testament', *ScrHier* 8 (1961) 335-383 at 374-383.

⁶³ E. Tov, 'The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the Septuagint', in idem, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1999) 285-300 at 289-290.

⁶⁴ T.H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Clarendon: Oxford, 1997) 6, 19-27.

⁶⁵ Josephus, *Ant.* 1.12-13 writes about the Alexandrian Greek version that only the portion of the Law was translated and interpreted, while in § 5 Josephus notes that for writing his *Jewish Antiquities* he directly draws on his own translation from the Hebrew records (ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν μεθιερμηνευμένη γραμμάτων).

3.4 Paul's Use of Scripture and Aramaic Targum

In the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, the spoken language of many Jews in the land of Israel was Aramaic.⁶⁶ It has already been pointed out in the foregoing section 3.1 that Paul's Letters contain transliterations of Aramaic words into Greek. It could be assumed that Paul's previous schooling as a Pharisee included the study of the Bible in Hebrew and translations and discussions in Aramaic. As the Pharisees engaged with teaching the Law to the Jewish people, Pharisaic scribes⁶⁷ may have played a part in Aramaic translations of (parts of) Scripture.

The translation of portions of the Hebrew Bible into Aramaic could be an oral process, but perhaps parts of Aramaic Targums were already committed to writing. The large-scale writing down of targumim in the Palestinian Targum tradition may be attributed to the rabbinic culture of the Amoraic era (ca. 220-500 CE).⁶⁸ Rabbinic exegesis is of course elaborated in rabbinic targumim. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that earlier traditions were at the basis of certain (parts of the) rabbinic targumim, for they are related to the beginnings of the rabbinic movement which was rooted in Pharisaic traditions.⁶⁹ In referring to earlier traditions, we need to distinguish between Aramaic translation with elements of interpretation through variant readings on the one hand and Aramaic targum structured along lines of typical rabbinic exegesis on the other.

Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls attests to the practice of Aramaic translations of Scripture among the sectarian Qumran community. Fragments of a 'Targum of Leviticus' (4QtgLev) and a 'Targum of Job' (4QtgJob and 11QtgJob) were published in 1977 by J.T. Milik⁷⁰ and in 1998 by F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar and A.S. van der Woude.⁷¹ The *Targum of Leviticus* was dated palaeographically to the second century BCE by J.T. Milik.⁷² The fragments from cave 4 and 11 of the *Targum of Job* have both been dated palaeographically to the middle of the first century CE.⁷³ This may indicate that targumic translations of the Pentateuch stood in a longer tradition than other parts of Scripture.

The Pentateuch was also the first part of Scripture integrally translated into Greek, as Flavius Josephus writes in the preface to his *Jewish Antiquities*.⁷⁴ This impression is also confirmed by the fact that the Greek biblical texts found in caves 4 and 7 of Qumran are

⁶⁶ See e.g. C. Rabin, 'Hebrew and Aramaic in the First Century', in Safrai and Stern (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century* II, 1007-1039. In the Septuagint, the term אַרְמֵיט as language is consistently translated as Συριστί, indicative of the area of crossroads of language contacts, (LXX 4 Kgdms 18:26, Isa 36:11, 2 Esd 4:8). The dialects of this area of crossroads have been labeled 'Central Aramaic' by E.M. Cook, 'A New Perspective on the Language of Onqelos and Jonathan', in Beattie & McNamara (eds.), *The Aramaic Bible. Targums in their Historical Context*, 142-156, 148.

⁶⁷ Cf. *Ant.* 13.297 about Pharisaic teachings to the people, τῷ δήμῳ, and *Ant.* 18.15 to the masses, τοῖς δήμοις; *J.W.* 2.162. On the relation between scribes and Pharisees, see e.g. Mark 2:16 and Acts 23:9.

⁶⁸ U. Gleßmer, *Einleitung in die Targum zum Pentateuch* (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1995) 101-181, there 103, in a survey of textual witnesses to the Palestinian Targum tradition, mentions the publication of a papyrus fragment dated to the 4th/5th century CE by Y. Yahalom in 1978.

⁶⁹ Cf. Strack & Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 4-5.

⁷⁰ J.T. Milik, 'II. Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (4Q128-4Q157)', in J.T. Milik & R. de Vaux, *DJD VI Qumrân Grotte 4. II (4Q128-4Q157)* (Clarendon: Oxford, 1977) pl. XXVII-XXVIII.

⁷¹ F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar & A.S. van der Woude, *DJD XXIII Qumran Cave 11. II (11Q2-18, 11Q20-31)* (Clarendon: Oxford, 1998) pls. IX-XXI. 11Q10 = 11QTargum of Job.

⁷² J.T. Milik, 'II. Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (4Q128-4Q157)', in *DJD VI*, 86.

⁷³ Milik, *DJD VI*, 90, and García Martínez, Tigchelaar & Van der Woude, *DJD XXIII*, 87.

⁷⁴ *Ant.* 1.12 οὐδὲ γὰρ πᾶσαν ἐκεῖνος ἔφθη λαβεῖν τὴν ἀναγραφὴν, ἀλλ' αὐτὰ μόνα τὰ τοῦ νόμου παρέδοσαν οἱ πεμφθέντες ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξήγησιν εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν.

mainly fragments from the Pentateuch.⁷⁵ However, also within the entire Targumim, the Targums of the Pentateuch appear to stand in a longer tradition of accompanying readings of Hebrew Scripture.⁷⁶ The Hebrew of the Torah needed to be accompanied by a translation in the more common language of the time, Aramaic. Aramaic even forms an integral part of the later biblical books of Daniel and Ezra, for which there probably was no equally pressing need to translate them into the spoken Aramaic of the people.

In his discussion concerning targumic texts in the literature of Qumran, Klaus Beyer has argued that the Aramaic Targum to the Pentateuch was composed by groups of scribes by way of a regular practice. Beyer dates this scribal practice back to the second century BCE at the latest.⁷⁷ R. Le Déaut also includes the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen ar) in his survey of Qumran witnesses to targumic texts, that is, as evidence of “early targumic versions of Genesis”.⁷⁸ In his edition of *4QTargum of Leviticus*, J.T. Milik has given a synoptic table of comparison to the rendering of Leviticus 16:12-15 and 16:18-21 in the Targum Neophyti, the Targum Onqelos, the Samaritan Targum, and the Syriac version.⁷⁹ In more recent literature, *4QTargum of Leviticus* has been positively compared by Andreas Angerstorfer with the Targum Onqelos in terms of literary style and ‘Sitz im Leben’ in the Palestinian synagogal culture of liturgical readings from the Torah.⁸⁰ The evidence of Qumran targumic texts does, in any case, strengthen the case that Aramaic translations of Torah were in use in the Palestinian-Jewish scriptural culture of the first century CE.

The Semitic background of scriptural culture may lie at the foundation of certain quotations from Scripture in Paul's Letters in cases where the Greek text does not correspond to the Septuagint or other Greek versions. One example can be found in a quotation from Leviticus in Paul's Second Letter to the Corinthians 6:16c. This quotation forms part of a special collection of scriptural quotations in 2 Cor 6:16c-18, which I will discuss more extensively in chapter eight when dealing with the metaphor of the Temple in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. After the Temple of the living God has been mentioned as a metaphor for the religious congregation, the quotation of Lev 26:11 and other biblical verses follow, introduced by the words “as God said”. This quotation runs: ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω, “I will dwell in them and move among them”. Although the verb ἐμπεριπατεῖν is in the Septuagint version of Lev 26:11, translating the Hebrew הלכה, the absence of the other verb, ἐνοικεῖν, with which the quotation starts has often been explained as an adaptation in the interest of the exegetical purpose of the writer.⁸¹

⁷⁵ 4Q119 (4QLXXLev^a); 4Q120 (4QpapLXXLev^b); 4Q121 (4QLXXNum); 4Q122 (4QLXXDeut); 4Q127 (pap4QParaExod gr); 7Q1 (7QLXXExod).

⁷⁶ B. Grossfeld, ‘Targum Onqelos, Halakha and the Halakhic Midrashim’, in Beattie & McNamara (eds.), *The Aramaic Bible. Targums in their Historical Context*, 228-246 at 238 concerning the widespread growth and popularity of the midrashic interpretations of the Torah reflected in the Targum Onqelos, drawing on earlier targumic traditions. Cf. R. Le Déaut, *Introduction à la Littérature Targumique. Première partie* (Institut Biblique Pontifical: Rome, 1966) 32-51 at 38-39 about *m. Meg.* 4:4 concerning synagogal readings of the Torah.

⁷⁷ K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1984) 278-280, discusses 4QtgLev (4Q156) as the oldest witness to the Pentateuch Targum.

⁷⁸ Le Déaut, *Introduction à la Littérature Targumique*, 64-72 at 71-72.

⁷⁹ Milik, *DJD VI*, 87-89.

⁸⁰ A. Angerstorfer, ‘Übersetzungen zu Sprache und Sitz im Leben des Toratargums 4Q Tg Lev (4Q 156), sein Verhältnis zu Targum Onkelos. In memoriam Prof.dr. Werner Stenger (1938-1990)’, *BN 55* (1990) 18-35.

⁸¹ Cf. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 178 who rather explains Paul's use of the verb ἐνοικεῖν from a free translation of יהיה משכני עליהם in Ezek 37:27, part of which is combined with Lev 26:12. Lev 26:11, however, already has גמתי משכני בתוכם, and the phrase בתוכם seems to correspond more closely to Paul's use of a scriptural quotation here as prooftext for the Temple as metaphor for the religious community.

I propose a different explanation for the presence of these two verbs in Paul's 'quotation' of Leviticus. In the Massoretic Hebrew text, the verse from Lev 26:12 runs as follows: והתהלכתי בתוכם והייתם לכם לאלהים ואתם תהיו לי לעם. This can be translated as "and I will walk among you and I will be your God and you will be my people". The completely preserved Aramaic Pentateuch-Targum, the Targum Onkelos to Leviticus,⁸² begins the Aramaic version of Lev 26:12 with אשרי שכינתי ביניכון, "I will let my Shekhinah dwell among you". Shekhinah is a typical term in rabbinic theology for God's indwelling presence which avoids too much personification of God. The Aramaic verse runs as follows: ואשרי שכינתי ביניכון אהוי לכו לאלה ואתון תהון קדמי לעם. Underlying the rabbinic expression אשרי שכינתי could be an earlier tradition which has a variant reading שכנתי instead of the התהלכתי in the Masoretic text. The verb ἐνοικεῖν with which the 'quotation' is started in the Pauline passage is equivalent to this verb שכן, and thus the alternation between the two verbs for 'dwelling' and 'moving among' could be well explained by the divergent readings of this verse of Lev 26:12 in traditions of a transmitted Hebrew text and targumic readings of Scripture.

The supposition of variant readings of scriptural verses, even of the Pentateuch, is also supported by evidence from Qumran. In fact, the only Greek textual witness to Lev 26:12 in the literature of Qumran, 4Q119 (4QLXX Lev a) fr. 1 ll.17-18, has a shorter text than the Septuagint as we know it, missing the καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω ἐν ὑμῖν and reading ἔθν[ος] instead of λαός in the LXX. Thus, even in the case of a Greek manuscript supposedly representing a Septuagintal text type, there are still variations which might be explained by the Semitic background of scriptural culture.

The fluidity of scriptural 'quotations' in the first century CE may also be shown by an example from another Greek text from the Judaean desert, the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8Hev/XII gr), published in the DJD series in 1990.⁸³ This scroll, which follows the canonical order of the Minor Prophets in the Hebrew Bible rather than that of the Septuagint, comprises an example of the variation of verbs in the case of Zechariah 3:7. Whereas the Septuagint text of the latter part of Zech 3:7 has the verb ἀναστρέφομαι, the text of the Minor Prophets Scroll has the verb ἐνπεριπατεῖν.

The variety of languages in which biblical texts were versed, containing textual variants of the Masoretic Hebrew text, can also be found in Paul's quotation of a verse from Scripture. Early targumic versions of the Pentateuch in general could be termed proto-targumic texts from the point of view of comparison with Rabbinic Targumim. The availability to Paul of such early targumic versions of the Pentateuch in general, and of Leviticus in particular, in synagogal and study contexts cannot be overlooked.

4. Shared methods of biblical interpretation

4.1 Midrash, Peshar and the New Testament in light of the Dead Sea Discoveries

In the domain of comparative analysis of the use of Scripture, forms of citation and biblical interpretation (testimonia, midrash, peshar) have received much attention in scholarly hypotheses and theories.⁸⁴ The discovery of and subsequent scholarship on the Dead Sea

⁸² Critical text edition by A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic. Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts I The Pentateuch according to Targum Onkelos* (Brill: Leiden, 1959).

⁸³ E. Tov, *DJD VIII* (Clarendon: Oxford, 1990).

⁸⁴ E.g. Fitzmyer, 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations', 297-333 and idem, "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament', *TS* 18 (1957) 513-537; E.E. Ellis, 'Midrash, Targum and New Testament Quotations', in idem & M. Wilcox (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Semitica* (Edinburgh, 1969) 61-69; recently, Lim, *Holy Scripture in the*

Scrolls has confirmed the pre-existence of midrash as an exegetical technique and a literary genre in pre-70 CE Judaism, before rabbinic midrash.⁸⁵ Rabbinic midrash has its own classification⁸⁶ and characteristics in its development from oral traditions and study of Scripture within rabbinic schools, the *בתי המדרש* and *ישיבות*. The literature of Qumran, however, comprises the genre of eschatological midrashim (4Q174, 4Q177, 4Q182 – also named 4QMdrEschat^{a-c}). Midrash, as a term for the exegesis rather than the exegetical genre, also figures in legal texts. For instance, 1QS VIII, 15 and 4QD^e 7, II, 15 refer to the study and interpretation of the Law. In the literature of Qumran, *מדרש* as exegesis of composite texts of biblical verses (testimonies) can be distinguished from *פירוש*, exact interpretation of separate biblical books,⁸⁷ and *פשר*, commentary.

In his article on 'Midrash Peshet in the Pauline Letters', Timothy H. Lim has described the methodological difference between Midrash and Peshet. Midrash has to be understood as an interweaving exegesis of biblical lemma and commentary, whereas Peshet is defined by a formal distinction between biblical lemma and commentary. Thus, midrashic exegesis seems to leave more room for exegetical adaptation or modification.⁸⁸ In his monograph, by comparing Pauline biblical interpretation with Peshetite exegesis, Lim goes further into the issue of textual divergence as being part of 'post-biblical exegeses'. Without this notion of the divergence of textual versions of the Bible, variant readings of particular verses from Scripture in quotations would one-sidedly be taken for the exegete's modification from the viewpoint of a fixed canon.⁸⁹ The plurality of text types on which Paul could draw, as he was knowledgeable in Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew,⁹⁰ provokes the question to which extent his use of Scripture can actually be termed exegetical modification.

4.2 Midrash, Peshet and Biblical Interpretation in the Pauline Letters

In recent New Testament scholarship on Paul's exegesis, midrash has been given attention among shared methods of interpretation of Paul and contemporary Jewish literature. Midrash is a method of linking verses from different biblical books together on the basis of certain key words or phrases from an exegetical viewpoint which gives direction to the chain quote. James L. Bailey and Lyle D. VanderBroek have given examples of midrash-type exegesis in Romans, 1 Corinthians and Galatians as part of their discussion of literary forms in the New

Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters, and G. J. Brooke, 'Shared intertextual interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament', in M. Stone *et al.* (eds.), *Biblical perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 28; Brill: Leiden, 1998) 35-57.

⁸⁵ Cf. e.g. E.E. Ellis, 'Short Studies. A Note on Pauline Hermeneutics', *NTS* 2 (1955-56) 127-133, and *idem*, 'Midrash, Targum and New Testament Quotations', 61-69; G.J. Brooke, 'Qumran Peshet: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre', *RevQ* 10 (1981) 483-503 has stressed the distinction between midrash and peshet in the interest of sound methodology in biblical studies and comparative midrash.

⁸⁶ Strack & Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 237-240 give a subdivision in Halakhic and Haggadic, Exegetical and Homiletical Midrashim.

⁸⁷ Cf. the relation between *פירוש* and *פרושים*, as expressed by Josephus' description of the Pharisees in *J.W.* 2.162: οἱ μετ' ἀκριβείας δοκοῦντες ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα. Cf. Acts 22:3.

⁸⁸ T.H. Lim, 'Midrash Peshet in the Pauline Letters', in S.E. Porter & C.A. Evans (eds.), *The Scrolls and the Scriptures. Qumran Fifty Years After* (Sheffield, 1997) 280-292 at 282.

⁸⁹ See Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*, 3-28.

⁹⁰ Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*, 26-27; cf. Acts 21:40, 22:2, 26:14 and 2 Cor 11:22, Phil 3:5 – supposing a link between Ἑβραϊκῶς διάλεκτος and Ἑβραῖος; cf. Rom 8:15, 1 Cor 16:22, Gal 4:6 for Aramaic words and phrases.

Testament. Running commentary, peshet interpretation, typological interpretation and allegorical interpretation are treated by them as four subforms in Paul's Midrash.⁹¹

D. Moody Smith has proposed typological exegesis as the most important form of biblical interpretation in Paul's Letters as well as other New Testament writings. He describes such Christian typology as follows: "Not just the texts, but the events and persons of which the texts speak are prototypes of God's revelation in Christ".⁹² D. Moody Smith allows for the possibility of affinities between Paul's methods of interpretation and certain elements of contemporary Jewish exegesis, especially Essene exegesis. As for the influence of midrash-type exegesis on Paul's use of Scripture, D. Moody Smith comes with an example of a shared Exodus midrashic tradition with Philo in 1 Cor 10:1-13.⁹³

Another hypothesis concerning the interpretative use of Scripture in Paul's Letters, concerns the early Christian Testimonia collections, which is important for our understanding of chain quotes from Scripture, as, for example, in 2 Cor 6:16c-18 and in Rom 3:10-18. In his 'review of the Scholarly Literature on the Testimonia hypothesis', Martin C. Albl has discussed the influential positions of certain scholars in framing and developing the Testimonia hypothesis. In this connection, Edwin Hatch's hypothesis on the use of 'scriptural extract collections', the 'Testimony Book hypothesis' of J. Rendel Harris, the idea of testimonies as a substructure to the Christian message by C.H. Dodd, and Barnabas Lindars' focus on the apologetic life-setting of testimonia need to be mentioned.⁹⁴ The Dead Sea discoveries, which include the so-called 4QTestimonia (4Q175), have given a further impetus to the Testimonia hypothesis.⁹⁵ Albl has pointed to a relative distinction between midrash, which has a scriptural text as starting-point, and a testimonium, which has an extra-scriptural event as the starting-point for scriptural exegesis.⁹⁶

The idea of an extra-scriptural event as a starting-point for a testimonium could be related to Jesus' death and resurrection. Quotations from Scripture foretelling his Messiahship could be understood as early Christian testimonia, which are in line with typological interpretation. In his discussion of testimonia in Paul's Letters, Albl also points to connections with a Jewish life-setting. Thus, in the case of Rom 3:10-18, he identifies this scriptural chain quote with a Jewish Psalms Collection. In the case of 2 Cor 6:16-7:1, Albl links this passage with a Temple Testimonia collection.

Albl does, however, not consider the question of the life-setting of the supposedly original non-Pauline composition in 2 Cor 6:16c-18. As I have argued in the previous section 3.4 on Paul's use of Scripture and Aramaic Targum, the Pauline edition of a non-Pauline composition may reveal a background in Palestinian Jewish scriptural culture. It is possible that the 'Temple Testimonia collection', as Albl calls it, was in use in some comparable form within Palestinian-Jewish synagogal culture.

⁹¹ J.L. Bailey and L.D. VanderBroek, *Literary Forms in the New Testament. A Handbook* (WJK: Louisville, KY, 1992) 42-48.

⁹² D. Moody Smith, 'The Pauline literature', in idem, D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (FS Barnabas Lindars; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1988) 265-291 at 278.

⁹³ Moody Smith, 'The Pauline literature', 276-283.

⁹⁴ M.C. Albl, "And Scripture cannot be broken". *The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections* (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1999) 7-69.

⁹⁵ Cf. e.g. Fitzmyer, '4QTestimonia' and the New Testament', 513-537.

⁹⁶ Albl, "And Scripture cannot be broken", 65-66.

5. Summary

In this chapter, we have seen that the literary context of scriptural interpretation determined temple theology in the Jewish culture contemporary to Paul. The temple theology in the literature of Qumran is based on the sectarian understanding of Scripture. A valid comparison between temple imagery in Paul and Qumran takes commonalities in the contemporary Jewish culture of scriptural interpretation into account. The search for a historical background to Paul's cultic imagery entails a comparative investigation of echoes of Scripture and biblical interpretation which are interwoven in the use of cultic imagery, including temple imagery.

The intersecting scriptural culture of Palestinian synagogues formed an important way through which shared traditions of biblical interpretation and theological views on the Temple could influence Paul during his former life as a Pharisee. The contemporary synagogal liturgy, as it is described in Josephus, the Gospels and Acts, and early rabbinic literature, is also reflected in Paul's Letters in certain ways. Paul explicitly refers to synagogal readings from 'Moses', that is, the Torah in 2 Cor 3:15, and Christian Jews may have brought elements of synagogal liturgy into the worship service as it is evoked in 1 Cor 14:26-28.

Moreover, Paul's language and his use of Scripture cannot be understood in a monocausal relation to the Septuagint and the Hellenistic Diaspora setting. It is also necessary to make a comparison with contemporary Palestinian-Jewish synagogal culture. The Hebraisms, transliterations of Aramaic words and certain religious concepts do at least endorse Paul's relation to Hebrew scriptural culture. Paul's use of Scripture reflects a relative dependence on the Septuagint, but there are also cases in which Paul's scriptural quotations are independent or do rather relate to the Masoretic text. The supposition of the Septuagint as the predominant *Vorlage* for Paul's quotations carries with it the danger of harmonisation and the negation of part of the evidence of Paul's quotations from Scripture. In the light of the Dead Sea discoveries, the history of the biblical text can be understood in terms of more fluidity and more textual divergence, so that variant readings of Scripture cannot self-evidently be explained as exegetical modifications. On the basis of analogies between Paul's use of Scripture and Aramaic Targum, certain variant readings in Paul's Letters may be explained in relation to Semitic scriptural culture. This scriptural culture was represented by Syro-Palestinian synagogues.

In scholarly analyses of biblical interpretation, the midrashic exegesis and pesherite exegesis of Qumran literature have been compared with Pauline exegesis; a comparative approach which has brought to the fore the issue of textual divergence. Affinities between Paul's exegesis and Essene exegesis have been pointed out by scholars who deal with the background of Paul's exegesis. The 'Testimonia hypothesis', which originally concerned early Christian testimonia collections, may further benefit the study of the Jewish background of Paul's biblical exegesis.

Part Three

**CULTIC IMAGERY
IN THE CORINTHIAN CORRESPONDENCE**

CHAPTER 6

PRELIMINARY ISSUES OF CULTIC IMAGERY THE PAULINE CORPUS

IN

1. Cultic imagery and its interpretation

1.1 The identification of cultic terms

Cultic imagery may be discerned in passages where Paul uses the traditional language of a communal worship cult. In the context of the Graeco-Roman world contemporary to Paul, *cult* was related to the worship in or concentrated around a sanctuary.¹ Paul abundantly attests to this ancient context of cult, both in his exhortation against pagan idolatry (e.g. 1 Cor 8) and in his references to Israel's worship cult (e.g. Rom 9:4, 1 Cor 10:18). In view of this context contemporary to Paul, I exclude from my survey terms which are either too general to have specific cultic connotations, like οἱ ἄγιοι, 'the saints',² or στῦλοι, 'pillars' (in Gal 2:9),³ or terms which are too much intertwined with descriptions of singular rituals. Paul's references to rituals such as Jewish circumcision (cf. Gal 2:7-9, 5:6-12), baptism (1 Cor 1:13-17), and the Lord's Supper (1 Cor 11:17-34) may be distinguished from cultic imagery. Cultic imagery conveys aspects from a religious worship cult which was centred around a sanctuary. By contrast, the above mentioned rituals concern initiation or 'institutionalisation'⁴ which by themselves do not stand for a temple cult or are unrelated to it.

With respect to cult contemporary to Paul's time, one can hardly speak of a distinctly Christian cult. Christian worship, as described by Paul, is of course determined by Christian rituals, such as the Lord's Supper and Christian baptism. On the other hand, Christian Jews in Paul's time participated in the Jerusalem Temple cult (cf. Acts 21:17-26; chap. 3). Furthermore, the Christian religious calendar as we know it had not yet become fully institutionalised. For instance, the Sunday as the Christian first day of the week was instituted at a later stage in Christianity's separation from Judaism (cf. *Barnabas* XV, 1-8), whereas Paul thought in terms of a Jewish calendar, as is revealed by his use of the expression κατὰ μίαν σαββάτου in 1 Cor 16:2.

¹ See W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* (ET by J. Raffan of the original German edition in 1977; Harvard UP: Cambridge, Mass., 1985) 54-118 at 84-87 about the fixed place of any ancient Greek cult in a sanctuary. Cf. Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.193 and Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.66-70 about the centrality of the Temple for pre-70 CE Judaism.

² Cf. the analogy between ἄγιοι and believers in Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 1:1; Phil 1:1, 4:22. Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 141-176 rightly categorises οἱ ἄγιοι among general ecclesiological terms, just as ἐκκλησία and ἐκλεκτοί / κλητοί.

³ Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 200 categorises Gal 2:9 among 'Zweifelhafte Belege' and refers to general, metaphorical connotations to the term στῦλοι in the Old Testament and Greek literature. Siegert, "'Zerstört diesen Tempel ...!'", 108-139 at 129-130 reads Gal 2:9 as Paul's polemic against "jenes Christentum, das an den Jerusalemer Tempel noch Heilshoffnungen (...) zu knüpfen pflegte". This seems a misinterpretation to me, since Paul's polemic against the hypocrisy of compelling Gentiles to live like Jews in Gal 2:1-14 does not necessarily entail his denouncement of the Jerusalem Temple cult. Gal 2:15 may reflect the idea that Paul does not polemicise against Jews or Jewish institutions *per se*. On the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem in Gal 4:25-26, see my chap. 4, section 4.3.

⁴ A term borrowed from M.Y. MacDonald, 'Ritual in the Pauline Churches', in D.G. Horrell (ed.), *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1999) 233-247 at 233.

Paul uses the cultic imagery of priesthood, sacrifice, and the Temple in his Letters to congregations in Christ. For an accurate historical interpretation, Paul's cultic terms should be compared with the usage of cultic terms in contemporary pagan Hellenistic as well as Jewish culture. It further depends on the context of Paul's Letters whether implicit cultic connotations of certain terms can be discerned and can be made relevant for our survey. The historical interpretation of Paul's cultic imagery should thus take into account the ancient cultural context in which Paul and his original readers lived.

What did Paul's cultic imagery of a priestly service and sacrifice mean for his original readers? What cultic and religious context does Paul have in mind when using cultic terms? A rhetorical-critical approach to Paul's Letters may illuminate the historical interpretation of these issues, in particular in the case of 1-2 Corinthians. However, aspects of the rhetorical situation of cultic imagery in the other Pauline Letters will also be surveyed in this chapter.

The identification of cultic terms in the Pauline corpus at large demands further precision. The present chapter will make clear how the distinction between Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Letters matters for the historical interpretation of cultic terms in particular.

Among the undisputed Pauline Letters (1 Thess, 1-2 Cor, Gal, Rom, Phil, Phlm), the exclusive appearance of *temple* imagery in 1-2 Corinthians (1 Cor 3:16-17, 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16) attracts immediate attention. 1 Corinthians also contains references to the priestly service and to Israel's Temple cult (1 Cor 9:13, 10:18). The Corinthian correspondence deserves extra attention for reasons to which I will return at the end of this chapter.

Apart from 1-2 Corinthians, Paul's Letters to the Romans and to the Philippians include definite examples of cultic imagery. By contrast, 1 Thessalonians, Galatians and Philemon do not comprise cultic terms. My search for cultic imagery in the authentic Pauline Letters other than the Corinthian correspondence will concern Romans and Philippians in this chapter.

1.2 The application of cultic imagery

The problem of interpretation of Paul's cultic imagery concerns, to speak with Gordon D. Fee, the fact that "the imagery itself is much clearer than its points of application"⁵. If we have determined what a particular cultic term signified in the Graeco-Roman world in which Paul and his original readers lived, the question arises how and why Paul adopts such a cultic term in the context of his Letters. The interpretation of Paul's cultic terms may have important implications for people's perspective on how Paul's religious thought can be related to Jews and Greeks respectively, both of whom he addresses (cf. Rom 1:16, 11:13-14; 1 Cor 1:22-24).

Since Paul uses cultic imagery in diverse contexts and applies it to himself, his audience or others, it is important to 'de-rhetorise'⁶ Paul's cultic language and to examine which theology underlies Paul's cultic imagery. A historical interpretation of Paul's cultic terms needs to address the context in which Paul makes concrete references to cultic worship as well as the question of how his concrete and figurative uses of cultic terms are related to each other. Among the authentic Pauline Letters, only 1-2 Corinthians and Romans contain both concrete and figurative uses of explicit cultic imagery.

⁵ Cf. Fee, *Philippians* NICNT, 251 n. 50 about Phil 2:17: "Perhaps we should confess that we are fishing for answers to a very difficult metaphor, on which certainty will be hard to come by".

⁶ A term coined by Thurén, *Derhetorizing Paul*, 28; see my 'Introduction', 14.

2. The delimitation of Pauline authorship from pseudepigraphy and interpolation

2.1 Pauline Letters and Deutero-Pauline Letters

Thirteen Letters in the canon of the New Testament claim Pauline authorship. However, only part of these Letters are recognised as authentic Letters written by Paul, whereas the rest is usually regarded as pseudepigraphy in New Testament scholarship. My discussion will follow the scholarly consensus which recognises seven authentic Pauline Letters (1 Thess, 1-2 Cor, Gal, Rom, Phil and Phlm) and regards six other Letters (Col, Eph, 2 Thess, 1-2 Tim, Titus) as Deutero-Pauline Letters, written by followers of Paul and presented under his name⁷. This consensus is supported by important arguments, in particular in the case of cultic imagery.

In view of an accurate survey of Paul's cultic terms, it is very important to keep the discussion of the Pauline Letters distinct from the Deutero-Pauline Letters. The authors of the Deutero-Pauline Letters, probably followers of Paul, may have envisaged the transmission of Pauline ideas which circulated orally, or an elaboration on Paul's thought.⁸ However, it is methodically flawed to analyse these Letters as materials for the reconstruction of Paul's thought or to harmonise the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline evidence, as has been done in certain previous studies on cultic terminology and temple imagery.⁹ There are important literary and historical reasons to suppose that Paul's thought underlying his use of cultic terms differs fundamentally from the ideas behind the cultic terms employed in the Deutero-Pauline Letters.

The first reason concerns the relation between cultic terms and *ecclesiology*. The Letter to the Ephesians¹⁰ is an important example of this. The building and temple imagery in Eph 2:18-22 conveys a very different perspective from that in 1 Cor 3:9-17. Paul envisages Jesus Christ as the foundation of God's building (1 Cor 3:11), God's Temple (1 Cor 3:16-17), whereas the author of Ephesians refers to the "foundation of the apostles and prophets, the cornerstone of it being Christ Jesus" (Eph 2:20). Paul himself, however, still struggled with the opposition by other 'superlative apostles' (2 Cor 11:5.12-15; cf. Gal 1:6-9). Eph 2:20 reflects a hindsight viewpoint on the contributions of the apostles to the growth of the church. Paul is included by the author of Ephesians in the 'foundational generation', as Andrew T. Lincoln has noted.¹¹ The contrast of 'the least among all the saints' in Eph 3:8 with 'the least of the apostles' in 1 Cor 15:9 also attests to this hindsight perspective.

⁷ Cf. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 329-394; Conzelmann & Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 235-313; Ehrman, *The New Testament*, 344-362.

⁸ Cf. Faßbeck, *Der Tempel der Christen* for a thorough analysis of the different ways in which the Temple concept was appropriated in later New Testament and Apostolic writings (Hebrews, Acts, *Barn.* 16, 2 *Clem.* 8f., Shepherd of Hermas, Eph 2:11-22, Col 1:20-22, and letters of Ignatius). Cf. 193-214 for an analysis of Eph 2:11-22 in relation to the 'Corpus Paulinum', but also in clear distinction from Paul's temple imagery.

⁹ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 60-71 mentions the doubted authenticity of Ephesians, but still refers to Paul as its author and describes the Pastoral Epistles as "the most recent and most discussed of the Pauline Letters" (66). Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 321-373 discusses Eph 2:11-22, 1 Pet 2:4-10, 1 Tim 3:15, Hebrews 3:6, 8-10 as 'Pauline tradition', implying elaboration on Paul's building and temple imagery.

¹⁰ On Eph and Col in relation to each other and to Paul's authentic Letters, see now G.H. van Kooten, 'The Pauline Debate on the Cosmos: Graeco-Roman Cosmology and Jewish Eschatology in Paul and in the Pseudo-Pauline Letters to the Colossians and the Ephesians' (Ph.D. diss., Leiden University, 2001) at 261-309, 'Synopsis'; the book based on this Ph.D. dissertation is forthcoming in the WUNT series of Mohr Siebeck.

¹¹ Cf. A.T. Lincoln, *WBC 42 Ephesians* (Word Books: Dallas, Tex., 1990) 153-154. *Contra* A. Lindemann, *Der Epheserbrief* (Theologischer Verlag: Zürich, 1985) 54 who interprets Eph 2:20 as the contemporary activity of prophets and apostles in light of Eph 3:5. ἐποικοδομηθέντες in Eph 2:20, however, denotes a 'relative past'.

In addition, we may note the use of the non-Pauline terms ξένοι, πάροικοι and συμπολίται τῶν ἀγίων¹² in Eph 2:19, which address Gentile converts (cf. Eph 2:11, 3:1). These terms in Ephesians convey metaphorical language from the socio-political process of naturalisation. Paul instead writes in terms of κοινωνία / κοινωνεῖν in the case of both association with the faith in Christ (1 Cor 1:9; 2 Cor 13:13; Gal 2:9; Rom 15:27; Phil 1:5; Phlm 6) and the expected dissociation from (previous) idolatrous practices (1 Cor 10:16, 2 Cor 6:14). Thus, the picture in Ephesians of the congregation as Temple is rooted in a different, more hierarchical context than Paul's temple imagery in 1-2 Corinthians.

Most importantly, the 'kyriocentric' designation of the community as 'a holy Temple in the Lord', ναὸς ἅγιος ἐν κυρίῳ, in Eph 2:21 contrasts with Paul's consistent 'theocentric'¹³ reference to 'God's Temple', ναὸς (τοῦ) θεοῦ, in 1 Cor 3:16-17, 6:19, and 2 Cor 6:16. The seemingly subtle difference between the 'kyriocentric', that is, Christ-centred,¹⁴ and the 'theocentric' temple imagery is in fact a marked contrast. That is, the Ephesian temple imagery is entirely focused on the identity of the church in relation to Christ, whereas Paul's metaphor of God's Temple may echo the Jewish tradition of a monotheistic worship cult in the Second Temple period in a certain way, since Paul also refers to examples from this cult (cf. 1 Cor 10:18, Rom 9:4). Moreover, Paul represents Israel and the Israelites both in a sense of speaking about the Jewish people (e.g. 2 Cor 3:7, 11:22; Rom 9:3-5, Phil 3:5), and in a metaphorical, Christian sense (e.g. Rom 9:6f.), whereas the author of Ephesians refers to Israel exclusively in the light of the faith in Christ (Eph 2:12).¹⁵ I will return to the issue of the Second Temple period context and the breaking point of 70 CE in my discussion below on the historical grounds for a disjunction between cultic terms in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Letters.

The second reason to suppose a difference in perspective between the Pauline and the Deutero-Pauline Letters concerns the *apocalyptic perspective* which invests cultic terms. This point can be clarified by a comparison between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians. 2 Thessalonians is usually categorised as a Deutero-Pauline Letter.¹⁶ The author of 2 Thessalonians refers to the self-proclamation of the 'man of lawlessness, the son of destruction' (2 Thess 2:3) as God in the Temple of God, ὁ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (2 Thess 3:4). This observation figures in the context of apocalyptic warnings about catastrophic events preceding the day of the Lord (2 Thess 2:1-12), which may be compared with those in the Synoptic Gospels in certain respects.¹⁷ On the other hand instead, Paul writes about God's protection of the congregation as his holy Temple against any violation (1 Cor 3:17), after

¹² Lincoln, *Ephesians* WBC, 150-151 contrasts the meaning of ἅγιοι as 'all believers' in Ephesians to its frequent designation of the Jerusalem church in Paul's Letters (Rom 15:25.26.31; 1 Cor 16:1; 2 Cor 8:4, 9:1).

¹³ A term coined by McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 100-107, writing about the "traditional theocentric orientation of the temple concept".

¹⁴ Cf. Lindemann, *Der Epheserbrief*, 55-56 and Lincoln, *Ephesians* WBC, 156-157.

¹⁵ Cf. Lindemann, *Der Epheserbrief*, 56 on the exclusive focus of Eph on the Christian believers as God's people, without attention for the Israelites as a term for the Jews being God's people as in Romans 9-11.

¹⁶ *Contra* A.J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians* (Doubleday: New York [etc.], 2000) 364-375 who favours Pauline authorship. Cf. Donfried, *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*, 49-67 on the future eschatology in 2 Thess 2:3-12 as opposed to the 'realized eschatology' in 1 Thess 4:13-5:11.

¹⁷ Cf. 2 Thess 2:1-3 about the apocalyptic circumstances preceding the Second Advent (παρουσία) of Christ and 2 Thess 2:9 about the 'false signs and wonders', σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ψεύδους, accompanying Satan's activity, in comparison with Mark 13:4,22-27; Matt 24:3-5,15-31; Luke 21:7-9,20-28. *Contra* Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians* AB, 420-421, who relates 2 Thess 2:3-4 to an event in the past (the desecration of the Temple by Antiochus IV Epiphanes), a comparison with apocalyptic language in Matt 24:15 par. strongly suggests the contemporary (or recent past) setting of the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE.

having alluded to the testing of individual works on the day of the Lord (1 Cor 3:13). Thus, the reference to the Temple of God in the context of 2 Thess 2:1-12 implies an apocalyptic perspective provoked by contemporary circumstances which is altogether different from Paul's apocalyptic perspective inherent in 1 Cor 3:9-17.

The third reason to keep the discussion of cultic terms in the Pauline Letters distinct from those in the Deutero-Pauline Letters concerns the relation between cultic terms and the addressees of *moral instructions*. 1 Timothy may serve as an example here. 1 Tim 3:15 exhorts its readers to proper conduct in the 'house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and firm base of the truth'. It may be inferred from the preceding passage, 1 Tim 3:1-14, that this proper conduct applies in particular to those who minister in the 'house of God', that is, the overseers and the deacons. By contrast, Paul uses the metaphor of the Temple in his Letters to the Corinthians (1 Cor 3:16-17, 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16) to address moral issues concerning the congregation at large. Thus, the institutional focus of 1 Timothy also affects the building and temple imagery in 1 Tim 3:15, and thereby conveys a perspective distinct from Paul's temple imagery.

The fourth reason to distinguish cultic terms in the Pauline Letters from those in the Deutero-Pauline Letters concerns the *historical argument* about the turning point of 70 CE. As I have already pointed out in chapter three, the turning point of 70 CE matters in particular for a historical reconstruction of traditions about the early Jesus-movement, since this reconstruction is based on post-70 CE texts reflecting later circumstances when Judaism and Christianity parted ways. The religious crisis following the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 CE also effected this separation. The Deutero-Pauline Letters are generally dated *after* 70 CE.¹⁸ Therefore, the different historical circumstances which provoked the composition of these Letters have to be kept in mind in a comparative analysis on the Pauline Letters. A literary search for connections between Paul and the later 'Pauline tradition' with regard to cultic terms, among which temple imagery,¹⁹ carries the danger of underestimating the historical differences between Paul's time and the post-70 CE period.

We may summarily conclude this section by stressing that the cultic terms from the Deutero-Pauline Letters cannot be included into our survey about Paul's use of cultic terms without doing injustice to sensitive issues, such as the different rhetorical and ecclesiological contexts of cultic terms in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Letters respectively.

2.2 The question of interpolations

The other issue is the delimitation from interpolations which may also occur within the Letters regarded as authentically Pauline. The recent study by William O. Walker Jr. categorises various types of evidence for the identification of an interpolation.²⁰ Walker supports the *a priori* probability of interpolations in view of the literary history of the Pauline corpus within the emerging canon of the New Testament, but he also recognises the burden of proof required for establishing an interpolation as a credible hypothesis.²¹

¹⁸ See Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 328-401; Conzelmann & Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 237-238, 295, 302, 313.

¹⁹ Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 167-191 and Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 270 focus on a comparison between 1 Cor 3:16, 6:19, 2 Cor 6:16 and Eph 2:22 and point to "Traditionszusammenhang" (Klinzing, 191) or "traditionsgeschichtliche Ähnlichkeiten" (Strack, 271).

²⁰ W.O. Walker, Jr., *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters* (Sheffield AP, Continuum: London & New York, 2001) 63-90, refers to text-critical, contextual, linguistic, ideational, comparative, situational, motivational, and locational evidence.

²¹ Walker, *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters*, 26-43, 57-62.

There are, however, complications to Walker's considerations about types of evidence for an interpolation. The evaluation of certain ideational, situational or motivational evidence for an interpolation may partly depend on the critic's understanding of Paul's theology and Paul's reaction to certain rhetorical situations. Thus, the argument for interpolation may sometimes depend on subjective grounds. Furthermore, the linguistic evidence of *hapax legomena* as 'non-Pauline' in my view provides a rather tenuous argument for interpolation, as may be illustrated by an example from the pericope 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. The argument for the *hapax legomenon* μετοχή in 2 Cor 6:14 as a non-Pauline word is problematic, since the related verb μετέχειν does occur quite frequently elsewhere in Paul's Letters (1 Cor 9:10,12; 10:17,21,30).

The issue of interpolation will be discussed in individual cases of literary units within the Pauline Letters, where applicable (on 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, see my chap. 8). I will only deal with the question of interpolation in a particular case if it is an issue in scholarly literature.

3. Cultic imagery in the Pauline Letters other than 1-2 Corinthians

3.1 Romans

In contrast with his other Letters,²² Paul's Letter to the Romans addresses a church which he had not yet visited (Rom 1:8-13). Contrary to the Corinthian congregation, whose foundation he claims for himself (1 Cor 3:10-11), Paul calls Roman Christianity 'other man's foundation', ἀλλότριος θεμέλιος (Rom 15:20). However, Paul knew Roman Christians from previous missionary contacts. The Roman audience addressed by Paul included believers from both Jewish and Gentile backgrounds (Rom 2:17-29, 11:13-14, 16:3).

3.1.1 Rom 3:21-26

Romans 3:21-26 stands apart as a literary unit about God's righteousness to sinful humankind through redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις) in Christ Jesus.²³ Paul writes about this redemption in terms which might have cultic connotations. Thus, we read in Rom 3:25a about Christ Jesus, ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ [τῆς] πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, 'whom God presented publicly as a means of expiation, through [the] faith, by his blood'. This redemption serves the twofold purpose of overcoming sins in the past and of demonstrating God's righteousness at the present time (Rom 3:25b-26).

Contemporary Jewish literature provides evidence for the idea that the term ἱλαστήριον may be related to the *place of propitiation* in the Israelite worship cult.²⁴ The related verb ἱλάσκεισθαι also denotes the activity of propitiating related to the Israelite worship cult at certain occasions in Josephus' works (*Ant.* 8.112; *J.W.* 5.385). On the other hand, the usage of ἱλαστήριον as a *means of propitiation* may be quite general without specific cultic connotations (*Ant.* 16.182).²⁵

²² Cf. 1 Thess 1:5-9, 2:1; 1 Cor 1:14-16, 2:1-5; 2 Cor 10:1f., 13:1-2f.; Gal 1:8-9; Phil 3:18, 4:15-16; Phlm 17.

²³ Cf. J.D.G. Dunn, *WBC 38A Romans 1-8* (Word Books: Dallas, Tex., 1988) 161; J.A. Fitzmyer, S.J., *Romans* (Doubleday: New York [etc.], 1993) 341.

²⁴ The LXX term ἱλαστήριον mainly translates the Hebrew כפרת, that is, the covering or mercy seat upon the ark as the place around which rituals of atonement were centred. Cf. LXX Exod 25:17-22, 31:7, 35:12, 38:5.7-8; Lev 16:2.13-15; Num 7:89. Cf. Philo, *Cherubim* 25 quoting Exod 25:19; Hebrews 9:5.

²⁵ The verb ἱλάσκεισθαι may generally stand for making someone sympathetic toward someone or something (*Ant.* 6.124; *Ag.Ap.* 1.308). I disagree with the argument of D.A. Campbell, *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in*

In a pagan Hellenistic context, the verb ἰλάσκεισθαι may also both denote a cultic activity of propitiation and an intra-human or non-cultic religious activity of appeasing or conciliating,²⁶ while the term ἰλαστήριον further stands for propitiation in Graeco-Roman literature as well.²⁷ In the early Roman context, the idea of propitiation could further be related to both a cultic context of sacrifices within the *cultus deorum*, as the means to ward off omens, and a figurative context of morality and intra-human relationships.²⁸

The above mentioned contextual evidence does not unequivocally point to a connection of Paul's term ἰλαστήριον with cultic connotations.²⁹ Ferdinand Hahn has in fact argued against the idea of relating atonement to cultic tradition in Rom 3:25, considering this indemonstrable.³⁰ In general terms, Paul applies the idea of atonement for sins, and thereby reconciliation of God with his people, to Christ Jesus in Romans 3:21-26. This general idea of redemption in Christ Jesus is probably corroborated by Paul's statement in Rom 3:22 that 'there is no distinction', οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν διαστολή. This statement rhetorically counters the idea that the Law, and by extension the Jewish worship cult, can create an absolute distinction between Gentile impurities and Jewish holiness. Thus, Paul appears to defy the idea that the levitical commandment which distinguishes between the holy and the common, and between the unclean and the clean (Lev 10:10) should entail a distinction between Jews and Gentiles. In this way, Paul opposes ideas voiced by his opponents, among whom were the most traditionalist circles within the Jerusalem church (Gal 2:11-14). It would therefore make sense to Paul's argument that ἰλαστήριον expresses a notion of redemption in terms apart from the law (Rom 3:21), and, by extension, in terms apart from the Jewish worship cult.³¹

The redemption through Christ Jesus in Rom 3:25a does not entail the abrogation of the old covenant of God with Israel mediated through the priestly Temple cult.³² Just as Paul refers to righteousness through faith as a principle which upholds the law (Rom 3:27-31), so does Paul's theology of atonement serve to unify Jewish and Gentile converts in faith. Paul, however, mentions the worship cult as a privilege of the Israelites in Romans 9:4 (see the next section).

Romans 3.21-26 (Sheffield AP, JSOT Press: Sheffield, 1992) 130-133 that Paul's mentioning of ἰλαστήριον necessarily derives its meaning from the *Yom Kippur* in a Jewish context, addressing Christian Jews in Rome.

²⁶ See Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 195 and 273-274 respectively. Cf. BDAG, 473-474.

²⁷ Cf. BDAG, 474. Another term for cultic rituals of propitiation may be τὰ (ἱερὰ) μελικτήρια in a pagan context (LSJ) as well as in an Israelite context (cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 4.462 and 5.385).

²⁸ Cf. H.-F. Mueller, 'Ritual vocabulary and moral imperatives', in idem, *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus* (Routledge: London & New York, 2002) 108-147 at 146-147 about sin-offerings to propitiate the god Mars in Valerius 2.7.7 (*numen tuum propitiabatur*), and 131-139 about Valerius' description of relations in cultic terms.

²⁹ *Contra* K. Kertelge, 'Die »reine Opfergabe«. Zum Verständnis des »Opfers« im Neuen Testament', in Schreiner (ed.), *Freude am Gottesdienst*, 355-356 who interprets Rom 3:25 with Rom 5:9, 1 Cor 11:25 and 2 Cor 5:21 as evidence of a 'typological contrast' between the sacrifices of the old covenant and the eschatological sacrifice of Jesus' death in the new covenant. However, he contrast in Rom 3:21-26 is rather between opposing ideas of God's righteousness; cf. Rom 3:31.

³⁰ F. Hahn, 'Das Verständnis des Opfers im Neuen Testament', in K. Lehmann & E. Schlink (eds.), *Das Opfer Jesu Christi und seine Gegenwart in der Kirche. Klärungen zum Opfercharakter des Herrenmahles* (Herder: Freiburg im Breisgau / Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1983) 51-91 at 74-75.

³¹ *Contra* Campbell, *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3:21-26*, 132-133 who argues that Paul makes subtle Levitical allusions (Rom 3:25a, 8:3.34) to adapt his message to Christian Jews in Rome.

³² Cf. W.S. Campbell, 'Romans III as a Key to the Structure and Thought of Romans', in K.P. Donfried (ed.), *The Romans Debate* (Revised and Expanded Edition; T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1991) 251-264 at 254-255 who notes in relation to Rom 3:21-26 that Paul's gospel "is universal not in opposition to Jewish particularism, as has often mistakenly been believed, but precisely on the basis of that Jewish particularism which, through the fulfilment in Christ of the promises to Israel, is now opened up to include Gentiles also".

3.2.2 Romans 9-11

Romans 9-11 forms a thematic unity, because it defines the place of Israel in Paul's theology of salvation.³³ It is important for our understanding of Paul's theology on contemporary Judaism and Israel, which pertains to converts from the Gentiles in God's covenant with Israel.³⁴ Within Rom 9-11, certain issues directly (Rom 9:4) or indirectly (Rom 9:33, 11:26-27) relate to Jerusalem (Zion) and the Temple cult.

Rom 9:1-5

Romans 9:1-5 is a statement from religious conscience, which expresses Paul's view about his relation to the Jews, "my brothers, my kinsmen according to the flesh" (Rom 9:3). Paul writes in Rom 9:4-5 that they indeed are "Israelites to whom belong belong the adoption of sons and the glory and the covenants³⁵ and the lawgiving and the worship service and the promises, of whom are the patriarchs and from whom is the Christ according to the flesh; the One Being³⁶ over all, God be blessed for ever, amen".

Among the blessings of the Israelites, the *worship*, ἡ λατρεία, is of interest to our survey of cultic imagery, since it concerns the Israelite worship cult, that is, the Jerusalem Temple cult in Paul's time.³⁷ The term 'glory' (ἡ δόξα) might further be related to the worship service of the Temple which was filled with the 'glory of the Lord' according to 1 Kings 8:10-11. Nevertheless, the latter identification is less sure in view of its place in Paul's enumeration, which is distant from ἡ λατρεία; and because the 'glory' may also be more broadly connected to the manifestation of God's glory to Israel through the covenants recounted in the Bible,³⁸ and reinterpreted by Paul (cf. e.g. 2 Cor 3:7-11).

The context for Paul's description of, among other Israelite privileges, Israel's Temple cult is a theological dilemma. That is, in Rom 9:1-3, Paul phrases the dilemma that his gospel mission in Christ separates him from fellow Jews who do not believe in Jesus Christ,³⁹ while Paul views faith as the only way of salvation (cf. Rom 10:1-4, 11:23). Without this faith the word of God is empty according to Paul (Rom 9:6). Nevertheless, Paul also views God's gifts and call as irrevocable (Rom 11:29) and stresses his sense of belonging to the Israelite tradition at the same time in Rom 9-11 (cf. Rom 11:1, καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλῆτης εἰμί).

Just as Paul concludes Rom 9:1-5 with a prayer-like blessing formula, he also expresses his 'heart's desire and prayer to God' in Rom 10:1 that these Jews may be saved through faith. Paul's perspective on the Israelite prerogatives, including the Temple cult, is determined by faith which enlightens the tradition. Paul's theology of Israel opens the

³³ See e.g. Fitzmyer, *Romans* AB, 550-554 with bibliography.

³⁴ Cf. Rom 9:3-4, 32, 11:28 for the 3rd person plural designating fellow Jews; see J.D. Kim, *God, Israel, and the Gentiles. Rhetoric and Situation in Romans 9-11* (SBLDS 176; Society of Biblical Literature: Atlanta, Ga., 2000) 103-107 about Rom 11:13-14 in the debate about the audience addressed in Rom 9-11.

³⁵ Cf. B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (UBS: London & New York, 1975), 519 about αἱ διαθήκαι in Rom 9:4 as a *lectio difficilior*, preferable to the variant reading ἡ διαθήκη.

³⁶ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 520-523 notes that ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων, if linked to the preceding phrase ὁ Χριστὸς κατὰ σάρκα in Rom 9:5, yields an un-Pauline idea of Christ as God. See LXX Exod 3:14 about God as ὁ ὢν; cf. Philo, *Spec.Laws* 1.270 about the 'Temple of the truly Existent', τὸ τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος ἱερὸν.

³⁷ Cf. LXX 1 Chron 28:13, 1 Macc 2:19.22; Josephus, *J.W.* 2.409; Fitzmyer, *Romans* AB, 547 translates ἡ λατρεία as 'the cult', that is, Israel's Temple cult as opposed to "the idolatrous worship of Israel's neighbors".

³⁸ Fitzmyer, *Romans* AB, 546 notes examples from Exod 15:6, 11; 16:10; 40:34; 1 Kgs 8:11 about the different contexts to God's glory through God's covenants with "Israel's ancestors".

³⁹ Cf. Rom 8:35-39, in which Paul stresses that nothing can 'separate us from the love of Christ' (v. 35).

perspective of salvation up to the Gentiles, but at the same time stresses the weight of Israelite tradition through the metaphor of the olive tree in Rom 11:17-24; a metaphor which associates the Israelites with the natural position in God's plan of salvation.

Rom 9:30-33

In the context of his theological elaboration on the theme of God's election, Paul voices the idea that righteousness is not only attained by those who descended from Israel but also by the Gentiles (Rom 9:6-29). Thus, God's calling addresses not only the Jews but also the Gentiles, οὐ μόνον ἐξ Ἰουδαίων ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἐθνῶν (Rom 9:24); an idea for which Paul quotes from the prophets Hosea and Isaiah as prooftexts in Rom 9:25-29. By emphasising faith as the quality which brings Jews and Gentiles together, Paul aims to correct a wrong kind of perception of righteousness from the Law devoid of faith (Rom 9:30-32).

In the context of this argument, Paul 'quotes' from Scripture in Romans 9:33: καθὼς γέγραπται· ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται, 'as it is written: behold, I lay a stumbling stone in Zion and a rock of temptation to sin, and the one who believes in him will not be ashamed'. This 'quotation' appears to be collated from Isa 28:16 and 8:14, for Paul has the image of a 'stumbling stone', ὁ λίθος τοῦ προσκόμματος, already in his mind (Rom 9:32) and refers the reader back to scriptural prooftexts.

Since Zion denotes the city of Jerusalem,⁴⁰ Paul implicitly expresses a critical view on the centrality of Jerusalem and its Temple. Paul alludes to prophetic criticism of Zion and appropriates it for his view about the contemporary situation of unbelief. Paul's critical view on the contemporary place of Jerusalem and its Temple appears to play a central part in the background of Paul's theology of salvation. In the rhetorical situation of opposition to his mission (Galatians), Paul is even far more polemical and direct in his view about Jerusalem, since he distinguishes between the 'present Jerusalem' in slavery and the 'Jerusalem above' which is free in Gal 4:25-26. Nevertheless, the context of Rom 9-11 precludes this kind of polemic against Jerusalem, since the stumbling block in Zion may make the Israelites stumble (Rom 9:32), but it does not make them fall (Rom 11:11) in Paul's perspective.

Rom 11:1-16

Paul explicitly counters the idea of God's rejection of his people in Rom 11:1-16, quoting from 1 Kgs 19:10,14 in Rom 11:3 and from 1 Kgs 19:18 in Rom 11:4 to elaborate the notion of God's grace for a faithful remnant in the midst of a hardened, unbelieving rest.⁴¹ In Rom 11:16, Paul uses terms derived from a *cultic* context of a dough offering and the figure of a tree with its branches as two examples to illustrate the idea that God's covenant with Israel naturally extends from the patriarchs to contemporary Israel.⁴²

Thus, Rom 11:16 reads: εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα· καὶ εἰ ἡ ῥίζα ἁγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι, 'If the first fruit (of dough) is holy, so is the lump; and if the root is holy, so are the branches'. The cultic context of a dough offering is found in Numbers 15:18-21; and *m. Hallah* refers back to this original context of the Temple cult for the dough offering.

⁴⁰ Cf. BDAG, 925 about Mt. Zion, a "hill within the city of Jerusalem", and Zion as Jerusalem, cf. Jer 3:14.

⁴¹ Cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans* AB, 602-618 about Rom 11:1-10 on Israel's hardening being 'partial', and Rom 11:11-24 on Israel's disbelief being 'temporary and providential'.

⁴² Fitzmyer, *Romans* AB, 614 points to divergence in the identification of the two images in Rom 11:16, and links the first fruits of dough with the remnant "which has already accepted Christ" and the root with the patriarchs. The preceding verses, Rom 11:11-15, in my view strongly implies that both images concern Israel.

Thus, Paul uses cultic imagery to reaffirm the holiness of the Israelites, whose acceptance by God is understood by Paul as a life which saves from death (Rom 11:15). The second example of the root of a tree and its branches marks the transition to Paul's elaboration of the metaphor of the olive tree in Rom 11:17-24.

Rom 11:25-32

Paul emphasises the eventual salvation of all Israel in the concluding part of Romans 9-11, that is, Rom 11:25-32. In Romans 11:26-27, Paul presents a collation of scriptural quotations about Zion and God's covenant with the Israelites. Paul here unfolds his eschatological perspective on God's covenant with Israel. Since Zion stands for Jerusalem and may therefore illuminate Paul's eschatological perspective on Jerusalem and the Temple, Romans 11:25-32 deserves specific attention for our survey.

In Rom 11:26-27, Paul refers to words from LXX Isaiah 59:20-21 and 27:9 about the covenant of God with his people through the Deliverer who is to come from Zion. The Deliverer is identified as the Lord in the context of Isaiah, but Paul's use of Zion-traditions (cf. Rom 9:33 previously discussed) suggests that faith in Christ is the context for the covenant and salvation here. Paul in fact identifies Jesus Christ as the Deliverer from the wrath to come, that is, in the expected end-time, in 1 Thess 1:10. On the other hand, Paul writes about God's agency in redemption in 2 Cor 1:9-10. The salvation of all Israel through God's irrevocable call (Rom 11:26-29) appears to reinforce the privileged place of the Israelites. Since Zion, which stands for Jerusalem, is apparently central to this eschatological salvation and the eventual renewal of the covenant, it appears unlikely that Paul had the supersession of Israelite privileges in mind.

Paul's perspective on the contemporary worship in the Jerusalem Temple, however, has been troubled by the sharp ritual boundaries between Jews and Gentiles and a similar pressure to draw such ritual boundaries as exerted by the 'circumcision party' (cf. Gal 2:11-14, 6:12). In view of Paul's redefinition of his understanding of Jewish identity (Rom 2:28-3:8) and of his belief in the one God of the Jews and the Gentiles together (Rom 3:29-30), Paul's idea of valid Temple worship would probably correspond with the prophetic tradition in Isaiah 56:7 of God's Temple as a 'house of prayer for all peoples'.

3.2.3 Rom 12:1-2

From ἡ λατρεία in Rom 9:4 (cf. section 5.2.1), Paul's theological discussion turns to ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία ὑμῶν, 'your *reasoned* worship', in Rom 12:1. This verse addresses the worship of the Roman congregation in cultic terms, urging its members to present 'your bodies as a living sacrifice holy and acceptable to God', παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ. The fact that Paul refers to the bodies of the Roman believers as a living sacrifice may be explained in the context of dangers of persecution (Rom 12:14). The body as a living sacrifice could then represent the idea of endurance of hardships for the sake of the faith in Christ. Paul's sense of a *reasoned* worship may well be informed by what he writes in Rom 12:2, namely that the Roman congregation should not be conformed to this world, but should focus on the renewal of the mind in light of God's will. The will of God comprises what is good, acceptable, and perfect (Rom 12:2).

The expression ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία in Rom 12:1 has often been interpreted as '*spiritual* worship'⁴³. Wolfram Strack, for example, has associated Paul's use of the term λογικός in

⁴³ Cf. the translation from RSV; Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 73 n. 1: "Rom. xii.1 has the word λογικός ('spiritual worship') in a context similar to that of 1 Pet ii. 5.", and Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 362. See, however, the translation 'a cult suited to your rational nature' by Fitzmyer, *Romans* AB, 637.

this passage with the usage of πνευματικός in 1 Peter 2:5, which denotes the explicitly *spiritual* idea of the church as a Temple in the end time, as distinct from the contemporary Temple cult.⁴⁴ The term λογικός figures in 1 Pet 2:2 in the expression τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα, which the Revised Standard Version translates as ‘the pure *spiritual* milk’. In Paul’s own Greek, however, the term πνευματικός consistently signifies something spiritual (1 Cor 3:1-2, 10:3-4).⁴⁵ It remains to be argued rather than to be assumed whether the word λογικός means the same in Paul’s Greek as in the Greek of 1 Peter. The context to the usage of λογικός in Rom 12:1 is certainly different from that of 1 Pet 2:2-5. Contrary to 1 Pet 2:5, Paul does not write about spiritual sacrifices in Rom 12:1, but about the bodies as living sacrifices which are acceptable to God. Strack’s association of Paul’s term λογικός with πνευματικός in 1 Pet 2:5, therefore amounts to a harmonisation of evidence from the New Testament writings and fails to do justice to Paul’s Greek. It is even misleading to think that Paul and the author of 1 Peter had a fixed idea in mind with the term πνευματικός, for this depends on the context of their messages.

Moreover, Christine Mohrmann observed that traditional associations of the term λογικός with ‘reasonable’ and ‘rational’ may have persisted in early Latin Christianity, as is revealed by the Latin translation *rationabilis* of the Greek term λογικός. The Latin term *rationabilis* was far less well defined than the pair *spiritualis-carnalis* in later Latin Christianity according to Mohrmann.⁴⁶

Paul has a figurative notion of cultic worship in mind in Rom 12:1-2, as becomes clear from his use of the term sacrifice in a non-literal way. However, it does not necessarily follow that this figurative notion of cult concerns *spiritual* worship, in contrast to the contemporary Jerusalem Temple cult.⁴⁷ For if ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία ὑμῶν in Rom 12:1 were necessarily contrasted to ἡ λατρεία in Rom 9:4, by the same reasoning τὰ ἱερά in Jewish diaspora communities (*Ant.* 14.213-214, 227-228, 234, 237, 240, 242, 245, 258) would have to be contrasted to τὰ ἱερά of the Jerusalem Temple cult (*J.W.* 4.279). This latter idea is not at all implied by Josephus.

R.J. McKelvey and G. Klinzing have rightly noted that Paul’s reference to the bodies of the Roman addressees as a living sacrifice, θυσία ζῶσα, precludes the identification of ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία, with Hellenistic spiritualisation.⁴⁸ Hellenistic Jewish literature applies the figurative idea of sacrifice to the soul, as we read for instance in a treatise of Philo: ‘Genuine worship is that of a soul presenting the truth as its simple and only sacrifice’ (*Worse* 21).⁴⁹

In my view, Paul had in mind not so much a distinction from the Jerusalem Temple cult but rather a contrast with the surrounding Graeco-Roman world in Rom 12:1-2. Thus,

⁴⁴ Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 362 about the οἶκος πνευματικός and the πνευματικὰς θυσίας in 1 Pet 2:5: “Der Begriff πνευματικός ist hier ähnlich dem λογικός in Röm 12,1 zu sehen”.

⁴⁵ The notion of spiritual food in 1 Pet 2:2-5 may be an elaboration on that in 1 Cor 3:1-2 and 10:3-4. See Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 468: “Der 1 Petr steht im Einflußbereich paulinischer bzw. nach-paulinischer Theologie”.

⁴⁶ C. Mohrmann, ‘Rationabilis - ΛΟΓΙΚΟΣ’, in eadem, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens I Le latin des chrétiens* (Ed. di Storia e Letteratura: Rome, 1961) 179-187.

⁴⁷ Thus P.W.L. Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City. New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich. / Cambridge, U.K., 1996) 122-123 interprets ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία in Rom 12:1, translated as ‘spiritual worship’ (122), in contrast to the form of worship “offered in the Temple (as in Rom. 9:4)” (23).

⁴⁸ McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 184-185; Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 214-215 contrasts Hellenistic spiritualisation to Paul’s cultic imagery applied to the body. However, Klinzing (216-217) understands Rom 12:1 and 1 Pet 2:5 as two corresponding cases of ‘Umdeutung des Kultus’ and implicitly associates the meaning of πνευματικός in 1 Pet 2:5 with Paul’s usage of λογικός in Rom 12:1.

⁴⁹ γνήσιοι δ’ εἰσὶν αἱ [θεραπείαι] ψυχῆς ψιλὴν καὶ μόνην θυσίαν φερούσης ἀλήθειαν. Text from F.H. Colson & G.H. Whitaker, *Philo* II (LCL 227; Harvard UP: Cambridge, Mass., & London, 1929) 217.

Paul contrasts the surrounding world, ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος,⁵⁰ to which his readers should not conform, with the renewal of the mind in light of God's will in Rom 12:2. As I have already mentioned, Paul's sense of the body as a 'living sacrifice' may be understood in the context of endurance of hardships for the sake of the faith in Christ. This idea becomes even more tangible when Paul refers to an apparent imminent context of tribulation, persecution, and evil in Rom 12:12-21.

3.2.4 Rom 15:14-33

Romans 15:14-33 unfolds Paul's travel plans and links Paul's mission to the Gentiles with his service for the Jerusalem church.⁵¹ It is significant that Paul uses cultic imagery in this connection, since this may tell us something about how Paul understood the relation between Jerusalem and the Gentiles.

Rom 15:16

In Rom 15:16, Paul expresses his service for the Gentile congregations in cultic terms 'to be a servant of Christ Jesus for the Gentiles, administering the gospel of God as a priest, in order that the offering of the Gentiles may be acceptable,⁵² sanctified by the Holy Spirit', εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱεουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

Paul's mode of expression in Rom 15:16 evokes the analogy between Paul's gospel mission and cultic worship, as the terms λειτουργός, ἱεουργεῖν, and ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνῶν reveal. Through this analogy, Paul associates his own role with that of priestly service in cultic worship; terms which by themselves may have both pagan and Jewish connotations.⁵³ Even though there may be parallels with pagan cultic usage of these terms,⁵⁴ it is unlikely that Paul would have an analogy in mind other than that with the priestly service of God represented by the contemporary Jerusalem Temple. For Paul also points to the *gospel of God* in Rom 15:16 and to his preaching the gospel from *Jerusalem* to Illyricum in Rom 15:19.

⁵⁰ Cf. BDAG, 32 about the Jewish dichotomy between העולם הזה and העולם הבא underlying Paul's term ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος (parallel to העולם הזה) in Rom 12:2.

⁵¹ Cf. the parallel between Paul's hope in Rom 15:16 that the 'offering of the Gentiles' may be acceptable, εὐπρόσδεκτος, and in Rom 15:31 that his service for Jerusalem may be acceptable, εὐπρόσδεκτος, to the saints. See J.D.G. Dunn, *WBC 38B Romans 9-16* (Word Books: Dallas, Tex., 1988) 854 about Rom 15:14-33 as "the intimation of travel plans"; cf. 856-857 about the use of cultic terms in Rom 15:15-16 and 15:27-28.

⁵² The 'offering of the Gentiles' stands in my view for that which the converts from the Gentiles have to offer to God, that is, their faith and works out of faith.

⁵³ On λειτουργέω and λειτουργός, see A. Hilhorst, "'Servir Dieu" dans la terminologie du judaïsme hellénistique et des premières générations chrétiennes de langue grecque', in A.A.R. Bastiaensen, A. Hilhorst & C.H. Kneepkens (eds.), *Fructus Centesimus. Mélanges offerts à Gerard J.M. Bartelink à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire* (Instrumenta Patristica 19; Steenbrugge, 1989), 186-189, 190-192; C. Spicq, *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire I* (Éditions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse / Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1978) 475-481; G. Kittel (ed.), *TWNT 4 A-N* (Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1942) 221-238.

⁵⁴ On λειτουργός and λειτουργέω in a pagan cultic context, cf. e.g. *SEG XXVII* (1977) 745; *XXXIII* (1983) 639, 907; *XLII* (1992) 529, 533; *XLIII* (1993) 311A.1; *XLV* (1995) 2351; on ἱεουργός as a cult official in a pagan context, cf. e.g. *SEG XXXI* (1981) 950; *XXXII* (1982) 872; *XXXIII* (1983) 935, 937; on προσφορά, cf. e.g. *SEG XXVI* (1976) 1676, 1683; *XXX* (1980) 1711; *XXXI* (1981) 1451; *XXXII* (1982) 1492, 1513; *XXXIII* (1983) 1305; *XXXIV* (1984) 1511; *XXXV* (1985) 1555.

In fact, several passages in the Septuagint refer to servants, λειτουργοί, in the Jerusalem Temple, which may also be a general designation applied to the priests.⁵⁵ The term ἱερουργεῖν occasionally designates the priestly service in the Septuagint.⁵⁶ In Josephus' works, the verb ἱερουργεῖν often denotes the activity of worshippers who participate in the sacrificial rites of the Jerusalem Temple (*J.W.* 5.14, 16; *Ant.* 3.237; 5.333; 11.110), but sometimes it is specified as priestly service (*Ant.* 14.65, 67; 17.166). Philo also alludes to the Temple cult a few times through the term ἱερουργία (*Spec.Laws* 1.125; *Moses* 2.73).⁵⁷

J. Ponthot has argued that the focus in Rom 15:16 is not so much on the priestly formulation of Paul's mission but on the 'ecclesiological and soteriological vision' underlying the cultic imagery which relates to the Gentiles.⁵⁸ This interpretation still leaves the question why Paul couches his theological message in cultic terms, a dimension which is apparently important to Paul.

Significantly, the term ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνῶν, meaningless in the context of pagan Hellenistic cults as it refers to the offering of the 'Gentiles' from a Jewish point of view,⁵⁹ was charged with dispute in the Jewish context contemporary to Paul. That is, the place of Gentile offerings in the Jerusalem Temple cult was hotly disputed by Palestinian-Jewish movements (cf. my chap. 1). The revolutionary movement which gained the upper hand among the priestly factions of the Jerusalem Temple at the eve of the Jewish war would accept no gift or sacrifice from any foreigner according to Josephus (*J.W.* 1.409). The Qumran text 4QMMT further expresses a negative sectarian viewpoint on the offering of Gentile sacrifice, זבח הגוים (MMT B 8).⁶⁰ On the other hand, Josephus and early rabbinic literature provide evidence that the priestly establishment generally accepted certain forms of participation of Gentiles in the Jerusalem Temple cult⁶¹.

Within this contemporary Jewish context, Paul's cultic imagery may serve a deliberate rhetorical purpose. Paul's expressed hope that the offering of the Gentiles may be acceptable, εὐπρόσδεκτος, could be related to his wish to conciliate his mission among the Gentiles with the Jerusalem church. The fact that he expresses this hope in cultic imagery may reveal that Paul expects the saints of Jerusalem, as opposed to the 'unbelievers in Judaea', to show goodwill to his Gentile mission (Rom 15:31).

Rom 15:27-28

The relation to Jerusalem brings us to the other part of Paul's service, that is, his service for the Jerusalem church, which he mentions in Rom 15:25-33. Paul states in Rom 15:27 that the

⁵⁵ Cf. LXX 2 Esdr 7:24 (λειτουργοὶ οἴκου θεοῦ); Sir 7:30f about servants. Cf. LXX 2 Esd 20:40 (οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ λειτουργοί); Isa 61:6 (ὕμεις δὲ ἱερεῖς κυρίου κληθήσεσθε, λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ) about priests.

⁵⁶ 4 Macc 7:8 mentions οἱ ἱερουργοῦντες τὸν νόμον, 'those who administer the law as priests', and 4 Macc 3:20 refers to the Temple service, ἱερουργία.

⁵⁷ Other Philonic terms are τὰ ἱερεῖα (*Drunkness* 85) and ἡ περὶ τὸν νεὼν λειτουργία (*Spec.Laws* 1.123).

⁵⁸ J. Ponthot, 'L'expression culturelle du ministère paulinien selon Rom 15,16', in A. Vanhoye (ed.), *L'apôtre Paul. Personnalité, style et conception du ministère* (BETL 73; Leuven UP / Peeters: Leuven, 1986) 254-262.

⁵⁹ τὰ ἔθνη is biblical Greek, translating the Hebrew הגוים, for Gentiles. The term is also used in Jewish post-biblical Greek; cf. *Ant.* 13.196, 200; 19.328. Cf. J.M. Scott, *Paul and the Nations. The Old Testament and Jewish Background of Paul's Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of Galatians* (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1995).

⁶⁰ Cf. MMT B 3 about the contribution of the wheat of the Gentiles (תרומת דגן הגוים) and B 4-5 that it should not be eaten nor brought into the Temple, ש, לבוא למקדש, [ואין] [הגוים] [ואין].

⁶¹ E.g. Josephus, *J.W.* 2.411-414; *m. Zebah.* 4.5, *m. Menah.* 5.3,5 and 6.1 about the meal-offering of a Gentile; *m. Hul.* 1.1, however, focuses on the uncleanness of animals killed for food by Gentiles.

converts from the Gentiles should serve, λειτουργῆσαι, the congregation in Jerusalem. This passage about the other part of Paul's service, which is related to the Jerusalem church, establishes the other half of the cultic metaphor which Paul began in Rom 15:16.

Having compared his own position as an apostle with the priestly service, Paul puts the position of the Gentile congregations in perspective in Rom 15:27-28. Thus, Paul refers to their material service, ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς, in Rom 15:27 and to the fruit of this service (καρπός) delivered by himself in Rom 15:28. Here the analogy may again stem from the priestly service which mediated spiritual blessings (e.g. the priestly blessing), but presupposed a material sustenance by the worshippers.⁶²

Significantly, Rom 15:26-27.31 underlines the centrality of the Jerusalem church in the gospel mission to the Gentiles, since the Gentiles have come to share in the spiritual blessings of the saints in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, Paul apparently does not count the Roman church among the churches of the Gentiles who are expected to make a contribution for the poor to the saints at Jerusalem (cf. Rom 15:26-27, 16:4). Contrary to the Thessalonian, Corinthian, and Philippian congregations, the Roman church included Christian-Jewish missionaries, like Prisca and Aquila (Rom 16:3-4), among its numbers.

The Roman readers are demanded to pray that Paul's mission to Jerusalem may be found acceptable by the saints and that he may be delivered from the unbelievers in Judaea (Rom 15:30-31). Paul thereby presupposes that the Jerusalem church had this central place in the gospel mission and its spiritual blessings also for the Roman congregation(s).

3.3 Philippians

Paul wrote his Letter to the Philippians in a relatively late stage of his gospel mission, while being imprisoned in Rome (cf. Phil 1:13-14). Philippi was a Roman colony (Acts 16:12, cf. Phil 4:22) and the congregation in Philippi may have largely consisted of Gentile converts (cf. Phil 4:15). Nevertheless, Paul found it necessary to write about his Jewish background (Phil 3:5-6) and to warn the Philippians against opponents, 'evil-workers' (Phil 3:2), who would impose a Jewish way of life on Gentile converts. This suggests a certain extent of (Christian-)Jewish influence or presence in Philippi.

3.3.1 Phil 2:12-18

In a rhetorical unit about that which the Philippians share with Paul 'as in my presence, but much more in my absence' (v.12), Paul emphasises their partnership in faith. He urges the Philippians to do all things without complaints and disputes, in order to become unblemished and pure, blameless children of God in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation (Phil 2:14-15). In Phil 2:16, Paul stresses that, in that case, he may not have run in vain when the day of Christ has come.⁶³ Paul brings the idea of partnership to a climax in Phil 2:17 where he uses a cultic metaphor about the sacrificial offering of the Philippians' faith together with a libation of Paul himself: Ἐὰν εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν, 'But even if I am offered up as a libation over the sacrificial service of your faith, I am delighted and I rejoice with all of you'. Through this hyperbole, Paul also urges the Philippians to show solidarity with him (Phil 2:18).

⁶² Cf. BDAG, p. 591. *Contra* J.D.G. Dunn, *WBC 38B Romans 9-16* (1988), 876 who interprets Paul's language as a turning of tables, "Gentiles ministering (as priests) to Jews"; this seems to me an overinterpretation of λειτουργεῖν in this context. The material service concerns the contribution for the poor among the saints in Jerusalem (Rom 15:26) and is not specified as cultic imagery, as is the case in Rom 15:16 with λειτουργός.

⁶³ οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἔδραμον. Cf. the very similar phrase μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον in Gal 2:2.

The expression ἡ θυσία καὶ λειτουργία τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, literally ‘the sacrifice and service of your faith’, here conveys the Philippians’ part in Paul’s cultic metaphor. According to recent commentaries, Paul refers to the theme of common suffering rather than to martyrdom or death, since the latter idea must be refuted on lexical, contextual, and theological grounds.⁶⁴ The idea in commentaries suggests that we have to deal with a difficult verse containing a cultic metaphor, but it should be noted that the combination of the adjectives ἀμειπτος, ἀκέραιος and ἄμωμος in Phil 2:15 probably also has cultic overtones. This language conveys the idea of an unblemished, unmixed state which corresponds to a state beyond reproach which was required of priests in the Temple service (cf. *Ant.* 3.278).

If Phil 2:17 expresses the theme of common suffering, why does Paul couch this idea in sacrificial language? Was it common to use such terms as proverbial language for suffering in contemporary Jewish tradition or in the Graeco-Roman world at large? The work of Josephus comprises a number of cases of figurative usage of σπένδομαι: ‘to become reconciled (with someone), reconcile oneself with, to make an agreement’ (cf. *Life* 324) or as a middle voice also ‘to covenant, to enter into (a contract)’ (*Ant.* 5.51). The word σπονδή can also stand for treaty, treaties, conclusion of peace, truce (*Ant.* 13.242) or covenant, alliance (*Ant.* 1.313; 12.154).

In the pagan Graeco-Roman context, sacrifice and libation could take place in religious associations, while aspects of rituals apparently even took place in domestic settings.⁶⁵ Paul refers to the pagan sacrificial context when he discusses food offered to idols in 1 Cor 8, but his exhortation is also firmly set against idolatry in 1 Cor 10:14. By analogy, it therefore appears very unlikely that Paul would have had an allusion to pagan cultic practices in mind with his use of sacrificial imagery in Phil 2:17. The context of Phil 2:12-18 may also imply a contrast with the pagan environment, since Paul addresses the Philippians as the ‘children of God’ in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation (Phil 2:15).

The idea of the covenant mediated through the priestly service of God was familiar and probably also important to Paul. Paul exhorts the Philippians to become blameless and pure. His sacrificial imagery in Phil 2:17 apparently serves to underline the opposite of a vain mission to the Gentiles (Phil 2:16). Since the figurative idea of a sacrificial service of faith clearly derives from the cultic domain, it may have been patterned on the Israelite tradition of the Temple cult which stood for the worship of the one God and which applied to Paul’s mission to the Gentiles through the faith in Christ.⁶⁶

3.3.2 Phil 4:14-20

Paul uses cultic imagery in Philippians 4:14-20, where he also introduces the idea of partnership and solidarity. In Phil 4:18, Paul describes the gifts sent by the Philippians in cultic terms. The gifts stand for the fruit of the Philippians’ helpful partnership in the gospel of Christ. Thus we read in Phil 4:18: ἀπέχω δὲ πάντα καὶ περισσεύω· πεπλήρωμαι δεξάμενος παρὰ Ἐπαφροδίτου τὰ παρ’ ὑμῶν, ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας, θυσίαν δεκτὴν, εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ ‘*Now I have received all things in full and I have more than enough; I am filled with the things which I have received from you on the part of Epaphroditus, a pleasant fragrance, a pleasing sacrifice, acceptable to God*’.

⁶⁴ G.F. Hawthorne, *WBC 43 Philippians* (Waco, Tex., 1983) 105-106; Fee, *Philippians* NICNT, 250-252.

⁶⁵ Cf. J. Rüpke, ‘*Collegia sacerdotum*: Religiöse Vereine in der Oberschicht’, in U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser & A. Schäfer (eds.), *Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike. Untersuchungen zu Organisation, Ritual und Raumordnung* (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 2002) 41-67 at 53 on the “allgemeine Zusammengehörigkeit von Opfer und Mahlzeit”.

⁶⁶ Cf. Phil 3:3 οἱ πνεύματι θεοῦ λατρεύοντες καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

The cultic language of offering and sacrifice is related to the 'fruit' among the Philippians (Phil 4:17). This 'fruit' may be connected to the 'fruit of righteousness through Jesus Christ to the glory and praise of God' in Phil 1:11. Paul voices the partnership in faith through a metaphor from the cultic domain which also expresses partnership between human beings in the covenantal relationship toward God.

4. Summary

Contrary to much previous scholarship on cultic imagery in the New Testament, we have important historical and literary reasons to suppose a disjunction between the evidence of cultic imagery in the Pauline and the Deutero-Pauline Letters respectively.

The evidence of Romans yields information about how Paul's cultic imagery may be related to his mission to Jews and Gentiles. Paul's reference to expiation by Christ's blood in Rom 3:25, however, does not necessarily have cultic connotations, but expresses the general christological orientation of Paul's thought about redemption in God's righteousness.

Paul's reference to Israel's worship cult in Rom 9:4 figures in the context of the theological theme of Rom 9-11 about the temporary hardening of part of Israel in unbelief, which paradoxically brings salvation for the Gentiles who are included in God's covenant. Paul was undoubtedly critical towards the contemporary Jerusalem and its Temple. However, Paul's argument in Rom 9-11 does not point out that Paul had the supersession of the Temple cult in mind. Just as in the case of the Law, Paul instead redefined the idea of Israel's cult in light of the faith in Christ to include the Gentiles in God's covenant.

The idea of a substitution for Israel's cult in the form of spiritual worship needs to be reconsidered, especially in the case of Rom 12:1-2, since the idea of spiritualisation does not do justice to Paul's Greek, nor to the context of the passage. Paul's term 'reasoned worship', ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία, in Rom 12:1 rather denotes a juxtaposition with the way of life in the surrounding world, to which the Roman congregation should not conform. Reasoned worship is related to the renewal of the mind in light of the will of God (Rom 12:2).

The cultic imagery in Rom 15:14-33 may have a deliberate, rhetorical purpose, expressing Paul's hope that the Jerusalem church may be conciliated with his Gentile mission. Paul further presupposes the assent of Christian Jews in Rome to his mission, among whom were fellow missionaries of Paul, like Prisca and Aquila. His cultic imagery could play on contemporary Jewish discussion about the part to be played by the Gentiles in the Jerusalem Temple cult.

Philippians includes two passages, Phil 2:12-18 and 4:14-20, where Paul uses cultic imagery (Phil 2:17, 4:18). Paul's figurative use of cultic terms here may be understood in the light of the important Israelite tradition of a priestly covenant. As Paul has opened the perspective of this covenant up to the Gentiles, he also applies the idea of the priestly covenant to his mission to the Gentiles.

In view of the cultic imagery in the Pauline corpus, I will proceed to closer examination of cultic imagery in 1-2 Corinthians in the next chapters (chaps. 7 & 8) for a number of reasons.

1. Among Paul's authentic Letters, only 1-2 Corinthians comprise explicit *temple imagery* which is applied to different issues (1 Cor 3:16-17, 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16).
2. The Corinthian correspondence provides the most extensive discussion of pagan idolatrous practices as juxtaposed to Israelite tradition (cf. e.g. 1 Cor 8-10), and thereby provides the most extensive context for our question of how Paul's cultic imagery can be related to his mission to both *Jews* and *Gentiles*.

Preliminary issues to cultic imagery

3. The explicit use of *examples* from Israel's history and from the *Israelite cult* in the Corinthian correspondence is unparalleled in the other Pauline Letters, and lends itself particularly for rhetorical analysis.
4. The evidence of cultic imagery in the other Pauline Letters is either very limited (Philippians) or does not apply as directly and explicitly to the addressed community (Romans) as we encounter it in the Corinthian correspondence. The evidence of 1-2 Corinthians may further be contrasted with Romans, in that Paul did not found the congregation(s) in Rome, whereas he was intensively engaged in the gospel mission to Corinth from the beginning.

In cases where needed, the interpretation of cultic imagery in 1-2 Corinthians may be illuminated by the larger context of the other Pauline Letters.

CHAPTER 7

CULTIC IMAGERY IN 1 CORINTHIANS

1. Introduction: Towards a new perspective on Paul's temple imagery

1.1 From cultic imagery to theological message

In the analysis of Paul's metaphor of God's Temple, scholarly discussion has focused on the key passages 1 Cor 3:16-17, 6:19, and 2 Cor 6:16 in a way which leaves certain questions about the coherence of Paul's temple imagery unsolved. It is often stressed that 1 Cor 3:16-17 and 2 Cor 6:16 relate to the community as Temple, whereas 1 Cor 6:19 concerns the individual body as Temple.¹ Some scholars have tried to resolve the tension between these two applications of the temple concept by additionally associating 1 Cor 6:19 with a corporate idea.²

The search for a theological message underlying Paul's cultic imagery, in particular his temple imagery, is further complicated by the fact that 2 Cor 6:16 stands apart in the discussion about the authenticity of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. It is therefore necessary to discuss whether and how 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 fits into a survey of Pauline temple imagery (see chap. 8).

My starting point for discussing Paul's cultic imagery in the Corinthian correspondence is that Paul's theological message expresses itself significantly and irreplaceably through this cultic imagery. I oppose the minimising point of view on Paul's cultic terms, for instance in 1 Cor 3:16-17, as 'rhetorical devices' in the sense of mere examples in passing, which are subordinate to other, more important theological themes.³

The overarching theme which is often discerned by commentators as dominating 1 Cor 1:10-4:21 concerns Paul's response to the factionalism within the Corinthian congregation,

¹ See Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 49-60, 141-142, 141 n. 2; McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 92-107 at 102 about 1 Cor 6:19 as a "particularization of the conception of the church as the temple"; Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 167-184 at 183 about 1 Cor 6:19, noting that Paul's temple imagery is not homogeneous.

E. Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Cultic Language in Qumran and in the NT', *CBQ* 38 (1976) 159-177 at 172 about temple imagery in 1 Cor 6:19 applied "not to the community, but to the body of the individual Christian".

Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 235-252 at 251 about the contrast between the application to the community in 1 Cor 3:16 and to the individual in 1 Cor 6:19; R. Kirchhoff, *Die Sünde gegen den eigenen Leib. Studien zu πόρνη und πορνεία in 1Kor 6,12-20 und dem sozio-kulturellen Kontext der paulinischen Adressaten* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1994) 177-188 explains the application of the metaphor of the Temple to the individual body, which is untypical of contemporary Judaism, as related to the idea of the indwelling Holy Spirit which does apply to individuals in Jewish tradition (183-184); C. Böttrich, "'Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes'", in Ego *et al.* (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*, 411-425 at 419-420 also notes the difference between the collective temple concept in 1 Cor 3:16-17 and 2 Cor 6:16 and the individual concept in 1 Cor 6:19.

² Cf. M. Newton, *The concept of purity at Qumran and in the letters of Paul* (Cambridge UP: Cambridge, 1985) 53-58 about τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν in 1 Cor 6:19 as a corporate entity; S.-W. (Aaron) Son, *Corporate elements in Pauline anthropology* (Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico: Rome, 2001) 124 argues for "a certain oscillation in Paul's thought between the corporate and the individual", comparing 1 Cor 6:19 to 1 Cor 3:16-17.

³ G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich., 1987) 146-147, 146 n.4 hypercritically discusses Gärtner's book cited in n.1 above for putting "too much weight on the language of what seems rather to be a rhetorical device in this letter". Cf. W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther 1 IKor 1,1-6,11* (EKKNT; Benziger Verlag: Zürich and Braunschweig & Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1991) 287 n.59 who calls the idea "die Tempelsymbolik den ganzen Abschnitt beherrschen zu lassen" a fallacy.

due to a strife about wisdom and status.⁴ Since the issues in 1 Cor 4:10-4:21 are consequently understood as constituent elements of this overarching theme, the cultic imagery in 1 Cor 3:16-17 is therefore often discussed as an example of subordinate importance. This approach usually leaves the significance of Paul's temple imagery undervalued, while scepticism about comparative studies between Paul's temple imagery and temple theology in contemporary Judaism (cf. n.1 above) reduces the investigation of a context to a survey of parallels.

A comparable case presents itself with the temple imagery in 1 Cor 6:19. Commentators usually interpret this verse in the context of 1 Cor 6:12-20, emphasising the issue of *πορνεία* and the notion of the indwelling Spirit which sanctifies the body. While these issues are discussed, marginal attention is paid to the temple imagery to the extent that Paul's image of the Temple appears almost arbitrary as a term for the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit.⁵

In this way, the Pauline temple imagery in 1 Corinthians remains a kind of *Fremdkörper* among other more recognisable categories of Pauline theology. To borrow a term from Karl Paul Donfried, the cultic imagery in Paul's Corinthian correspondence should not be treated as a 'stepchild' of Pauline theology, but it should be taken fully into account in the study of Paul's Letters.⁶ The ancient cultural context to Paul's cultic imagery is tangible in another main section of Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians, 1 Cor 8:1-11:1, in which food offered to idols, an aspect of idolatry, is a main theme. In this section, Paul also suggests an analogy between the priestly service and the gospel mission (1 Cor 9:13) and he refers to Israel's cult (1 Cor 10:18). In view of this ancient cultic setting, the image of God's Temple cannot have been a relatively unimportant theme for Paul and his original readers.

Another problem with the point of view which explains Paul's cultic imagery away as flexible 'rhetorical devices' consists in the fact that such an approach implies a reductionist perspective on metaphorical language as far as Paul's metaphor of the Temple is concerned. Since the community or the individual cannot literally be a physical temple, we may indeed

⁴ E.g. A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1914) 55-69 about 1 Cor 1:10-4:21 as Paul's 'case' against the *σχίσματα* (69); C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (A&C Black: London, 1968) 93f.; H. Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1969) 90 about the recurring theme of parties, factions; Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 150 views 1 Cor 3:18-23 as a 'preliminary conclusion' to the matter; Schrage, *1 Kor 1,1-6,11* EKKNT, 127 refers to the subdivision of 1 Cor 1:10-4:21 as "Die Gemeindespaltung aufgrund von Weisheitshypertrophie (Kreuz und Weisheit)"; C. Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (THKNT 7; Evangelische Verlagsanstalt: Leipzig, 1996) 24 refers to the theme of 1 Cor 1:10-4:21 as "Die gefährdete Einheit der Gemeinde 1,10-4,21".

Apart from discerning 1 Cor 1:18-4:21 as a major section in Paul's argument against factionalism, Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation. An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (HUT 28; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1991) understands the entire Letter as a case of deliberative rhetoric for concord among the Corinthians, that is, against factionalism; see the criticism by Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 229-238 who contrasts the case for analysing Galatians and Romans as "sustained rhetorical argumentation" to the case of 1 Corinthians which resists such analysis in Anderson's view.

⁵ Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 249-266 at 264 notes an analogy with the Jerusalem Temple, but emphasises the "phenomenon of the indwelling Spirit"; Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther 2 1 Kor 6,12-11,16* (EKKNT; Benziger Verlag: Solothurn & Düsseldorf and Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1995) 7-48 (33) considers the idea of the body rather than the soul as the dwelling place of the Spirit to be characteristically Pauline; Wolff, *1. Korinther* THKNT, 122-132 at 130 notes a parallel with the Jerusalem Temple (1 Kgs 8:10f.), but also the absence of parallels in antiquity to Paul's specific application of temple imagery in 1 Cor 6:19.

⁶ K.P. Donfried, 'Shifting Paradigms: Paul, Jesus and Judaism', in idem, *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*, 1-20 at 19-20 uses this term to point to the undervalued place of 1 Thessalonians in Pauline studies, while he also pleads for a new paradigm about Paul in relation to Jesus and to the Judaisms of his period, including the re-evaluation of the theme of the *temple*.

suppose that Paul's use of the image of the Temple is a metaphor.⁷ That is, certain qualities which are ingrained in the concept of God's Temple are transferred to the community or to the individual, even though they cannot literally be a physical Temple.

The minimising point of view on Paul's cultic imagery unjustifiably reduces the significance of metaphorical language to a one-dimensional function as an ornament. Philosophers of religion have countered the idea that a metaphor can be treated as an ornament which may be substituted by another word which circumscribes the same idea (hence called the *substitution theory*). Janet M. Soskice rightly notes that "metaphor should be treated as fully cognitive and capable of saying that which may be said *in no other way*".⁸

My purpose in analysing Paul's cultic imagery in context is to demonstrate how this imagery expresses a coherent moral perspective in Paul's theology.⁹ Paul first of all addressed concrete issues in the communal life of the Corinthian congregation, but Paul's response elaborates theological ideas of which his cultic imagery is an essential part.¹⁰ It is particularly important for our search of a coherent perspective to understand whether and how the individual, physical body is related to the social body of the religious community in Paul's theology, as expressed by his temple imagery in 1 Corinthians.

1.2 The Temple and God's Spirit

Although many scholars have pointed to the strong probability that Paul's image of God's Temple, ναὸς θεοῦ, echoes a contemporary context of Israelite tradition,¹¹ the concept of God's Spirit is less often involved in the analysis of this potential Jewish context to Paul's temple imagery.¹²

In older scholarship, Paul's temple imagery, with its notion of the indwelling Spirit, was contrasted to Jewish temple theology. Thus, Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer make the following comment on 1 Cor 3:16:

⁷ The perception of Paul's temple imagery as metaphor is shared by De Lacey, 'οἰτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς: The Function of a Metaphor in St Paul', in Horbury (ed.), *Templum Amicitiae*, 391-409 and by Böttrich, "Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes", 411-425. *Contra* Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 234.

⁸ Cf. Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 44; Van Herck, *Religie en metafoor*, 35-58. See my Introduction, section 3.2.

⁹ Most recently, Y.M. Gillihan, 'Jewish Laws on Illicit Marriage, the Defilement of Offspring, and the Holiness of the Temple: A New Halakhic Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7:14', *JBL* 121/4 (2002) 711-744 has pointed to the contemporary Jewish context of the interrelation between the holiness of the religious community and the holiness of the Temple. This idea of holiness stands in contrast with the impurity of forbidden sexual relations and may underly 1 Cor 3:16-17, 6:19, 7:14, and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 according to Gillihan.

On pages 719-728, Gillihan refers to Lev 18:6-18; Deut 23:3.14; Ezra 9:1-2; 10:19; Neh; Mal 2:11-12; 4QMMT B 39-49, 75-82; 4QFlor I i 2-4; CD-A IV, 17, 20-21, VII, 1; *Jub.* 16:8-9, 30:7-17, 41:25-28; *m. Qiddushin* 3:12; *m. Yebam.* 8:3. Although her interpretation gives a degree of coherence to the idea of impurity and holiness in 1-2 Cor, Gillihan mainly focuses on 1 Cor 7:14 and does not discuss the issue of individual and corporate levels of Paul's temple imagery nor the cultic imagery in 1 Cor 9:13, 10:18.

¹⁰ See C.K. Barrett's introduction to his *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 17 emphasising that "theological principles" can be detected behind Paul's practical advice for his readers.

¹¹ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 56-60; Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 168-172; Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 147; Lang, *Die Briefe and die Korinther*, 51-55; De Lacey, "οἰτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς", 391-409; cf. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 90.

¹² E.g. Y. Congar, *Le mystère du Temple* (Paris, 1958); Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 49-60; Newton, *The Concept of Purity*, 54-55.

Paul and God's Temple

“Both Gentile and Jew might speak of their ναὸς Θεοῦ, but, while the pagan temple was inhabited by an *image* of a god, and the Jewish by a *symbol* of the Divine Presence (*Shekinah*), the Christian temple is inhabited by the *Spirit* of God Himself”.¹³

Robertson and Plummer do not present an isolated case in applying a rabbinic term, *Shekinah*, which stands for the Divine indwelling Presence,¹⁴ to Jewish temple theology. Bertil Gärtner, in his discussion of 1 Cor 3:16-17 and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1¹⁵, focuses his attention on the ‘presence’, ‘dwelling’ and ‘dwelling place’ of God, comparing it with the rabbinic term *Shekinah*, as a noun from the Hebrew verb נָשַׁב, which is parallel to the Greek (ἐν)οικεῖν in Paul. Following Gärtner’s example, Michael Newton also uses the term *Shekinah* in his discussion of these two passages¹⁶. Wolfgang Schrage has criticised previous assumptions that Paul’s temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:16 would imply the idea that the Jerusalem Temple was doomed to destruction, as an echo of Jesus-tradition, or abandoned by God. Nevertheless, Schrage creates the impression of a contrast between the ‘old Temple’ filled with God’s *Shekinah* and the eschatological Christian community as Temple.¹⁷

The use of the rabbinic term *Shekinah* in the pre-70 CE period is, however, difficult if not impossible to prove.¹⁸ Thus, a comparison of Paul’s concept of God’s indwelling Spirit in the Temple with a Jewish theological concept from the post-70 CE perspective is made on unequal terms and falls short. Furthermore, the contrast between *Shekinah* and the Spirit of God as suggested in the above quotation provokes the idea that God’s Spirit or the Holy Spirit would be an exclusively Christian concept.

In commentaries by G.D. Fee and F. Lang, the discussion of the temple imagery is separated from the discussion of Paul’s concept of the Spirit of God. Lang perceives a development of a ‘spiritualising’ transference of the Old Testament concept of the dwelling of God’s name in the Temple, but fails to adduce examples from Jewish post-biblical literature.¹⁹ M. Newton and R.J. McKelvey have linked the gift of God’s indwelling Spirit with the Messianic age and Christ in their respective interpretations of 1 Cor 3:16-17.²⁰

R.J. McKelvey has noted the “traditional *theocentric* orientation of the temple concept” in this passage and in 2 Cor 6:16; a concept employed by Paul in his concern about the unity and sanctity of the Corinthian congregation.²¹ This observation of McKelvey brings us to the inconsistency in the scholarly analysis which splits 1 Cor 3:16 up in one part which is exclusively theocentric and in one part which is christological.

The immediate and exclusive association of Paul’s concept of God’s Spirit with christology leaves an analogy with the concepts of the ‘Spirit of God’ and the ‘Holy Spirit’ in Jewish tradition out of the picture. My historical interpretation aims to take ideas about God’s

¹³ Robertson & Plummer, *First Corinthians* ICC, 66.

¹⁴ See Jastrow, 1573.

¹⁵ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 49-60. Note the criticism by Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 171-172 of Gärtner’s comparison between 1 Cor 3:16 and Qumranite temple theology, refuting a link with the Jewish *Shekinah* theology.

¹⁶ Newton, *The Concept of Purity*, 54-55.

¹⁷ Schrage, *IKor 1,1-6,11* EKKNT, 305 criticises the idea of a prophecy of destruction or of abandonment supposedly underlying 1 Cor 3:16, but not the combination ‘old Temple’ / *Shekinah*.

¹⁸ The term שכּינָה does not occur in the Hebrew Bible nor in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

¹⁹ Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 146-147; Lang, *Die Briefe and die Korinther*, 55-56.

²⁰ M. Newton, *The Concept of Purity*, 54-56; McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 98-107 at 100, stressing “a vast difference between Paul’s understanding of the idea [of God’s indwelling] and that of Qumran”.

²¹ McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 100-107.

Spirit in relation to the concept of the Temple in first-century CE Judaism into account, and puts Paul's cultic imagery in the contemporary context of the world in which Paul and his original readers lived.

1.3 A new approach to Paul's cultic imagery and methodology

In this chapter I discuss the relevant passages which comprise cultic imagery in Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians, searching for a coherent theological message expressed through this imagery in the contemporary context of Paul's time. Before starting this survey, I will pay attention to the *rhetorical situation* of 1 Corinthians and focus on the way Paul structures his argumentation in response to certain issues which he wants to discuss.²²

From the analysis of the threefold *rhetorical situation* of 1 Corinthians (exigence, audience, certain constraints) we may proceed to discuss which place the passages with cultic imagery have in Paul's argumentation. The question of how the *rhetorical situation* may relate to the *historical* context to 1 Corinthians may be discussed by perceiving 1 Corinthians as one half of a correspondence. Although any reconstruction of the other half of the correspondence, that of the Corinthians addressing Paul, must remain hypothetical, Paul's Letter provides connections for discussing the historical situation of the Corinthian audience.

My survey of the rhetorical units in which Paul uses cultic imagery will provide a discussion of the structure of each rhetorical unit, the Greek text,²³ a translation,²⁴ an overview of relevant issues of textual criticism, and an explanation of cultic imagery in context. After the identification of the cultural context(s) on which Paul's cultic imagery draws, I will interpret this imagery in the rhetorical unit and in the larger structure of Paul's argumentation.

In my search for coherence in the theology underlying Paul's cultic imagery, the following questions of interpretation can be posed from the outset:

1. How does Paul's cultic imagery address his readers: converts from among both the Jews and the Greeks (1 Cor 1:22-24)? This question may be discussed with the aid of rhetorical criticism and the historical-critical analysis of Paul's use of pre-existing traditions. The answer to this question should take the re-evaluation of scholarly theories of spiritualisation and substitution as well as comparative approaches into account.
2. What ideas of purity and holiness does Paul's cultic imagery in 1 Corinthians convey and how do these ideas relate to the individual and corporate levels of the Corinthian congregation? In other words, how does Paul's use of cultic imagery condition the social behaviour expected of those within the congregation, and how does it mark the boundaries with those outside the congregation? This question may be answered by means of social-scientific approaches, which, if adapted to the ancient cultural context of Paul's Letters, may advance the study of purity and holiness in Paul as social phenomena.

Social-scientific approaches may refine the analysis of relations between the individual and the group, the subculture and surrounding culture, which lie at the heart of Paul's cultic imagery. An influential anthropological model in New Testament exegesis is the

²² The influential definition of the *rhetorical situation* by Lloyd F. Bitzer has already been mentioned in the Introduction, p. 12, and in chap. 4, p. 166. See Esler, *Galatians*, 17; cf. the discussion of Lloyd F. Bitzer's theory in the context of defining the historical situation and the rhetorical situation of Romans, Rom 9-11 in particular, by Kim, *God, Israel, and the Gentiles. Rhetoric and Situation in Romans 9-11*, 33-35.

²³ The Greek text as established in Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (27th rev.ed.; Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart, 1993).

²⁴ Translations are my own, unless otherwise stated.

grid-group model developed by Mary Douglas.²⁵ This model provides the means to characterise a community, in our case the Corinthian congregation as envisaged by Paul, by the extent to which this community adheres to or breaks away from the symbolical world view of surrounding culture(s) (*grid*) and by the extent of expected participation in the community (*group*). This model needs to be adapted to the historical situation of 1 Corinthians which is characterised by the surrounding cultures of the Greeks, the Jews, and the church of God (1 Cor 10:32).

Anthropological approaches may be particularly useful for the analysis of the individual and corporate levels in Paul's temple imagery. Mary Douglas has proposed to study the physical body and the social body in relation to each other; a method which may provide an angle from which to put the different levels of Paul's temple imagery into perspective.²⁶ If, as Mary Douglas puts it in *Purity and Danger*, "we are prepared to see the body as a symbol of society, and to see the powers and dangers credited to social structure reproduced in small on the human body",²⁷ this may have consequences for the interpretation of Paul's metaphor of the Temple, which applies to the body in 1 Cor 6:19. Thus, anthropology may help us in our search for coherence in the individual and communal applications of Paul's temple imagery.

2. The rhetorical situation of 1 Corinthians

2.1 The exigence

A fundamental concern of Paul, which provides us with an important starting point for Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians, is the report about dissensions (*σχίσματα*) and quarrels (*ἔριδες*) among the Corinthians (1 Cor 1:10-11). In juxtaposition to this situation, Paul's own view is that the Corinthians should be of the same mind and judgement (1 Cor 1:10). Since Paul starts with this appeal immediately after his greetings (1 Cor 1:1-3) and thanksgiving (1 Cor 1:4-9), this raises the question of how this appeal relates to the exigence of 1 Corinthians.

Margaret M. Mitchell has taken the factionalism mentioned by Paul in 1 Cor 1:10 as a point of departure for her rhetorical analysis of 1 Corinthians in its entirety, as 'deliberative rhetoric' against factionalism and in favour of concord.²⁸ However, this idea of 1 Corinthians as a sustained argumentation in favour of concord as opposed to factionalism has recently been criticised.²⁹ It should also be noted that Paul does not aim at concord without exception, considering his statement in 1 Cor 11:18-19 that he partly believes the report about

²⁵ M. Douglas, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (Pantheon: New York, 1982). For the application of this model in New Testament exegesis, see e.g. J.H. Neyrey, 'Body Language in 1 Corinthians: The Use of Anthropological Models for Understanding Paul and his Opponents', *Semeia* 35 (1986) 129-170; T.L. Carter, 'Big Men' in Corinth', *JSNT* 66 (1997) 45-71 criticises Neyrey for ascribing strong and weak grid to Paul and his opponents respectively (47); cf. J.D. Gordon, *Sister or Wife? 1 Corinthians 7 and Cultural Anthropology* (Sheffield AP: Sheffield, 1997) 150-153; Horrell (ed.), *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*, 29-31.

²⁶ Cf. J.H. Neyrey's reference to Mary Douglas' work in his interpretation of body language in 1 Corinthians in his *Paul, in other words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters* (WJK: Louisville, Ky., 1990) 102-146.

²⁷ Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 142.

²⁸ Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 65-183 at 68-80.

²⁹ Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 231-238 criticises the lack of proof for viewing 1 Cor 1:11-15:58 as a sustained argumentation of the *propositio* in 1 Cor 1:10.

dissensions (σχίσματα): “for there must be factions (αἰρέσεις) among you in order that those who are genuine among you may be recognised”.³⁰

Nevertheless, Mitchell’s purpose to work out the coherence and compositional integrity of 1 Corinthians at the concrete level of its structure as ‘deliberative rhetoric’ is to be recommended in my view.³¹ In comparison to his Letters to the Galatians and to the Romans, 1 Corinthians may seem less unified in structure, but this difference is at least partly due to the unique situation of Paul’s response to a letter from the Corinthians (cf. 1 Cor 7:1).³²

In my view, Paul’s concern for *proper community building* on the basis of his gospel mission constitutes the exigence of 1 Corinthians in response to both reports and the Corinthians’ letter. The dynamic character of the communication, reflected by Paul’s response to reports and the writing of the Corinthians as well as by his reference to a previous letter from his hand (1 Cor 5:9), precludes a static view about 1 Corinthians as a letter-speech.³³ The figure of *building* is, however, prominent in 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 3:9-10,12,14; 8:1; 10:23; 14:3-5,12,17,26) in a way which is unparalleled by the other Pauline Letters. Thus, the explicit reference to building up the congregation, ἡ οἰκοδομὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας (1 Cor 14:12), is unique to 1 Corinthians, and Paul foregrounds his own exclusive role in the foundation of this Corinthian ‘building’ in 1 Cor 3:10. As the master builder, Paul gives both instructions for building up the congregation, and warns against that which endangers the process of community building. The extent to which this ‘building’ is an ongoing process becomes further clear from the fact that Paul refers to directions for the other things, which he will still give when he comes to the Corinthians (1 Cor 11:34).³⁴

At various points in 1 Corinthians, Paul clearly points out that the situation of the Corinthian congregation is far from perfect, and at a distance from the community building which Paul has in mind. Anderson has already pointed out that it would be wrong to interpret Paul’s appeal in favour of concord and against the actual situation of dissensions in 1 Cor 1:10 as the *propositio* for the entire Letter (cf. n. 29 above). The exhortation against dissension is part of the *narratio* (1 Cor 1:10-17) and certainly constitutes an important, recurring issue in 1 Corinthians. The *propositio* is, however, represented in 1 Cor 1:17 which emphasises the centrality of the gospel as opposed to boasting over ritual or wisdom, which divides the community rather than serves the common good.

In view of Paul’s concern for proper community building, we may discern the following subjects in 1 Corinthians as the constituent elements of this overarching concern:

1. *The lack of communal identity* (1 Cor 1-4).

The communal identity is not yet enough developed, apart from the way of life of unbelievers, due to the Corinthians’ factionalism and quarrels about worldly status and wisdom.

³⁰ Translation from RSV.

³¹ Cf. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 1-19 about the significance of rhetorical criticism for defending the unity of 1 Corinthians against partition theories based on perceived inconsistencies.

³² Cf. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 85-86 about the literary integrity of 1 Cor. I disagree with Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 46 f. and 266 f. that 1 Corinthians can be neatly subdivided in two parts, one ‘in response to reports (1:10-6:21)’, the other ‘in response to the Corinthian Letter (7:1-16:12)’, since 1 Cor 11:18 (ἀκούω) suggests a response to reports just as much as 1 Cor 1:11 (ἐδηλώθη) and 5:1 (ἀκούεται) do.

³³ Note the reservations against applying ideal types of ancient rhetorical theory to the exegesis of Paul’s Letters in Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 6-19; Anderson, ‘Relation of Rhetoric to Epistolography’, in idem, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 93-109; H.-J. Klauck, ‘Brieftheorie und Rhetorik’, in idem, *Die antike Briefliteratur und das Neue Testament. Ein Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch* (UTB 2022; Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh: Paderborn [etc.], 1998) 165-180.

³⁴ 1 Corinthians has been compared with contemporary Jewish letters of instruction, in particular Halakhic Letters by Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*.

2. *Dangers to the communal identity* (1 Cor 5-6).

Immorality and other forms of injustice pose a threat to the integrity of the community and necessitate boundaries between those inside and those outside the community.

3. *The balance between the individual and the communal way of life* (1 Cor 7).

In response to questions from the Corinthians (1 Cor 7:1), Paul discusses individual cases of the way of life demanded by God, including the issue of mixed marriages (1 Cor 7:12-16).

4. *Boundary marking and religious conscience: food offered to idols* (1 Cor 8:1-11:1).

Paul presents a nuanced argument on boundary marking, including people with a weak conscience for the sake of salvation by the gospel, but excluding participation in idolatry.

5. *The proper observance of worship traditions* (1 Cor 11:2-34).

Paul's instructions concern ways of worship for men and women and the Lord's supper.

6. *The proper spirit for community building* (1 Cor 12-14).

This admonition may be subdivided into sections about the unity of the congregation through the Spirit and in the body of Christ (1 Cor 12); sections about love as the essential drive for community building (1 Cor 13), and sections about understandable, meaningful words of worship and prophecy as preferable to speaking in tongues for a proper liturgical order (1 Cor 14).

7. *The resurrection as the heart of the gospel* (1 Cor 15).

In this part, Paul also counters an actual situation, namely that of doubts among the Corinthians about the resurrection (1 Cor 15:12,34-36). Thus we are at the heart of Paul's purpose "to preach the gospel, not with the wisdom of reason, lest the cross of Christ be rendered void" (1 Cor 1:17). Paul thus reinforces the foundation for the community building.

8. *The closing part of the Letter* (1 Cor 16).

In view of the above subdivision of the structure of 1 Corinthians, it is important to note that the cultic imagery (1 Cor 3:16-17, 5:7, 6:19, 9:13, 10:18) figures in contexts which serve to invigorate both the communal identity and the boundaries which set the Corinthians apart from that which would endanger this communal identity, as envisaged by Paul.

2.2 The audience

The Corinthian audience which Paul addresses undoubtedly mainly consisted of Gentile converts, as indicated by Paul's reference to their Gentile past (1 Cor 12:2; cf. 1 Cor 16:15). This does not exclude the possibility that the Corinthian congregation included Godfearers (cf. Acts 18:7) and proselytes to Judaism. In 1 Cor 1:22-24, Paul speaks about those who are called to the faith in Christ from among both the Jews and the Greeks. Paul writes in 1 Cor 9:19-23 that his gospel mission generally addresses the Jews, those under the law, those outside the law,³⁵ and the weak. These references to both Jews and Gentiles make sense only if both were within the horizon of the Corinthian audience's cognitive grasp.

1 Cor 10:32 in fact suggests that the Corinthians were surrounded by different religious communities, with which they should interact well, as Paul writes: "Do not give offence to either the Jews or the Greeks or the congregation of God". The historical situation of the Corinthian congregation is determined by its relation to this surrounding culture. Thus, it is worthwhile to discuss the three groups mentioned in 1 Cor 10:32 in some more detail.

³⁵ Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 248 refers to this group as "Greeks (under cover as the 'lawless ones')". Cf. Rom 2:14 about the Gentiles: τὰ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα.

2.2.1 Jewish tradition and Corinth

The presence of Jewish influence in the Corinthian congregation did not only come from baptised converts to the faith in Christ, including Jews and Greeks, slaves and free men (1 Cor 12:13), but also from itinerant Christian Jews like Apollos (1 Cor 1:12; 3:4-6; 16:12; cf. Acts 18:24-19:1), Cephas (1 Cor 1:12), Barnabas (1 Cor 9:6), Aquila and Prisca (1 Cor 16:19; cf. Acts 18:2), Timothy (1 Cor 4:17, 16:10; 2 Cor 1:1.19; Acts 16:1-3), and Silvanus (2 Cor 1:19; cf. Acts 15:22.32, 16:25).

The Jewish community and its synagogue in Corinth

Although Paul does not mention the presence of Jewish institutions like a synagogue in Corinth in any direct or explicit way, there is external evidence about a Jewish community in ancient Corinth in Philo's treatise *On the Embassy to Gaius* 281, where Corinth is named among the Jewish settlements, ἀποικίαι, in 'Europe', that is the mainland of Greece. It can be inferred from Acts 18:4 that Corinth had a synagogue, συναγωγή, where Christian Jews also came. For the late Second Temple Period, the literary evidence suggests that this institution was mainly known in the Diaspora as προσευχή, a 'prayerhouse' (e.g. *Flaccus* 45, 47).³⁶ Among epigraphical finds in Corinth two inscriptions relate to the existence of a synagogue; one containing the words [συν]αγωγή Ἑβραίων,³⁷ the other the words διδάσ[καλος] καὶ ἀρχ[ισυναγωγ]ος τῆ[ς συναγωγῆς].³⁸

We cannot exclude the possibility that one liturgical context of prayer for the Godfearing part of the converts to the faith in Christ still was the synagogue of Corinth in Paul's time.³⁹ The notion of different kinds of converts is confirmed by Paul. In 1 Cor 8:7, he states that the knowledge that there is only one true God and one Lord, Jesus Christ, is not common to all, since some were hitherto accustomed to idols. This statement implies that others were not used to idols, or no longer were, because of the appeal of Israelite monotheism.

The Jewish religious calendar

In a number of cases, Paul presupposes some degree of familiarity of his Corinthian readers with the Jewish religious calendar. This is another point of correspondence between the Corinthian audience and Jewish tradition.

³⁶ Cf. the Palestinian Jewish tradition about the Temple of Jerusalem as a 'house of prayer', οἶκος προσευχῆς: 1 Macc 7:37; Matt 21:13, Mark 11:17, Luke 19:46, a Jesus-tradition rooted in Scripture (1 Kgs 8:29-30; Isa 56:7).

³⁷ P.J.-B. Frey, *CII I Europe* No. 718 dating the inscription between 100 BCE and 200 CE; cf. S. Krauss, *Synagogale Altertümer* (Hildesheim, 1966) 242-243 no. 92. G. Foerster, 'Remains of a Synagogue at Corinth', in L.I. Levine (ed.), *Ancient Synagogues revealed* (Jerusalem, 1981) 185 dates the inscription much later, linking it with the find of the capital of a half-column with three *menorot*; the late dating of the inscription to the 4th-5th century CE is supported by J. Murphy-O'Connor, 'Corinth', in *ABD* I, 1138.

³⁸ *SEG* XXIX (1979) No. 300; *Bulletin Épigraphique* 93 (1980) No. 230 puts the brackets in different places, but reconstructs the same text. G.H.R. Horsley disputes a Jewish context for this inscription in his comments in *SEG* XXXVII (1987) 264. Cf. T. Rajak & D. Noy, 'Archisynagogoi: Office, Title and Social Status in the Greco-Jewish Synagogue', *JRS* 83 (1993) 75-93.

³⁹ On Godfearers in the Jewish synagogue of the Hellenistic diaspora, see e.g. J. Reynolds & R. Tannenbaum, *Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias* (Cambridge UP: Cambridge, 1987). Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 14.110 about the part of Jews and Godfearers, σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν, "even those from Asia and Europe" (*sic!*) in the longstanding contribution to the wealth of the Jerusalem Temple.

Thus, the original context of the Jewish Pilgrim festivals⁴⁰ underlies Paul's references to Passover and Pentecost. In a metaphorical way, Paul describes Christ as the paschal lamb in 1 Cor 5:7. The imagery of unleavened bread, ἄζυμος, found in the direct context of 1 Cor 5:6-8, is undeniably derived from Jewish customs surrounding the Jewish Passover, just as the very term πάσχα derives from the Aramaic word אַחַסְתָּ.⁴¹ Paul represents Pentecost, πεντηκοστή, as a simple indication of time in 1 Cor 16:8, in relation to the length of his stay in Ephesus. The Hellenistic Jewish evidence refers to Pentecost as the festival seven weeks, that is, the fiftieth day after Passover (ἐορτὴ ἑβδομάδων in LXX; cf. 2 Macc 12:32, Philo, *Spec.Laws* 1.76).

Paul further comes up with the Jewish term σάββατον, derived from the Hebrew שַׁבָּת, to indicate a week's period in 1 Cor 16:2. Paul uses this term in the context of suggesting a fixed time for storing something for the collection: 'each first day of the week', κατὰ μίαν σαββάτου ἕκαστος. The Hebrew term שַׁבָּת denotes both the Sabbath and the space of time from one Sabbath to the other, that is, the seven-day week⁴². Significantly, Philo writes in his second treatise *On the Special Laws* that σάββατον was the term used by the Hebrews 'in their native tongue', πατρίῳ γλώττῃ, whereas the Greeks would call it ἑβδομάς⁴³. Although the Hebraising term for a seven-day week points to the Jewish religious calendar, the notion of the seven-day weekly cycle *per se* was also known in the Babylonian calendar and through astrology.⁴⁴ The term σάββατον also figures prominently in the Septuagint, and even pagan Roman writers of the Augustan era like Ovid (*Remedium amoris* 217f.) and Horace (*Satires* I, 9, 60 f.) refer to the *sabbata*, albeit as distinctly Jewish rites alien to them. Thus, Ovid writes about the *peregrina Sabbata*, the foreign Sabbath. This evidence puts the self-evident way Paul uses the term σάββατον in perspective, because he presupposes the readers' acquaintance with this item of the Jewish calendar. Paul's self-evident usage could not have been meaningful if he had addressed an audience just familiar with a totally pagan environment.

The Corinthians' knowledge of Scripture

It is not my purpose to give a survey of Paul's use of Scripture here (see for more detailed discussion, chap. 5). Nevertheless, it is important to note some aspects of Paul's references to Scripture in 1 Corinthians which presuppose knowledge of the Scriptures of Israel on the part of the Corinthians.

The citation of Scripture as the 'Law of Moses' (Deut 25:4 in 1 Cor 9:9) and the 'Law' (Isa 28:11 in 1 Cor 14:21) attests to the importance of Jewish tradition as a frame of reference, not only for Paul but apparently also for the Corinthian congregation. The Law was central to contemporary Jewish scriptural tradition (cf. e.g. Josephus, *J.W.* 2.229, 7.150.162; *Ag.Ap.*

⁴⁰ In Jewish liturgy known as שלש רגלים from Exod 23:14; cf. I. Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy. A Comprehensive History* (translation by R.P. Scheindlin; JPS/JTSA, 1993) 111-117. Cf. e.g. Philo, *Spec.Laws* 1.68-69.

⁴¹ The LXX term ἄζυμος translates מצה; LXX Lev 23:5-6 refers to the feast of unleavened bread, ἐορτὴ τῶν ἄζυμων, as coming one day after the Lord's Passover, πάσχα τῷ κυρίῳ; cf. Exod 23:14-17; 34:18-24; Deut 16:1-17. Cf. Matt 26:17; Mark 14:1.12; Luke 22:1.7; Acts 12:3, 20:6.; John 11:55; 12:12.20.

⁴² See KBL, 947; Jastrow, 1520.

⁴³ *Spec.Laws* 2.194; cf. §§ 41, 86. Cf. LXX Exod 20:8 (ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν σαββάτων); Josephus' summary of the Decalogue uses the term τὰς ἑβδομάδας (*Ant.* 3.91), addressing a Greek-speaking audience (*Ant.* 1.5).

⁴⁴ F. Rochberg-Halton, 'Calendars. Ancient Near East', in *ABD* I, 810-814. Philo, *Spec.Laws* 2.57-58 mentions to the seven day weekly cycle, ἑβδομάς, distinguishing the 'higher point of view' of Moses from astrology. On *hebdomadales* in the Roman calendar and the influence of astrology, see J. Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome. The People and the City at the Height of the Empire* (Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1985) 161-162.

2.175). Paul's references to his previous communications with the Corinthians suggest that he shared with them a christological understanding of the Law, as he underlines in, for instance, 1 Cor 9:21 and in 1 Cor 15:56-57. Nevertheless, such an understanding of the Law is based on a presupposed basic knowledge of these Scriptures. When, for example Paul retells the biblical Exodus story from a christological perspective in 1 Cor 10:1-13, as a way to instruct the Corinthians, he only quotes Exodus 32:6 in 1 Cor 10:7 and probably suggests that his Corinthian readers may fill in or reread the rest of the biblical story.

Paul's use of Scripture in 1 Corinthians is characterised by a certain fluidity which suggests that the Corinthian readers are already well initiated in Scripture and may be expected capable of following Paul's argument from Scripture. Paul's quotations from Scripture do not provide specifications of the scriptural passages quoted, but are usually introduced by the formula γέγραπται or, less commonly, by ἐγράφη (1 Cor 9:10) and by ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος (1 Cor 15:54).⁴⁵ In various cases, Paul intertwines his argument with words from Scripture without even using quotation formulas at all (1 Cor 2:16, 5:13, 10:26, 14:24-25, 15:25.27.32). These various ways in which Paul introduces words from Scripture convey the dynamic perspective of a living religious tradition.

2.2.2 *Corinth in its Hellenistic environment*

The other group mentioned in 1 Cor 10:32 is that of the Greeks, οἱ Ἕλληνες, who, in Paul's usage, can clearly be associated with the Gentiles (cf. 1 Cor 1:22-23). The pagan Hellenistic environment of Corinth clearly intersects with the Corinthian audience which Paul addresses, as his references to mixed marriages with unbelievers (1 Cor 7:12-16), to pagan temples (1 Cor 8:10), to the pagan meat market (1 Cor 10:25), and to unbelievers' invitations to Corinthian believers for dinner in the ambiguous context of cultic meals reveal (1 Cor 10:27-29).

In Paul's time, the pagan Hellenistic environment of Corinth was characterised by a variety of the more traditional Greek cults, the more recently introduced, Egyptian cults, the imperial cult, and Hellenistic institutions like athletic games.⁴⁶ Even though pagan cults were firmly regarded as idolatry by Paul and by at least part of his audience, except for those with a 'weak conscience' (cf. 1 Cor 8:4-7), the audience's interaction with the Gentile environment precludes a completely negative perspective on this environment by Paul. In fact, Paul notes in 1 Cor 5:1 that the Corinthians' immorality does not even occur among the Gentiles.

2.2.3 *Corinth and the church of God*

The church of God, the third collectivity which Paul mentions in 1 Cor 10:32, has been equated with the Corinthian church.⁴⁷ I have a problem with this view, since the imperative ἀπρόσκοποι γίνεσθε is followed by three datives, including that of τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, which suggests a collectivity external to or more comprehensive than the Corinthian church only. The exclusive equation of the 'church of God' with the church of Corinth implies that the Corinthians should not give offense to themselves, which is an alogical thought.

⁴⁵ Cf. the comparative analysis by Fitzmyer, 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations', 297-333.

⁴⁶ See Murphy-O'Connor, 'Corinth', in *ABD* I, 1138 and idem, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (Glazier: Wilmington, 1983). Cf. D. Newton, 'Archaeological Evidence for Corinthian Cults', in idem, *Deity and Diet. The Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth* (Sheffield AP: Sheffield, 1998) 91-114 on the cults of Demeter and Kore, Asklepios, Isis and Sarapis, of the dead and heroes, the imperial cult, and athletic contests.

⁴⁷ Cf. e.g. J.F.M. Smit, "About the Idol Offerings". *Rhetoric, Social Context and Theology of Paul's Discourse in First Corinthians 8:1-11:1* (CBET 27; Peeters: Leuven [etc.], 2000) 100 about the "place which, according to Paul, the church of God in Corinth ought to take between Jews and Gentiles cf. 1 Cor. 1:2; 10:32".

Contrary to the specified usage in 1 Cor 1:2, the general term 'church of God' in 1 Cor 10:32, corresponds with the general notion of church represented by the churches in the diaspora together with the Jerusalem church.⁴⁸ Accordingly, Paul also emphasises the unity of congregations in Christ as one church in 1 Cor 4:17, 7:17, 11:16, 12:28, 14:33b. When Paul exhorts the Corinthians in 1 Cor 11:22 not to despise the church of God, the exhortation should also be understood in this broader perspective which relates the different congregations to each other as one church of God.

Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians provides various clues about contacts between different congregations in the diaspora. The fact that the Corinthians come to Paul (1 Cor 16:17), his sending of fellow workers, messengers of the churches (1 Cor 16:10-11) and the arrival of greetings from other congregations (1 Cor 16:19-20) suggest the interactions among congregations in the Diaspora. These interactions may have provided the Corinthians with information about the Christian Jews of the Jerusalem church who are often called saints by Paul. Writing about the collection to be sent to Jerusalem, Paul advises the Corinthians to follow the example of the contribution of the Galatian churches (1 Cor 16:1-3) and praises the household of Stephanas, both for being among the first converts in Achaia, and for serving the saints faithfully (1 Cor 16:15-18).

2.3 The constraints

The proper community building on the basis of his gospel mission could be thwarted by a number of circumstances and attitudes of the Corinthian congregation. In my view, two important constraints underlie Paul's argumentation in 1 Corinthians.

The first constraint concerns *philosophical objections* to Paul's gospel. It is apparent from Paul's way of writing in for instance 1 Cor 3:18, 21, 4:6-7, 18-19, 10:22, 11:16, and 15:12, 33-34 that he counters the inclination of certain 'arrogant people' among the Corinthians to be contentious and raise objections against Paul's gospel and the traditions surrounding it. The idea that these objections may be of a philosophical, reasoned nature appears to be confirmed by the prominence of the theme of wisdom, σοφία, that is, worldly wisdom as opposed to God's wisdom in 1 Cor 1:17-2:13. Thus, Paul counters the idea that the gospel merely consists of the wisdom of debatable human reason in 1 Cor 1:17, 2:1-5. However, these passages at the beginning of 1 Corinthians do not necessarily imply that Paul rejects the use of rhetoric or eloquence *per se*.⁴⁹

Paul's concern focuses on proper community building which stands in contrast with the competitive concern for excellence in eloquent wisdom. In this connection, it is interesting to note a parallel from contemporary Jewish literature about the contrast between the general revelatory character of Scripture and the elitist practice of philosophy. Thus, Josephus juxtaposes the Mosaic legislation, which addresses all co-religionists of Josephus, with the Greek philosophies which address the few, οἱ μὲν πρὸς ὀλίγους φιλοσοφοῦντες (Ag.Ap. 2.169),⁵⁰ in spite of the analogous biblical and philosophical views about the nature of God.

The second constraint concerns the *division* among the Corinthians about the status of different apostles, which defeats the purpose of the gospel mission. This division occurs at the

⁴⁸ Cf. BDAG, 304 categorising 1 Cor 10:32 under the subheading concerning "the global community of Christians, (universal) church".

⁴⁹ *Contra* Anderson, 'Paul's Outlook on Rhetoric: 1 Ep.Cor. 1-4', in idem, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 239-248.

⁵⁰ Ag.Ap. 2.168 specifies these Greek philosophies as "Pythagoras, Anaxagoras, Plato, the Stoics who succeeded him, and indeed nearly all the philosophers"; translation from Thackeray, *Josephus in nine volumes* I, 359.

beginning of 1 Corinthians, in 1 Cor 1:10-17, recurs in 1 Cor 3:4, but it also is apparent in 1 Cor 9:1-6, where Paul refers to a juxtaposition between Paul and Barnabas on the one hand and the other apostles, the brothers of the Lord, and Cephas on the other.

3. 1 Corinthians 3:9-17, the Temple and God's Spirit

3.1 The rhetorical unit of 1 Cor 3:9-17

Paul introduces the image of God's Temple as a metaphor in 1 Corinthians 3:16-17. This metaphor is of direct interest to our discussion of cultic imagery, since it concerns *explicit* cultic imagery. Apart from the main subsection of 1 Cor 1-4 to which we have already pointed above, 1 Corinthians 3:16-17 constitutes part of a smaller rhetorical unit. It is important to analyse this rhetorical unit to see in which context Paul uses temple imagery. The context of Paul's writing and the place of the temple imagery in the structure of Paul's argumentation determines the interpretation of this imagery. Thus, rhetorical criticism provides us with a heuristic tool to check the plausibility of different interpretations of Paul's temple imagery in context.

While scholars have proposed divergent pericope divisions – for instance regarding like 1 Cor 3:16-17 as a unit within a much larger textual unit,⁵¹ 1 Cor 3:5-17,⁵² 1 Cor 3:10-17,⁵³ or even 1 Cor 3:9-19⁵⁴ - I propose to identify 1 Corinthians 3:9-17 as a separate rhetorical unit. Below, I will give more detailed arguments from textual criticism and from the context of 1 Cor 3 for this delimitation of 1 Cor 3:9-17 as a distinct rhetorical unit.

a. Arguments from textual criticism

The earliest textual witness of 1 Corinthians, the Chester Beatty Papyrus text number 46, does not provide us with evidence for paragraph division because of its *scriptio continua*. Nevertheless, certain manuscript evidence supports the idea of literary units within 1 Corinthians, of which I will discuss a few examples below, without aiming to give a survey of manuscripts. The examples offer proof that the proposed rhetorical unit, 1 Cor 3:9-17, is not without precedent.

The 'Codex Sinaiticus' (א), whose provenance is dated to the fourth century CE,⁵⁵ provides us with evidence of a subdivision into units of text in view of the blank space following the last line of a previous paragraph and the left margin position of the first letter of

⁵¹ Cf. Robertson & Plummer, *First Corinthians* ICC, 55: 'III. 5-IV.21. The True Conception of the Christian Pastorate', of which 'The Temple (iii.16,17)' is one unit.

⁵² 1 Cor 3:5-17 on 'Paul and Apollos' in Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 82-92, or with 'Community and Office' in H. Conzelmann, *1. Korinther* KEK, 91-97, or on 'Correcting a False View of Church and Ministry' in Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 128-150, or on 'Service, Communalism and Eschatological Responsibility of the Preacher 3,5-17' in Schrage, *1Kor 1,1-6,11* EKKNT, 286.

⁵³ 1 Cor 3:10-17 dealing with 'The church as God's building' in W.F. Orr & J.A. Walther, *1 Corinthians. A New Translation. Introduction with a Study of the Life of Paul, Notes, and Commentary* (AB 32; Doubleday: Garden City, N.Y., 1976) 168, 172-174, or dealing with 'Construction or Destruction of the Community? 3,10-17' in Wolff, *1. Korinther* THKNT, 69-75. Cf. Williams, 'The Master Builder, Builders, and the Temple', in idem, *The Wisdom of the Wise*, 257-300.

⁵⁴ Cf. De Lacey, 'οἰτινές εἰστε ὑμεῖς', 391-409 at 401-402.

⁵⁵ Cf. Helen & Kirsopp Lake (eds.), *Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus. The New Testament, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas* (facsimile edition; Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1911) ix-xxiv, folios 68v col. III up to 75r col. II, for the text of 1 Corinthians, on which my reference to the Codex Sinaiticus is based.

the sentence which opens the next paragraph. In this way, the Codex Sinaiticus (folio 69^v cols. I, line 17 – II, 16) marks 1 Cor 3:9-11, 3:12-13, 3:14-15, and 3:16-17 as textual units. The important point here is the idea that 1 Cor 3:9, together with the subsequent verses, belongs to one textual unit, instead of to the preceding verses 5-8. Thus, this suggested division of textual units creates the impression that the building imagery which Paul elaborates from 1 Cor 3:9 onwards is coherent.

There is later important evidence from Greek manuscripts which do clearly point to the reading of 1 Cor 3:9-17 as a separate literary unit. Thus, two Greek manuscripts dated to the eleventh century, numbered [*]104 and 547 in the list of Greek codices by Nestle-Aland,⁵⁶ mark the beginning of the pericope at 1 Cor 3:9 with the word ἀρχή in a different colour of ink and the end at 1 Cor 3:17 with the word τέλος, also in a different colour of ink.

b. Arguments from the context

Since the arguments which can be drawn from textual criticism are limited and secondary (they do not necessarily show that Paul himself had such a paragraph division in mind), I will now turn to arguments from the context of 1 Corinthians. This context to 1 Cor 3:9-17 as a pericope is in my view set by 1 Corinthians 3:1-4:21, a larger separate section about communal division, about the authority of different apostles and about the initiation by these apostles to the gospel as an object of competition and debate.

First, several scholars have already noted Paul's use of the image of God's building, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή, in 1 Cor 3:9, which anticipates on the temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:16-17.⁵⁷ When one does not accept a minimising approach to Paul's building and temple imagery as a mere 'rhetorical device' or mode of illustration,⁵⁸ the idea of anticipation provides an argument for the literary relation between 1 Cor 3:9 and 1 Cor 3:16-17.

Second, the internal coherence of 1 Cor 3:9-17 may suggest that it is a separate rhetorical unit. Paul is breaking new ground with his metaphor of God's Temple in 1 Cor 3:16-17, and prepares the reader for this through figurative language evolving into the image of God's building, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή in 1 Cor 3:9. Paul then goes on to describe the basis for this building process, that is, the foundation of Jesus Christ as proposed by Paul's gospel mission (1 Cor 3:10-11). 1 Cor 3:12-15 unfolds a perspective on how each one (cf. ἕκαστος at the end of 1 Cor 3:10) may build on this foundation, while 1 Cor 3:16-17 takes the constituent parts of the communal building process together into the metaphor of the Temple.

Third, within the larger context of 1 Cor 3:1-4:21, 1 Cor 3:9-17 may be singled out from the preceding text (1 Cor 3:1-8) as well as from the text following it (1 Cor 3:18-23, 4:1-5.6-13.14-21), since it focuses exclusively on imagery for the communal building process. The preceding section, 1 Cor 3:1-8, has introduced the specific problem of strife and jealousy among the Corinthians about status and authority derived from teachings and baptism by

⁵⁶ Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (27th ed., 1993) 704, 707; Ms. [*]104, pp. 133r-v (*Harley 5537* from the British Library; 1087 CE); ms. 547, p. 241r (*Additional ms. 39590* from the British Library; 11th century). K. Aland & B. Aland, *Der Text des Neuen Testaments. Einführung in die wissenschaftlichen Ausgaben sowie in Theorie und Praxis der modernen Textkritik* (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart, 1982) 141 accord some importance to [*]104 as textual witness, at least for the Pauline Letters (category III). I have had the opportunity to consult these two mss., [*]104 and 547, in the British Library, London, in October 2001.

⁵⁷ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 57-58; Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 86; Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 133-134; Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* NTD, 51-55; De Lacey, 'οἰτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς', 402-406; Böttrich, "Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes", 415.

⁵⁸ *Contra* Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 133 n.19 who criticises Conzelmann and Riesenfeld for giving too much weight to the possible Jewish background to Paul's images of gardening and building, and minimises the significance of Paul's imagery as mere 'rhetorical devices' (146-147, 146 n.4).

different apostles, on which Paul already anticipated in 1 Cor 1:10-17. 1 Cor 3:1-8 serves to convince the Corinthians of the mere human standpoint which has hitherto characterised this Corinthian situation. 1 Cor 3:9-17 instead focuses on the godly standpoint and purpose of the communal building process. The communal building process is accomplished by the work, ἔργον, of each individual who can contribute to the development and growth of the Corinthian congregation (1 Cor 3:13-15). The work of the other apostles and missionary workers, characterised by the term κόπος in 1 Cor 3:8, cannot be exclusively equated with the work, ἔργον, in 1 Cor 3:13-15,⁵⁹ since 1 Cor 16:16 mentions the exemplary work done by the Corinthian household of Stephanas (οἱ τοιοῦτοι καὶ πᾶς ὁ συνεργῶν καὶ κοπιῶν).

Sections subsequent to 1 Cor 3:9-17 turn to the subjects of God's wisdom which serves communal harmony as opposed to futile worldly wisdom (1 Cor 3:18-23); of God's judgement of all things (1 Cor 4:1-5), of missionary efforts and hardships endured for the Corinthians' benefit (1 Cor 4:6-13), and of Paul's fatherlike intentions toward them (1 Cor 4:14-21).

3.2 Text, translation, and variant readings

3:9 θεοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν συνεργοί, θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομὴ ἔστε. 10 Κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεισάν μοι ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἔθηκα, ἄλλος δὲ ἐποικοδομεῖ. ἕκαστος δὲ βλέπew πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ. 11 θεμέλιον γὰρ ἄλλον οὐδεὶς δύναται θεῖναι παρὰ τὸν κείμενον, ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. 12 εἰ δὲ τις ἐποικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον χρυσόν, ἄργυρον, λίθους τιμίους, ξύλα, χόρτον, καλάμην, 13 ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον φανερόν γενήσεται, ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα δηλώσει, ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται καὶ ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον ὁποῖόν ἐστιν τὸ πῦρ αὐτὸ δοκιμάσει. 14 εἴ τις τὸ ἔργον μενεῖ ὃ ἐποικοδόμησεν, μισθὸν λήμψεται. 15 εἴ τις τὸ ἔργον κατακαήσεται, ζημιωθήσεται, αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός. 16 Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἔστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; 17 εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θεός· ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν, οἵτινές ἔστε ὑμεῖς.

3:9 *'For we are God's fellow workers, you are God's field, God's building. 10 Through the favour of God granted to me, I laid a foundation as a clever master builder, but another builds upon it. Let each one then direct his attention to how he builds upon it. 11 For no one can lay another foundation than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. 12 Now, if someone builds upon the foundation with gold, silver, precious stones, timber, hay, or straw, 13 the work of each one will become evident, for the day will make it clear, because it is revealed by fire; and the fire itself will prove by testing of what sort the work of each one is. 14 If someone's work which he built up survives, he will receive his reward; 15 if someone's work burns down, he will suffer loss, but he himself will be saved, though thus as through fire. 16 Do you not know that you are God's Temple⁶⁰ and that the Spirit of God dwells among⁶¹*

⁵⁹ Contra Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* NTD, 55 who contrasts 1 Cor 3:9-15 as addressing other missionaries and their work to 1 Cor 3:16-17 as addressing the Corinthian community. Paul's statement in 1 Cor 3:9, θεοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν συνεργοί, 'for we are God's fellow workers', speaks against Lang's idea of implicit polemic against the work of other missionaries. 1 Cor 1:10-17; 3:4,21-22; 4:6,18-19 situates the problem among the Corinthians themselves. Note the identification of ἄλλος, τις, and ἕκαστος in the context of 1 Cor 3:10-15 by Wolff, *1. Korinther* THKNT, 69-70: "Es handelt sich um alle, die Einfluß in der Gemeinde haben. Dabei ist nicht nur an derzeitige Gemeindeleiter zu denken, sondern an jeden, der durch sein Charisma zum "Aufbau" der Gemeinde beiträgt", referring to the significance of Paul's current usage of οἰκοδομ- in 1 Cor 14 (70 n. 256).

⁶⁰ ναὸς θεοῦ in 1 Cor 3:16, being part of the predicate, may theoretically be translated as either 'a Temple of God' or 'the Temple of God'. However, the context of 1 Cor 3:16-17 (ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν, οἵτινές ἔστε ὑμεῖς, 1 Cor 3:17) makes it most likely that we should translate it in the determined state.

you? 17 *If someone spoils the Temple of God, God will destroy that person; for the Temple of God is holy, and that you are*'.

There are relatively few variant readings to the established Greek text of 1 Cor 3:9-17 and they do not change much of the essential meaning of the verses. Two variant readings concerning the tenses of verbs deserve to be mentioned. The variant reading μένει in 1 Cor 3:14 focuses on the present instead of the future, as opposed to μενεῖ in the established text. The variant reading φθείρει in 1 Cor 3:17 similarly focuses on the present rather than on the future, as opposed to φθερεῖ in the established text. The future tenses of the established text focus on the eschatological setting of the communal building (cf. 1 Cor 3:13), whereas the present tenses of the variant readings rather focus on the general principles of testing individual works and the inviolability of God's Temple.

My translation of the second part of 1 Cor 3:16, 'and that the Spirit of God dwells *among* you', is supported by several arguments. First, the translation '*among* you' does more justice to the idea that God's Spirit works among and through people than '*in* you', which, in my view, could suggest an un-Pauline idea of the direct possession of God's Spirit by human beings. Paul distinguishes between the human spirit and the Spirit of God (cf. 1 Cor 2:11). He refers to the gifts of the Spirit bestowed on human beings by God (1 Cor 2:12,14), which enable the spiritual person, ὁ πνευματικός, to understand spiritual matters (1 Cor 2:13-15, 3:1). The gifts of the Spirit are related to but not synonymous with God's Spirit. J.D.G. Dunn has emphasised the *experience* of the Spirit in Pauline theology which may also undermine a reductionist idea of the Spirit as confined to (material) possession.⁶²

Second, the reference to God's presence in 1 Cor 14:25 may support the translation 'that the Spirit of God dwells *among* you'. Thus, when Paul writes about the presence of God in 1 Cor 14:25, he states that "God is truly *among* you", ὄντως ὁ θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστιν.⁶³

Third, the biblical context to the theology of God's presence provides evidence for the idea of the Temple as God's dwelling place *among* his people. Thus, for instance, LXX Ezekiel 37:27a, which reads καὶ ἔσται ἡ κατασκήνωσίς μου ἐν αὐτοῖς, is translated in the Revised Standard Version as "My dwelling place shall be *with* them".

Other contexts to the notion of God's indwelling Spirit, as in 1 Cor 6:19 and in Rom 8:9-11, may yield a different perspective. Nevertheless, in view of Paul's use of the metaphor of the community as God's Temple, the idea of the indwelling presence of God's Spirit among the community as a Temple makes good sense for the case of 1 Cor 3:16.

Finally, it should be noted that the phrase οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς in 1 Cor 3:17 reaffirms the radical sense of the metaphor which transfers qualities ingrained in the theological concept of God's Temple to the Corinthian congregation. This by itself does not mean that the emphasis on this identification of the Corinthians with God's Temple implies a contrast of ὑμεῖς to another group, for οἵτινές must be followed by a complementary subject.

3.3 Building imagery and temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:9-17

My discussion of 1 Cor 3:9-17 as a rhetorical unit will demonstrate the relation between the building imagery and the temple imagery. Yet some general lines of coherence may be mentioned from the outset. Paul focuses on both the entire community as God's building,

⁶¹ I am here indebted to a suggestion by Prof. G.P. Luttikhuisen. Note the different translation in the RSV of 1 Cor 3:16: "Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells *in* you". Cf. my chap. 8, section 3.2, note 33.

⁶² J.D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Continuum: London & New York, 1998) 413-441.

⁶³ RSV here translates: "God is really *among* you".

God's Temple and the role to be performed by individuals in the communal building process throughout 1 Cor 3:9-17. The ἄλλος, τις, and ἕκαστος which underline the individual level in 1 Cor 3:10-15, are the object of Paul's exhortation that each should build on the one foundation in a proper, careful way. In 1 Cor 3:17, the individual designated with τις, who endangers the holiness of the community as Temple, is destroyed by God.

3.3.1 1 Cor 3:9. *The Corinthians as God's field, God's building*

1 Cor 3:9, 'For we are God's fellow workers, you are God's field, God's building', assigns the process of community building, based on the gospel mission, exclusively to God. 'God's fellow workers' is a characteristically Pauline designation for fellow missionary workers who are called by God to the mission to spread the gospel of Christ.⁶⁴ 1 Cor 3:9 presents a natural transition to the addressees of this mission: the Corinthians as 'God's field, God's building'.

It is likely that Paul deliberately plays on the double meaning of οἰκοδομή as architectural structure and as the process of building in 1 Cor 3:9,⁶⁵ analogously with his exhortation to the Corinthians that their communal growth should take a definite shape in holiness and unity. Parallel to this, Paul has first referred to the activity of planting in 1 Cor 3:6-8 and then calls the Corinthians 'God's field', God's cultivated land in 1 Cor 3:9.

The Corinthians are not addressed by general imagery, but specifically by the expressions of *God's field*, θεοῦ γεώργιον, and *God's building*, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή. Pagan as well as Jewish readers could easily associate this evocative imagery with the institutional context of sacred land⁶⁶ and a sacred building, that is, a temple, set apart from a profane, worldly setting (σαρκικοί καὶ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον in 1 Cor 3:3). Since Paul exclusively refers to the relation with God, however, it is likely that his imagery has been derived from traditions of monotheistic worship.

Moreover, it is Paul's purpose to teach the Corinthians to live a holy communal way of life, as opposed to their division and quarrels, through his figurative equation of the Corinthians with God's field and God's building. This imagery makes better sense in light of the Israelite worship tradition. The biblical tradition relates the holiness of God's people tightly to the holiness of the Temple, the building of God's dwelling (cf. e.g. Lev 19:1-8, 20:1-8.26).

In a pagan context, a direct connection between the sanctity of the cultic domain and a communal holy way of life outside this domain is far less demonstrable. The idea of piety, εὐσέβεια, a possible equivalent in Greek religion to a holy way of life, reflects a variegated phenomenon of cultic and civic duties.⁶⁷ Paul does not have a fusion of various types of piety in mind; he does not even refer to εὐσέβεια in his Letters, but focuses on holiness.

⁶⁴ Cf. 1 Thess 3:2 (also συνεργὸν τοῦ θεοῦ); 2 Cor 1:24, 8:23; Rom 16:3.9.21; Phil 2:25, 4:3; Phlm 1:24.

⁶⁵ Cf. Wolff, *1. Korinther* THKNT, 68-69 at 69: "Bei οἰκοδομή hat er – entsprechend der griechischen Bedeutung – weniger das fertige als das im Bau befindliche Gebäude im Blick".

⁶⁶ In pagan Greek religion, sacred land belonging to a sanctuary was called the τέμενος; cf. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 84-87. In contemporary Jewish religion, the produce of the land of Israel was traditionally tithed to sustain the system of the priestly Temple cult in Jerusalem. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 11.182: τὸν τε γεωργοῦντα λαὸν τὰς δεκάτας τῶν καρπῶν ἐκέλευσε φέρειν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἵνα τρέφεσθαι διηνεκῶς ἔχοντες οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευῖται μὴ καταλείπωσι τὴν θρησκείαν (Greek text from LCL *Josephus* VI (1937) 402).

⁶⁷ See Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 272-275 about εὐσέβεια in the context of Greek polytheism. Philo, *Worse* 21 and *Spec.Laws* 2.63 associates εὐσέβεια with ὁσιότης, 'holiness', in relation to worship of God.

I disagree with the scepticism of certain commentators about the possible influence of Jewish tradition on Paul's building imagery in 1 Cor 3:9.⁶⁸ The combination in 1 Cor 3:9 of images of planting or cultivating, θεοῦ γεώργιον, and building, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή, is most probably not a coincidence in view of the possible influence of contemporary Jewish tradition. Several scholars have noticed the link between the imagery of planting (מטע) and building and temple imagery (בית/מבנית קודש) which also figures in the sectarian literature of Qumran.⁶⁹ With regard to imagery of planting in relation to the building of the Temple, George J. Brooke has pointed to *Jubilees* 1:16-17, a pseudepigraphon which circulated in Israel also outside the sectarian community of Qumran.⁷⁰ Such Jewish parallels to a cluster of images in Paul are not coincidence. On the contrary, they may be explained from the general Jewish background of the Second Temple period, echoing the longstanding tradition of the Temple cult, especially in view of Paul's elaboration of temple imagery.⁷¹

The Septuagint and Josephus use the same term of οἰκοδομή⁷² for the construction of the pre-eminent Israelite example of God's building, that is, the Jerusalem Temple.⁷³ Significantly, LXX 1 Chron 29:1 emphasises that 'the building will not be for man, but for the Lord God', οὐκ ἀνθρώπων ἡ οἰκοδομή, ἀλλ' ἡ κυρίῳ θεῷ. This contrast may have served Paul's point when dissuading the Corinthians from a *human* standpoint in 1 Cor 3:3, addressing them as *God's* building in 1 Cor 3:9.

⁶⁸ Robertson & Plummer, *First Corinthians* ICC, 59 refer to imagery in Jer 18:9, 24:6 and Ezek 36:9; Conzelmann, *1. Korinther* KEK, 93-94 refers to Jer 1:9, 12:14-16, 24:6, and Ezek 17:1-8, although his conclusion points to a general cultural context to Paul's imagery in 1 Cor 3:9; Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 133 n. 19 is sceptical against the idea that Jewish tradition influenced Paul in his choice of imagery in 1 Cor 3:9.

⁶⁹ Conzelmann, *1. Korinther* KEK (1969) 93 n. 56 refers to 1QS VIII 5; CD III 19; Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 168 mentions 1QS VIII 4, XI 8, and to 4QpPs 37 (=4Q171) III 15; cf. 168 nn. 3-5, 169 n. 9; Klauck, 'Kultische Symbolsprache bei Paulus', in Schreiner (ed.), *Freude am Gottesdienst*, 108; Schrage, *1Kor 1,1-6,11* EKKNT, 294-295 n. 103 also refers to 1QS VIII,5 and XI, 8. Note that the equivalent Greek terms φύτεία / φύτευμα / φυτόν to the Hebrew טמ correspond with Paul's use of the verb φυτεύειν in 1 Cor 3:6-8.

⁷⁰ Brooke, 'Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community', in Ego *et al.* (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*, 285-301 at 291-295 about 4Q174, 1QH a 16:4-37, and *Jubilees*.

⁷¹ Most commentators refer to 1QS as one among several parallels to Paul's usage. Klinzing suggests a direct link between Qumran literature, early Christianity and Paul. Note, however, the recent scepticism about hypotheses of borrowing by the Jerusalem church from the Qumran community in R. Bauckham, 'The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes', in J.R. Davila (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (Brill: Leiden & Boston, 2003) 63-89.

⁷² Cf. LXX 1 Chron 26:27 (ἡ οἰκοδομή τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ), 29:1; 2 Chron 3:2; 1 Esd 2:26 (ἡ οἰκοδομή τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ), 4:51, 5:60.70, 6:6.21; Tob 14:5 (οἰκοδομή ἐνδόξος); Josephus, *Ant.* 11.19-20, 59, 95 (in the textual versions of the Codex Ambrosianus (A) and the Epitome used by Zonaras (E)), 103 (A).

⁷³ Thus the Septuagint comprises the following terms for the Jerusalem Temple as a building, οἶκος:

ὁ οἶκος κυρίου (θεοῦ) / τῷ κυρίῳ / τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου in LXX 3 Kgdms 3:1, 6:1-2, 8:1.17; 4 Kgdms 15:35, 21:4; 1 Chron 22:5; 2 Chron 2:11, 3:1, 8:1, 27:3; 1 Esd 2:5, 5:67, 6:21.23.26; 2 Esd 4:1; Hos 8:1, 9:4.8; Joel 1:9, 4:18; Hag 1:2; Zeph 1:9; Zech 6:12.14-15, 7:3, 8:9, 14:20-21; Isa 37:1.14 (B S), 38:22, 66:20; Jer 17:26, 19:14, 20:1-2, 28:51, 33:2.7.9-10, 34:16, 35:1.3.5-6, 36:26, 40:11, 42:2.4, 43:5-6, 45:14, 48:5, 52:13.17.20; Bar 1:8.14; Lam 2:7; Ezek 8:14.16, 10:19, 11:1, 44:4-5, 11(A);

ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ / τῷ θεῷ in LXX 1 Chron 22:2; 2 Chron 3:3; 2 Esd 4:3, 5:13.17, 6:3.5.7-8; Joel 1:13-14.16; Nah 1:14; Zech 12:8; Isa 2:2-3, 38:20; Bar 3:24; Dan LXX 4:22 (ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος), 5:2, 23 (ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος); Dan Th 1:2.

Less frequent designations are ὁ οἶκος τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ (e.g. 3 Macc 2:18), ὁ οἶκος, τὸ ἅγιον ἡμῶν (LXX Isa 64:10), ὁ οἶκος ὁ ἅγιός σου (Bar 2:16), and ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ παντοκράτορος οἶκος (2 Macc 15:32).

3.3.2 1 Cor 3:10-11. Paul the master builder and the one foundation, Jesus Christ

In 1 Cor 3:10-11, we subsequently see that, in line with the imagery of building, Paul compares himself figuratively to a master builder (ἀρχιτέκτων) who has laid the foundation (θεμέλιος) for this building. Paul's representation of himself as a clever master builder implies that Paul claims the exclusive role in the foundation of the Corinthian congregation in Christ. This idea of Paul's exclusive role also corresponds to Paul's depiction of himself as a father to the Corinthians, as opposed to countless guides (1 Cor 4:14-15; cf. 1 Cor 3:1-6).

Paul's emphasis on the fact that 'like a *clever* master builder I have laid a foundation', ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἔθηκα, precludes debate about this foundation from the point of view of human wisdom, σοφία. In fact, Paul urges others to be careful with how they build on this foundation. This admonition again addresses the Corinthian situation of division and strife, and everyone is warned about his or her individual responsibility.

Since Paul repeatedly stresses the contributions of the Corinthians to the process of building up the congregation (cf. e.g. 1 Cor 12:23, 14:4-5.12.26), we may suspect that Paul addresses every one who may contribute to the community building process, including the Corinthians themselves. The Corinthians are God's building (1 Cor 3:9), but the fact that Paul continues to write in terms of construction work (1 Cor 3:10-15) implies that just as the gospel mission is a process, so the community building is also a work in process.

The figurative idea of Jesus Christ as the foundation for God's building in 1 Cor 3:11 strongly emphasises Paul's gospel mission as the foundation for the Corinthian congregation in Christ. In face of Corinthian dissensions, through which different missionaries were played out against each other as competing teachers, Paul emphasises the unity in the fellowship of Jesus Christ.

3.3.3 1 Cor 3:12-15. The individual work and the eschatological test of fire

In 1 Cor 3:12-15, Paul goes on to describe the works which each one may build (ἐποικοδομεῖν) on this foundation to contribute to the communal building process. As Paul has warned his readers that each one should take care how he or she builds upon it (1 Cor 3:10), Paul works his admonition out by pointing to the eschatological test of each work by fire, that is, the test on the Day of the Lord (1 Cor 3:13; cf. 1 Cor 1:8).

Significantly, Paul lists precious and inferior building materials together in 1 Cor 3:12. It is probable that Paul's use of imagery serves to admonish the Corinthians to be prudent and to build with solid material on the foundation. This building material cannot be taken literally, since Paul has the figurative community building upon the gospel mission in mind.

The building materials mentioned in 1 Cor 3:12 have been compared to the literary evidence for construction work on pagan temples by J. Shanor as a source providing "the Apostle with material for metaphor".⁷⁴ However, Shanor's viewpoint appears very unlikely to me, for Paul's view about pagan temples is negative, as his pejorative reference to an 'idol's temple', εἰδωλείον, in 1 Cor 8:10 indicates. Contrary to this, contemporary epigraphic evidence designates pagan sanctuaries with the term ναός.⁷⁵ Paul further writes that an idol (a pagan god) is nothing and that there is only one God (1 Cor 8:4), while he urges the Corinthians to shun idolatry, εἰδωλολατρία (1 Cor 10:14). Thus, there is a clear disjunction between Paul's pejorative perspective and the contemporary pagan perspective.

⁷⁴ J. Shanor, 'Paul as Master Builder. Construction Terms in First Corinthians', *NTS* 34 (1988) 461-471 at 471.

⁷⁵ Cf. *SEG* XXVIII (1978) 100 line 35 about a 'law of the Delphic amphiktion, 380/79 B.C.' in Athens (τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλω[ος] τὸ Πυθίον; *SEG* XXXV (1985) 1812 about ναός among terms for Augustan temples; *SEG* XLII (1992) about an Athenian decree 'honouring Satyra, Priestess of the Thesmophoroi, ca. 180 B.C.' (line 4: τοὺς ναοὺς; line 12: [ἐν τῷ ναῷ] τῆς Δήμητρος καὶ τῆς Κόρη[ς]).

In 1 Cor 3:14-15, the eschatological reward (μισθός) and punishment (ζημιούσθαι) for durable and perishable works respectively might be compared with contemporary Jewish evidence. LXX Sirach 51:30 reads: “Do your work (τὸ ἔργον ὑμῶν) before the appointed time, and in his time he will give you your reward (μισθός)”. The reward is here equally situated in the future, the time appointed by God.

The specific idea of apocalyptic fire probably stems from biblical and post-biblical Israelite traditions, since the eschatological connotations to Paul's idea are very strong.⁷⁶ Thus, Israelite tradition conveys the idea of a destructive, purging fire which will destroy evil and associations with evil. Amos 4:11 mentions fire from the midst of which Israel is saved, whereas some outright evildoers or idolaters among them are overthrown. Sirach 39:29 mentions fire among three other things created for vengeance against evil ‘in the time of consummation’, ἐν καιρῷ συντελείας (LXX Sir 39:28), and thus testifies to the pre-existence of the imagery of eschatological fire. In both cases, the context of the destructive fire is God's outrage turning against those who commit sins of ungodly injustice.

The eschatological judgement by fire also occurs in the sectarian literature of Qumran. According to 1QpHab X, 2-13, God's judgement against the Wicked Priest as well as against all those who have insulted God's chosen will be a punishment of fire, משפטי אש (1QpHab X, 13) in the end-time (אק in 1QpHab VII, 7-8.12-14). Even though this judgement by fire concerns those outside the community of the elect, it is particularly based on works, specified as ‘useless work’, עבודת שו (1QpHab X, 11) and as ‘acts of deceit’, מעשי שקר (1QpHab X,12). The *Community Rule* relates the judgement by everlasting fire to people of the lot of Belial (1QS II, 4-8). In the context of the representation of the sectarian Qumran community as a Temple in 1QS VIII, 4-9, this community is further referred to as the ‘tested rampart’, חומת הבחן (1QS VIII, 7).

Thus, the idea of eschatological fire as a judgement of human deeds is widespread in contemporary Judaism and provides a background to Paul's imagery. Nevertheless, Paul's concern is not with the eschatological punishment of those outside the congregation (cf. 1 Cor 5:12-13), but with purging the works related to the building process of the community. Paul stresses the salvation of all those called to faith, but at the same time he emphasises the judgement of each person's works.⁷⁷ Paul's eschatological perspective may well convey a concern with genuine, mature worship among the Corinthian congregation which withstands a test. Related to the verb δοκιμάζειν (1 Cor 3:13), Paul writes about the necessary factions in 1 Cor 11:19, “in order that those who are genuine (οἱ δόκιμοι) among you become manifest”.⁷⁸

The transition from the eschatological perspective of the testing of all individual works by fire (1 Cor 3:12-15) to the present of the community as God's Temple (1 Cor 3:16-17) expresses Paul's underlying moral perspective of holiness and unity which opposes dissension and iniquity. The eschatological orientation which pervades Paul's description of the building process appears to determine Paul's temple imagery as well, as the future tense φθερεῖ in 1 Cor 3:17 may indicate. 1 Cor 3:17 discusses the destruction of anyone who will spoil the community as Temple in the future.

⁷⁶ Scholarly exegesis of 1 Cor 3:12-15 has compared Paul's notion of apocalyptic fire with Jewish eschatology and Stoic philosophy: see e.g. Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 229 and De Lacey, “οἰτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς”, 405 n. 53; cf. Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 142 and Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* NTD, 52 referring to Isa 66:15.

⁷⁷ Cf. Rom 2:6, ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, a quotation from Proverbs 24:12, with the future tense differing from LXX Prov 24:12 which has ἀποδίδωσιν.

⁷⁸ Cf. 1 Thess 5:20-21 (translation from RSV): “but test (δοκιμάξετε) everything; hold fast what is good, abstain from every form of evil”.

3.3.4 1 Cor 3:16-17. The Corinthian congregation as God's Temple

After his message in terms of building imagery about the proper community building process, Paul arrives at the metaphor of the Corinthian community as God's Temple, ναὸς θεοῦ, in 1 Cor 3:16-17. Again, as in the case of the building imagery of 1 Cor 3:9, it should be noted that Paul's imagery focuses not just on any temple, but on *God's Temple*. Paul's temple imagery therefore implies monotheistic connotations.

Contemporary evidence from Jewish and Graeco-Roman cults may put Paul's temple imagery into perspective. In Paul's time, the contrast between the Jerusalem Temple and pagan temples becomes clear from Jewish and pagan Graeco-Roman sources. Epigraphic evidence of pagan Greek and Hellenistic cults frequently mentions the sanctuary, ναός, of a deity together with τὸ ἄγαλμα, that is, the statue of the deity worshipped in the sanctuary.⁷⁹ In this connection, it is important to note that the Jerusalem Temple did not contain any statue or image (cf. e.g. *Ag.Ap.* 1.199). In fact, the introduction of images in Jerusalem, let alone in the Jerusalem Temple, in Hellenistic and Roman times was considered a serious offence against ancestral tradition by many Jews. Biblical and post-biblical Jewish literature comprise statements about the sanctity and inviolability of God's Temple (cf. my chap. 1).

It may be significant that the Jerusalem Temple is often designated in biblical and post-biblical literature by exactly the same term as the one that Paul uses in 1 Cor 3:16-17, ὁ ναὸς (τοῦ κυρίου (/)) θεοῦ or its Attic variant form νεὸς θεοῦ.⁸⁰ The term ναός may more specifically designate the inner sanctuary of the Temple,⁸¹ as distinct from the invariably general term for the Jerusalem Temple complex, τὸ ἱερόν.⁸² By implication, the

⁷⁹ Cf. e.g. *SEG XXXI* (1981) 731 Delos, sanctuary of the Syrian gods, 118/117 – 90 BCE (line 4: τὸν ναὸν καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα); *SEG XXVI* (1986) 1039 Erythrai, temple for Aphrodite Pandemos, ca. 400 BCE (ll. 8-9: ὁ ναὸς οἰκοδομηθήσεται καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα ποθηθήσεται κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦ δήμου; ll. 28-29 [τὸν] ναὸν καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα); *SEG XXXVIII* (1988) 1444 Balbura, temple of Nemesis, 161 CE (τὸν ναὸν τῆς Νεμέσεως σὺν τοῖς ἀγάλμασιν); *SEG XL* (1990) 657 Delos, sanctuary of the Great Gods of Samothrake, 102/101 BCE (l. 2: τὸν ναὸν [καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀγάλματα]); *SEG XLII* (1992) 1223 honorary inscription, unknown provenance, 1st half 1st cent. CE (ll. 4-5: οἵτινες κατεσκεύασαν τὸν τε ναὸν καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα).

⁸⁰ *LXX* 4 Kgdms 23:4, 24:13; 2 Chron 15:8, 26:16, 27:2; 1 Esd 5:52.55.57. 64 (ὁ ναὸς τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ Ἰσραήλ); 6:18; Tob 1:4 (ὁ ναὸς τῆς κατασκηνώσεως τοῦ ὑψίστου); Jdt 4:2.11; Pss. 5:8 (ναὸς ἁγίος σου), 10:4 (ναὸς ἁγίος αὐτοῦ), 17:7, 26:4, 27:2, 28:9, 64:5, 67:30 (ὁ ναὸς σου ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ), 78:1, 137:2; Wis 3:14, 9:8; Sir 45:9, 49:12, 50:1. 7 (ναὸς ὑψίστου), 51:14; Jonah 2:5; Hab 2:20; Hag 2:9.15.18; Zech 8:9; Mal 3:1; Isa 66:6; Jer 7:4, 24:1; Dan *LXX* 3:53; Dan Th 3:53, 5:2-3; 2 Macc 8:2, 14:35 (ναὸς τῆς σῆς σκηνώσεως ἐν ἡμῖν). For ὁ νεός, see 2 Macc 4:14, 6:2, 9:16, 10:3.5, 13:23, 14:33, and Philo, *Creation* 137; *Drunkness* 85; *Dreams* 2.246 (ἡ γὰρ νῦν οὕσα ἱερὰ πόλις, ἐν ἧ καὶ ἅγιος νεός ἐστι); Josephus, *Ant.* 7.334; 8.119, 139; 9.5, 161, 254; 10.37; 11.6, 12, 58; 15.380; 18.261, 280; 20.228, 236.

Cf. ναὸς ἅγιος σου (*8HevXIIgr* col. II, 39), ναὸς ἅγιος [α]ὐτοῦ (*8HevXIIgr* col. XVIII, 40), and ναὸς (*8HevXIIgr* col. XXV, 5) denoting the Jerusalem Temple in the Greek *Minor Prophets Scroll* from Nahal Hever, dated to the later first century BCE by H.M. Cotton, 'Greek', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* I, 324-326 at 325.

⁸¹ *LXX* 3 Kgdms 6:3.5.17; Bar 1:8; Ezek 8:16, 41:1.4.15.21.23.25; 1 Macc 1:22, 2:8, 4:49-50.57, 7:36; 2 Macc 15:17-18.33; 4 Macc 1:10, 2:1, 3:17, 5:43; Josephus, *J.W.* 5.207, 209, 215, 220, 226, 229. Cf. Greek terms for the inner parts of the Jerusalem Temple, the 'Holy of Holies' are οἶκος καταπετάσματος (*LXX* Sir 50:5), τὰ ἅγια (e.g. 1 Macc 7:36; 2 Macc 15:17), ἁγίου ἁγίου or τὸ ἄδυτον, (*J.W.* 5.219, 236; *Ant.* 8.90, 103-104).

⁸² *LXX* 1 Esd 1:2.5.11. 47 (τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ κυρίου τὸ ἀγιαζόμενον ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις). 50 (τὸ ἅγιον αὐτῶν ἱερόν), 2:4 (τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ κυρίου τὸ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ). 26 (ἡ οἰκοδομὴ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ), 4:51. 63 (Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ τὸ ἱερόν), 5:43 (τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ). 44.54, 7:7, 8:13.17-18.22.64.78. 88, 9:1.6.38.41; Sir 50:2; Dan *LXX* 9:27; Dan Th 9:27; 1 Macc 10:43 (τὸ ἱερόν τὸ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις), 15:9; 2 Macc 1:18, 2:9.19.22, 3:2.4.12.30, 4:32, 5:15 (τὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς ἀγιώτατον ἱερόν). 21, 6:4, 10:1, 11:3.25, 13:10.14, 14:13 (τὸ μέγιστον ἱερόν). 31 (τὸ μέγιστον καὶ ἅγιον ἱερόν), 15:17; 3 Macc 1:10.16. 20 (τὸ πανυπέρτατον ἱερόν), 3:16; 4 Macc 4:8-9.11.20. Josephus, *J.W.* 5.184, 186-187, 193, 227.

contemporary Jewish concept of God's Temple, ναὸς θεοῦ, denotes the central and most holy place of the Temple which symbolises the priestly covenant of God with his people. The holiness of God's people is also a biblical imperative; see, for instance, LXX Numbers 15:40: καὶ ἔσεσθε ἅγιοι τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν, "and you shall be holy to your God" (cf. Lev 20:7; Deut 6:4-7).

Jewish temple-theological ideas cannot have been completely foreign to the Corinthians, since Corinth had a Jewish community, while missionaries like Apollos, Cephas, and Paul himself were all of Jewish descent. The occurrence of the same concept in Paul and contemporary Jewish traditions of temple religiosity brings up the question how Paul's temple imagery relates to Jewish tradition and to the diaspora setting of his addressees. In view of striking analogies with the Jewish monotheistic tradition of the Jerusalem Temple cult, Paul's temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:16-17 cannot be a *creatio ex nihilo*, but probably resounds this tradition in a figurative way. The Corinthians are warned against temptations, among which idolatry, in terms of biblical history as an example story (cf. 1 Cor 10:1-13,14-22). Consequently, the Corinthian audience would probably recognise the concept of monotheistic worship echoed by Paul's temple imagery. Paul identifies the Corinthians with God's holy Temple at the end of 1 Cor 3:17 (ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν, οἳτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς) to awaken the sense of communal identity among the Corinthians as a holy congregation in an unmistakable way.

In view of Paul's admonition against the Corinthians' dissensions and disputes, his use of the metaphor of God's Temple makes particular sense. Since the contemporary Jewish idea of Temple worship conveys a spirit of holiness and of honouring God, the metaphor of the community as a Temple addresses the Corinthians as people called by God to faith. Significantly, Philo describes Jewish pilgrimage to the Jerusalem Temple as follows: "the sacrifices and libations are the occasion of reciprocity of feeling and constitute the surest pledge that all are of one mind" (εἰς βεβαιωτάτην πίστιν ὁμονοίας).⁸³ Thus, the idea of the Temple provided a strong theological model for the appeal to holiness and unity.

Paul's use of temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:16-17 also provokes questions about the underlying relation of Paul's temple imagery to contemporary Jewish religion. Several studies on temple imagery in the New Testament in comparison to contemporary Judaism have concluded that in 1 Cor 3:16-17, among other passages, this temple imagery conveys a substitution for the contemporary Temple cult in that the church is presented as the new Temple.⁸⁴ Recently, Christfried Böttrich has tentatively countered this idea of substitution by stressing a rather positive Pauline use of the Jewish concept of God's Temple.⁸⁵

How should Paul's temple imagery be interpreted in view of the recent divergence of scholarly positions about substitution, spiritualisation or rather a normative use of the Jewish concept of God's Temple? In the context of 1 Cor 1-4, the building imagery and temple imagery of 1 Cor 3:9-17 serve to convince the Corinthians about the serious consequences of their calling by God. Paul addresses them as God's building, God's Temple, in order to make them clear that they are called to be holy rather than behaving as ordinary human beings

⁸³ *Spec. Laws* 1.70; translation from F.H. Colson, *Philo* VII (Harvard UP: Cambridge, Mass., 1937) 138-141.

⁸⁴ Cf. e.g. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 57 states that the "Christian church in Corinth is the true Temple", "the implication being that God's *Shekinah* no longer rests on the Jerusalem Temple, but has removed to the Church" (58); McKelvey, *The New Temple*; cf. the conclusion of Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 210-211 at 210, which implies about the self-definition as Temple, "in der ja die Konkurrenz und der Gegensatz zum Jerusalemer Heiligtum zum Ausdruck kommen mußte", that this also holds true for 1 Cor 3:16-17; more recently, W. Strack, 'Zusammenfassung zu den Tempelaussagen', in idem, *Kultische Terminologie*, 269-272 at 272: "Auch hat der Jerusalemer Tempel für ihn [Paulus] durch das Christusgeschehen jede Heilsbedeutung verloren".

⁸⁵ Böttrich, "Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes", 411-425 at 422.

obsessed with strife and factionalism. At the same time, Paul admonishes the Corinthians about their arrogance and pride. Instead of making their appeal to external authority and to conventional ideas about wisdom their grounds for pride, the Corinthians should invest in attaining a holy congregation. In this rhetorical context, there is in my view no specific reason or necessity to interpret the idea of the community as God's Temple in 1 Cor 3:16-17 as the Corinthians' (and thereby the church's) superiority over and substitution for the Jerusalem Temple.

In contemporary Jewish traditions there are parallels to the idea that people rather than the institution of the sanctuary are central to holiness, as prescribed in the Scripture for God's people. In the temple theology as reflected in 2 Macc 5:19 (cf. my chap. 1, section 1.1), the sanctuary is chosen by God for the sake of the people rather than the other way around. The idea of the community as a Temple in the *Community Rule* does not preclude the eschatological importance of Jerusalem and its Temple for the Qumran community, as the 4QMMT and the *War Scroll* reveal. Philo's description of the movement of the Therapeutae, which ascribes cultic symbolism to them (*Contempl. Life* 74, 81-82), does not deny the Jerusalem Temple its place at the heart of the Jewish worship cult.

In my view, it is probable that Paul's building and temple imagery serves the paideutic purpose of instructing and guiding the Corinthians in elaborating a mature communal identity as a congregation of God (cf. 1 Cor 1:2). In the context of the gospel mission, the temple imagery is figuratively applied to Christian worship. Thus, Paul writes about Jesus Christ as 'our wisdom, our righteousness and sanctification and redemption' in 1 Cor 1:30 and calls Jesus Christ the foundation for the Corinthians as God's building (1 Cor 3:11). At the same time, Paul reproaches the Corinthians for their boasting of wisdom and individual status (1 Cor 3:18-23, 4:6-7), stressing that what they have, they have received (1 Cor 4:7).

The theocentric character of Paul's metaphor of the Temple evokes associations with the Israelite tradition of monotheistic worship. As we have seen in Romans 9-11, Paul includes converts from the Gentiles in his theological concept of Israel and God's covenant with his people. Paul's metaphor of the Temple may therefore also be an *inclusive* concept. Because of this inclusion of converts from the Gentiles in God's covenant with the chosen people, the Corinthians can be addressed as God's Temple.

Paul stresses the mysteries of God (1 Cor 2:1.7-9f., 4:1), which include converts from Jews and Gentiles in their calling to the faith in Christ (cf. 1 Cor 1:24). Similarly, Paul refers to the inclusion of the Gentiles into God's covenant with Israel in Rom 11:25 as a mystery, *μυστήριον*, related to the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God (Rom 11:33). The inclusion of both Jews and Gentiles into God's covenant through Jesus Christ, in spite of its provocative character (cf. 1 Cor 1:21-23), does not entail the idea of supersession or substitution. Paul exhorts the Corinthians to respect the Jews, the Greeks, and the church of God (1 Cor 10:32), and urges them to serve the saints in Jerusalem (1 Cor 16:1-4.15-16). The metaphor of the Temple in 1 Cor 3:16-17 is a normative concept with moral connotations about a communal holy way of life, as opposed to dissensions and individual strife.

In my introduction, I have already pointed to the approach of spiritualisation and its problems, that is, the danger of importing notions of spiritualisation from other early Christian texts into the exegesis of Paul's Letters. The exegesis of temple imagery in Paul's Letters on its own terms requires a sensitive approach to Paul's discussion of spiritual matters on the one hand and his use of the concept of God's Spirit on the other. Paul's notion of the indwelling Spirit of God in relation to the Temple as God's dwelling place is not isolated from Israelite traditions of monotheistic worship. In the next section, I will therefore turn to the issue of how Paul's metaphor draws on temple theological ideas in contemporary Judaism.

3.4 The Temple and God's Spirit in 1 Cor 3:16-17 and contemporary Judaism

1 Cor 3:16-17 introduces the metaphor of God's Temple to the Corinthian readers. This metaphor figures in a rhetorical question starting with the words 'do you not know that', οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι. The rhetorical question figures prominently and almost exclusively⁸⁶ in 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 3:16; 5:6; 6:2-3,9,15-16,19; 9:13,24), introducing many passages with cultic imagery (1 Cor 3:16; 5:6; 6:19; 9:13). As the rhetorical question introduces "a well-known fact that is generally accepted",⁸⁷ Paul draws on a pre-existing notion about the Temple.

As we have already seen, the longstanding tradition of Israelite monotheistic worship was represented by the Jerusalem Temple cult as God's Temple in Paul's time. Paul's rhetorical question introduces the concept of God's Temple in relation to the idea of God's indwelling Spirit, in order to make the principle of communal holiness clear to the Corinthian readers.⁸⁸ This idea of God's indwelling presence has been compared with biblical theology as expressed in MT Exodus 25:8: ועשו לי מקדש ושכנתי בתוכם, "And they shall make a sanctuary for me so that I may dwell among them".⁸⁹ The Hebrew verb שכן parallels Paul's verb οἰκεῖν in 1 Cor 3:16. It should be noted that this verb שכן also figures in the Temple Scroll as part of the expression שוכן בתוך in which God is the subject, while God's people, the Israelites, the object. This expression is frequently connected with the theme of the Temple and the city of the Temple (11QT^a XLV, 14; XLVI, 11-12; XLVII, 18; LI, 7-8). Paul's theological notion of the indwelling presence of God's Spirit would not be foreign to those initiated in monotheistic worship in Paul's time. I will demonstrate this point through examples from the Septuagint, from Hellenistic Jewish literature, and from the literature of Qumran.

3.4.1 The Septuagint

On the part of Hellenistic Jewish literature, the comparative evidence for the relation between Paul's concept of the Temple and God's Spirit has received little scholarly attention. Even though Hellenistic Jewish literature does not convey the same idea as Paul's metaphor of the Temple, it may provide a useful background to the element of God's Spirit in Paul's temple imagery.

The Wisdom of Solomon 9:1-18

The Wisdom of Solomon 9:1-18, a Hellenistic Jewish work from the first century BCE which is part of the Septuagint, comprises an elaboration on the biblical story about king Solomon as recounted in 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles. Wis 9:1-18 combines elements from Solomon's prayer for wisdom (1 Kgs 3:6-9) and Solomon's dedicatory prayer for the Temple (1 Kgs 8:22.54; 2 Chron 6:12).

Wis 9:8 mentions the building of the Temple, οἰκοδομησαι ναόν, in a particular context. Thus, the prayer addresses God's instruction for Solomon to build the Temple, but also incorporates an entreaty to God to send his Holy Spirit from on high: βουλήν δέ σου

⁸⁶ Outside 1 Corinthians, the rhetorical question starting with οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι only occurs in Rom 6:16.

⁸⁷ BDAG, 693 lemma οἶδα, 1 e.

⁸⁸ I disagree with Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 246 n. 48 who refers to Paul's phrasing of the rhetorical question as a "diatribische Stilfigur".

⁸⁹ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 58.

τίς ἔγνω, εἰ μὴ σὺ ἔδωκας σοφίαν καὶ ἔπεμψας τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἀπὸ ὑψίστων; (Wis 9:17).⁹⁰ H. Engel has noted that the mention of the altar “in the city of thy habitation” in 9:8b reminds us of the place where Solomon’s dedicatory prayer was pronounced (1 Kgs 8:22.54; 2 Chron 6:12).⁹¹ This place of habitation was the Jerusalem Temple. The sending of God’s Holy Spirit may therefore also be linked with the Temple as God’s dwelling place.

The implicit link between the Temple and God’s Holy Spirit in the Wisdom of Solomon reveals a temple theological perspective from the Hellenistic period. 1 Kgs 8:29 and 2 Chron 6:20 do not refer to God’s Spirit in relation to the Temple, but focus on the Temple as the place where ‘God’s name’ will be.

3.4.2 Hellenistic Jewish Literature

Josephus’ Jewish Antiquities 8.108-114

The Biblical Antiquities of Flavius Josephus, that is, that part of his *Jewish Antiquities* which retell the biblical story comprises developments in Jewish temple theology contemporary to Paul. Furthermore, both Josephus and Paul had previously been educated as Pharisees, both wrote in an environment of the Hellenistic Jewish Diaspora, and scholars have traced the influence of Stoic philosophy in the works of both authors.⁹²

An important passage for the analysis of the relation between God’s Spirit and the Temple of God in 1 Cor 3:16-17 can be found in the eighth book of Flavius Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*. This passage recounts the biblical story of the dedication of the Temple built by king Solomon (1 Kgs 8; 2 Chron 6), whose dedicatory prayer is rendered in a way which adds significant details. For example, at the beginning of the dedicatory prayer in the *Jewish Antiquities* 8.108, Josephus elaborates on the biblical story by pointing to the nearness of God’s presence, who oversees mankind with a moral influence of guidance,⁹³ to those who send up prayers and worship God.

Josephus’ elaboration on the biblical story may reflect Hellenistic developments in temple theology, similar to those we have already discerned in the case of the Wisdom of Solomon. Apart from his reliance on historical sources like other writers, archives, and documents, Josephus most probably also relied on existing traditions in his retelling of the biblical story of Solomon’s dedicatory prayer.⁹⁴ The most striking passage for a comparison

⁹⁰ Greek text from A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes. Duo volumina in uno* (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart, 1979) Volumen II Libri poetici et prophetici, p. 358.

⁹¹ H. Engel, *Das Buch der Weisheit* (Stuttgart, 1998) 154; on Stoic influence in the Wisdom of Solomon, see J.R. Levison, *The Spirit in First-Century Judaism* (Brill: Leiden [etc.], 1997), 145, who refers to Wis 1:7, 7:7, and 9:17, as an example of the understanding of wisdom in the “conceptual orbit of a sapiential tradition permeated by Stoicism”.

⁹² Concerning Pharisaic education, see Josephus’ *Life* 12, and Phil 3:5-6; about the use of Stoic concepts and ideas in Josephus’ version of Solomon’s dedicatory prayer in *Ant.* 8.106-121, see E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (reprint 1956; Stuttgart 1913) 19 n. 2 and Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*, 132-136. For studies about Stoic influence on Paul, see e.g. M. Pohlenz, ‘Paulus und die Stoa’, *ZNW* 42 (1949) 69-104, and T. Paige, ‘Stoicism, eleutheria and community at Corinth’, in M.J. Wilkins & T. Paige (eds.), *Worship, theology and ministry in the early church: essays in honor of Ralph P. Martin* (JSNTSup 87; JSOT Press: Sheffield, 1992).

⁹³ This moral perspective on God’s omnipresence, (πάντ’ ἐφορᾶν καὶ πάντ’ ἀκούειν, πᾶσιν ἔγγιστα εἶναι in *Ant.* 8.108), is not only present in Josephus, but also common to Philo (πάντα γὰρ πεπληρωκῶς ὁ θεὸς ἐγγύς ἐστιν, ὥστε ἐφορῶντος καὶ πλησίον ὄντος in *On the Giants* 47).

⁹⁴ H.W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus* (HDR 7; Scholars Press, 1976) 29-38 refers to Josephus’ reliance on different scriptural texts (MT, LXX, Aramaic

with Paul's theology of God's Spirit dwelling among the religious community as God's Temple is Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 8.114. I will therefore quote it below:

πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἱκετεύω καὶ μοῖραν τινα τοῦ σοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἀποικίσαι, ὡς ἂν καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ἡμῖν εἶναι δοκῆς. σοὶ μὲν γὰρ μικρὸν οἰκητήριον καὶ τὸ πᾶν οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν κατὰ τοῦτον ὄντων κύτος, οὐχ ὅτι γε οὗτος ὁ τυχὼν ναός, ἀλλὰ φυλάσσειν τε ἀπόρθητον ἐκ πολεμίων ὡς ἴδιον εἰς ἅπαν καὶ προνοεῖν ὡς οἰκείου κτήματος παρακαλῶ.

“Besides these things I entreat Thee also to send some portion of Thy *spirit to dwell in the temple*, that Thou mayest seem to us to be on earth as well. For to Thee even the whole vault of heaven and all its host is but a small habitation – how much less this poor temple! Nonetheless I pray Thee to guard it for ever from sacking by our enemies, as Thine own temple, and to watch over it as Thine own possession”.⁹⁵

This Josephan version of king Solomon's dedicatory prayer entreats the Spirit of God to dwell in the Temple. Josephus presents a temple theological idea which differs from 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles. Instead the biblical version of the dedicatory prayer focuses on the presence of 'God's name' in the Temple (1 Kgs 8:29; 2 Chron 6:7-10).⁹⁶ As the evidence of the Wisdom of Solomon also reveals, the temple theological idea of God's indwelling Spirit probably existed in a more or less developed form in Jewish exegetical tradition in the Second Temple period.

The fact that a portion of God's spirit is entreated to dwell in the Temple (μοῖραν τινα τοῦ σοῦ πνεύματος), does not diminish the importance of this passage of Josephus for Paul's temple imagery. Philo's treatise *On the Giants* 22-27 makes the following suggestion about receiving a portion of the Spirit, that is, the 'Spirit of God', θεοῦ πνεῦμα, or the 'divine Spirit', πνεῦμα θεῖον: “But think not that this taking of the spirit comes to pass as when men cut away a piece and sever it. Rather it is, as when they take fire from fire, for though the fire should kindle a thousand torches, it is still as it was and is diminished not a whit” (§ 25).⁹⁷ The imagery of taking fire from fire echoes a theme of prophetic inspiration in Scripture (e.g. Exod 31:3, Num 11:17).

The idea that God's Spirit can be apportioned and imparted among human beings is also common to Paul. Thus, the Pauline expressions τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ in 1 Cor 2:12 and ναός τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ in 1 Cor 6:19 reflect this idea.

The temple theological idea of the indwelling presence of God's Spirit and God's protection of his Temple against destruction by anyone in 1 Cor 3:16-17 clearly echoes Jewish tradition as reflected in Josephus' passage quoted above. Paul applies this temple theological idea to the community as a Temple.

targum), pseudepigraphical works, Graeco-Jewish apologetic literature (e.g. Alexander Polyhistor), and Alexandrian scholastic exegesis, which accounts for “transformations, additions and interpretations” (30).

⁹⁵ Greek text and translation from Thackeray & Marcus, *Josephus in nine volumes* V, 632-633.

⁹⁶ Cf. the Deuteronomic expression of a 'place where the Lord your God shall make his name dwell', referring to the centralisation of cult in Jerusalem (Deut 12:5.11.21.26, 26:2, MT המקום אשר-יבחר יהוה אלהיכם בו לשכן; LXX ὁ τόπος, ὃν ἂν ἐκλέξῃται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐπικληθῆναι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖ).

⁹⁷ Transl. from F.H. Colson & G.H. Whitaker, *Philo*, II, 456-457.

3.4.3 *The literature of Qumran*

The sectarian literature of Qumran may provide evidence of the temple theological idea of God's indwelling Spirit which intersects with other contemporary Jewish traditions. The idea of intersections with the broader spectrum of contemporary Judaism is further endorsed by the presence of non-sectarian texts in the library of Qumran. To this extent, the literature of Qumran adds to the general picture of Judaism contemporary to Paul.

The explicit reference to the 'Spirit of God', although not directly linked with the image of the Temple of God in the literature of Qumran, figures in the *Rule of the Community* in the context of God's dwelling in the sectarian congregation. This congregation calls itself a 'holy community', יחד קודש (1QS IX, 2) in relation to the holy spirit of the community which derives from God (1QS III, 6-7).⁹⁸ The Qumran community views itself as a Temple, 'a holy house for Israel' (1QS VIII, 5) in which the Holy Spirit is established in eternal truth", ליסוד רוח קודש לאמת עולם (1QS IX, 3f.). The Qumran community's atonement for Israel's iniquities substitutes burnt offerings and sacrifices (1QS IX, 3-5), through the perfection in their communal way of life awaiting the Messianic end-time (1QS IX, 3-21 at 10-11).

In spite of the negative contemporary perspective of the Qumran community on the Jerusalem Temple cult as defiled (cf. e.g. 1QpHab VIII, 8-13; XII, 7-9), the sectarian eschatology, as reflected in the *War Scroll*, accords an important place to Jerusalem and its priestly setting (cf. 1QM I, 2-3; II, 1-6f.; XII, 13). The criticism of the defilement of the Temple was shared by other circles in contemporary Palestinian Judaism, as we have seen in our discussion of pseudepigraphical texts in chapter one. Thus, the transference of temple theological functions of atonement and priestly service to the sectarian community may still mirror ideas about the Temple which were shared by broader layers of contemporary Judaism.

Apart from the *Community Rule's* reference to the Holy Spirit, רוח קודש, in relation to the holiness of the community, the *Damascus Document* provides further implicit evidence of the connection between Temple and Spirit. Thus, in CD-A V, 6-11, there is a clear parallel between the defilement of the Temple (וגם מטמאים הם את המקדש, CD-A V, 6) due to transgression of the Law, and the defilement of the holy spirit of those who call the statues of God' covenant unfounded (וגם את רוח קדשיהם טמאו).

The literature of Qumran thus also provides implicit evidence for the idea that the holiness of the community as a Temple is given substance by the presence of God's Spirit.

4. 1 Corinthians 5:6-8, purity from sin in light of Christ's sacrifice

4.1 1 Cor 5:6-8 in the context of 1 Cor 5:1-13

Paul admonishes the Corinthians in 1 Cor 5:6-8 by means of figurative language derived from the celebration of the Jewish festival of Passover (πάσχα). Paul applies the image of the paschal lamb to Christ and contrasts the 'old leaven' of falsehood and wickedness (1 Cor 5:7-8) to the unleavened bread of unmixed purity and truthfulness (v. 8). Paul's exhortation in 1 Cor 5:7a to cleanse out, ἐκκαθάρατε, the old leaven should be interpreted in light of 1 Cor 5:1-13.

1 Cor 5:1-5 discusses a specific, flagrant case of πορνεία and 1 Cor 5:9-13 reminds the Corinthians of a previous writing of Paul to them, urging them not to mingle with sexually immoral men. Thus, the 'old leaven' can be identified with the way of life which the Corinthians have hitherto led and which was apparently characterised by their failure to

⁹⁸ Cf. 4Q504 1-2, V, 15; 4QS^a, frg. 2, line 1 – 1QS III, 7.

abstain from unjust practices within the congregation. The 'old leaven' stands for the impure mix of sins persisting among the Corinthians in Paul's perspective (1 Cor 5:1-2.6).⁹⁹

The overarching concern of 1 Cor 5:1-13 is therefore focused on driving wickedness out of the congregation, caused by the concrete case of incest, πορνεία, in 1 Cor 5:1. 1 Cor 5:3-5 has been interpreted as Paul's exhortation to excommunicate the perpetrator of incest in the interest of preserving the communal integrity from the impurity of the sin of πορνεία.¹⁰⁰ Within the larger section of 1 Cor 5:1-13, 1 Cor 5:6-8 functions as a pivot about the essence of sincere communal worship, between Paul's exhortation against πορνεία in 1 Cor 5:1-5 and Paul's reminder of the 'previous letter' in 1 Cor 5:9-13 which urged the Corinthians to abstain from any immoral or unjust practice.

Before turning to the cultic imagery in 1 Cor 5:6-8, it is important to comment on the communal perspective evoked in 1 Cor 5:1-13. Since the Corinthian community has been addressed as God's building and God's Temple in 1 Cor 3:9-17, the communal holiness also needs to be protected from profaning and defiling influences. Paul addresses exactly this issue when he urges the Corinthians to cleanse out the old leaven (1 Cor 5:7).

Paul's perspective of communal boundaries insists on the Corinthians' purity from various kinds of injustice and on their dissociation from anyone who practices injustice. Thus, the perpetrator of incest must be excommunicated, whereas the Corinthians should mourn this sin committed in their midst (1 Cor 5:1-5). Paul reminds the Corinthians about his 'previous letter' in 1 Cor 5:9-10, and continues to urge them that they should not associate with (συναναμίγνυσθαι), nor even eat with (συνεσθίειν) unjust people, such as the idolater, εἰδωλόλατρες, mentioned in 1 Cor 5:11. Paul enforces the idea about communal boundaries, which should safeguard the communal holiness, by distinguishing between those inside (ἔσω) and those outside (ἔξω) the congregation in 1 Cor 5:12. Paul concludes his admonition about the necessity to protect the communal holiness from profanation by quoting a passage from Deut 17:7 in 1 Cor 5:13: "Drive out the wicked person from among you".¹⁰¹

This communal perspective on the Corinthian congregation as God's holy Temple provides points of correspondence with contemporary Jewish tradition, as Paul's quotation from Deut 17:7 in 1 Cor 5:13 indicates. We may better understand Paul's dualist perspective, which presupposes a sharp juxtaposition between those inside and those outside the congregation of God, against the background of Jewish tradition.

Leviticus 10:10, which prescribes a distinction between holy and profane, and impure and pure as ritual categories, was also interpreted in moral terms in Paul's time. Thus, in partial elaboration on Lev 10:11, Philo adds a moral category, the distinction between lawful and unlawful things.¹⁰² Philo refers to this distinction in the context of writing about the regulations for priests in the sacrificial cult of the Temple of Jerusalem. The idea of the Temple represented a holy communal way of life.

⁹⁹ ζύμη stands for both leaven and metaphorically for corruption, falsehood, and thus the 'old leaven of malice and evil', ζύμη παλαιᾶ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας (v. 8) refers to the immorality (πορνεία, 1 Cor 5:1), arrogance (φυσίωσις, 1 Cor 5:2) and boasting (καύχημα, 1 Cor 5:6) still present among the Corinthians. The evil committed by some of them is the subject of Paul's discussion in 1 Cor 5:9-13 and 1 Cor 6:9-11.

¹⁰⁰ See A. Yarbro Collins, "The Function of "Excommunication" in Paul", *HTR* 73 (1980) 251-263.

¹⁰¹ ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν. Note the change from the 2nd person singular of ἐξαρεῖς in the LXX into the 2nd person plural to address the Corinthians as a collective, a unified community. Cf. Deut 19:19

¹⁰² LXX Lev 10:10-11: διαστείλαι ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τῶν βεβήλων καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἀκαθάρτων καὶ τῶν καθαρῶν. καὶ συμβιβάσεις τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ πάντα τὰ νόμιμα, ἃ ἐλάλησεν κύριος πρὸς αὐτοὺς διὰ χειρὸς Μωϋσῆ. Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.100 has: εἰς διαστολήν καὶ διάκρισιν ἁγίων καὶ βεβήλων καὶ καθαρῶν καὶ ἀκαθάρτων καὶ νομίμων καὶ παρανόμων. Note also Philo's addition of the term διάκρισις which, beyond the meaning of distinction already conveyed by διαστολή, also stands for decision, judgment, thus making the moral perspective more explicit.

There is a striking parallel in the literature of Qumran to Paul's admonition in 1 Cor 5:11 that the Corinthians should not associate nor even eat with unjust persons. Thus, the *Rule of the Community*, which also conveys the concept of the sectarian community as a Temple, as we have seen, prohibits the member of the community from uniting (תּוּחַ) and eating and drinking (לֹא יֹאכַל מִהוֹנֵם כּוֹל וְלֹא יִשְׁתֶּה) with wicked men (1QS V, 14.16). 1QS V, 18-19 further mentions the "worthless works", מַעֲשֵׂי הַבַּל, and the worthlessness, הַבַּל, of "all who do not know his covenant". This parallel tells us that Paul's idea of communal boundaries and separation from those who endanger the communal holiness may be patterned on contemporary Jewish tradition. Paul's quotation from Deut 17:7 confirms this.

Paul's exhortation in 1 Cor 1:10 about the unity of judgement can specifically be related to the judgement expected of the Corinthians against immorality and other sins within the congregation. Paul's message is that, in order to protect their community from the impurity of sin, the Corinthians should be unified in their dissociation from every sin. In this connection, the concept of the community as God's Temple is functional and far from coincidental.

4.2 1 Cor 5:6-8 and its cultic imagery

5:6 Οὐ καλὸν τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν. οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ; 7 ἐκκαθάρατε τὴν παλαιὰν ζύμην, ἵνα ἦτε νέον φύραμα, καθὼς ἔστε ἄζυμοι· καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός. 8 ὥστε ἐορτάζωμεν μὴ ἐν ζύμῃ παλαιᾷ μηδὲ ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας ἀλλ' ἐν ἀζύμοις εἰλικρινείας καὶ ἀληθείας.

5:6 *Your pride is not good. Do you not know that a little leaven ferments the whole lump? 7 Clean out the old leaven in order that you become a fresh dough, since you are unleavened dough; for our paschal lamb, Christ, has been sacrificed. 8 Therefore, let us neither celebrate with an old leaven nor with a leaven of wickedness and sinfulness, but with the unleavened dough of pure motives and truthfulness.*

There are few variant readings to the established Greek text of 1 Cor 5:6-8.¹⁰³ One variant reading for 1 Cor 5:7b deserves particular attention, as it explicates for whom Christ has been sacrificed as paschal lamb, by adding the words ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. With this addition, 1 Cor 5:7b reads: 'for our paschal lamb, Christ, has been sacrificed for our sake'. This explication could, however, be viewed as pleonasm, since the idea is already expressed by the words τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν in the established Greek text.

Importantly, Paul's focus on the sacrifice of 'our paschal lamb', τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός, implies a distinctively Christian definition of Passover that is different from the paschal lamb customarily offered by the Jews in the Jerusalem Temple on Passover in Paul's time¹⁰⁴. In fact, various contemporary Jewish and early Christian sources point to

¹⁰³ The omission of the negation Οὐ at the beginning of 1 Cor 5:6 by two patristic textual witnesses turns the first sentence into irony (cf. Mark 7:6.9). At the end of verse 6, the rare variant reading δολοῖ, from the verb δολοῦν, 'to falsify, adulterate', instead of ζυμοῖ conveys an overly negative emphasis, whereas Paul may only have intended to express the irreducible implication of a certain mentality and behaviour by general imagery. A variant reading in 1 Cor 5:7 adds the particle οὖν after ἐκκαθάρατε. A variant reading to 1 Cor 5:8 has πορνεία instead of πονηρία, but is supported by only few manuscripts (F and G). The established Greek text, which has a pair of two general terms, κακία and πονηρία, is more logical; moreover, the term πονηρία corresponds with Paul's mention of ὁ πονηρός in his quotation from Deut 17:7 in 1 Cor 5:13.

¹⁰⁴ About customary sacrifice during Passover, see Josephus, *J.W.* 6.423; *Ant.* 2.313; about the 'feast of unleavened bread', ἡ ἐορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων, following Passover, see *J.W.* 2.224, 244; 4.402; *Ant.* 3.248-250f.

centrality of the Jerusalem Temple cult with regard to the sacrifices on important Jewish 'pilgrim festivals', among which the sacrifice of the paschal lamb during Passover.¹⁰⁵

Apart from the sacrifice of the paschal lamb, other terms related to the contemporary Jewish feast of Passover, like 'unleavened dough' or 'unleavened bread' (ἄζυμοι) and 'batch of dough' (φύραμα), permeate Paul's words of exhortation in this pericope. The traditional meaning of the related Jewish feasts of unleavened bread and Passover is linked with the exodus from Egypt and the release from slavery.¹⁰⁶ Thus, Paul couches his exhortation to the Corinthians against sexual immorality in terms traditionally related to Jewish Passover. Yet he at the same time he transforms the concepts he uses to apply them to Christ. The reference to Christ as the paschal lamb in 1 Cor 5:7 has been interpreted by several scholars as Paul's application of a pre-existing Jesus-tradition which typified Jesus' crucifixion as paschal sacrifice.¹⁰⁷

What implications does the application of the cultic concept of the Passover sacrifice to Christ have on our understanding of how Paul addresses Jews and Greeks? What does this figurative use of cultic terminology derived from the Jewish sacrifice of the paschal lamb indicate about Paul's perspective on the Jerusalem Temple cult?

The interpretation of 1 Cor 5:7 in context has led W. Strack to view Christ's atoning death as the foundation for Paul's thought about communal holiness, thereby substituting the Jerusalem Temple cult as the mediating institution of atonement¹⁰⁸. This idea would seem to be confirmed by Paul's polemical juxtaposition of the contemporary Jerusalem in slavery to the Jerusalem which is free in Gal 4:25-26. It should also be noted that Paul writes in 2 Corinthians about a new covenant through Christ which can only take away the veil of mystery hanging over the reading of the old covenant of Moses (2 Cor 3:4-18).

The direct context of 1 Cor 5:6-8, however, does not convey such clear connotations of substitution for the Jerusalem Temple cult. The issue is rather the substitution for the 'old leaven', that is, the iniquities of sexual immorality among the Corinthians, which Paul implicitly associates with the pagan way of life of outsiders and unbelievers (1 Cor 5:1.12-13, 6:11; cf. 1 Thess 4:5). According to Paul in 1 Cor 5:8, the celebration to which Christ as the paschal lamb is central may naturally be identified with the institution of the Lord's Supper as ritual, for which Paul gives instructions in 1 Cor 11:17-34. This celebration entails a Christian institution, but not necessarily a substitution for the Jerusalem Temple cult in Paul's thought. In Paul's theology, the new covenant through Christ does not abrogate the old covenant, but removes the veil from it in order to disclose the full revelatory power of Scripture (cf. 2 Cor 3:4-18). Furthermore, Paul ascribes the covenants as well as the worship, among other gifts, to the Israelites in Rom 9:4.

C. Wolff has presented a different interpretation of Paul's figurative use of cultic imagery, stressing that the typology of Christ's atoning sacrifice is analogous to rather than substituting Jewish Passover, which typifies liberation from a situation of bondage based on

¹⁰⁵ E.g. *J.W.* 6.290, 421-423, Mark 14:1-2, Luke 22:7 (about the feast of Passover and of unleavened bread); *J.W.* 1.253; 2.42; 6.299; *Ant.* 3.252-254; 14.337f.; 17.254; Acts 2:1.5-11 (about Pentecost); *J.W.* 2.515; *Ant.* 4.209; 8.100-101f., 123, 225; 11.75-78, 154; 13.372; John 7:2 (about the feast of Tabernacles). About the 'three Pilgrim Festivals', שלש רגלים, see Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy. A Comprehensive History*, 111-117; cf. MT Exod 23:14. The slaughtering of the Passover-offering, פסח, is also located in the Temple court, עזרה, in *m. Pesahim* 5:5-8.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Exod 12:14-20; Lev 23:5-8; Josephus, *Ant.* 2.313 about the meaning of πάσχα: σημαίνει δ' υπερβάσια, διότι κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν ὑπερβὰς Αἰγυπτίους ἐναπέσκηψε τὴν νόσον, 'which signifies "passing over", because on that day God passed over our people when he smote the Egyptians with plague' (text and translation from Thackeray, *Josephus* IV, 300-301); *Ant.* 3.248.

¹⁰⁷ Klauck, 'Kultische Symbolsprache bei Paulus', 109; Wolff, *1. Korinther* THKNT, 106.

¹⁰⁸ Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 187-191 at 197, and 269-272.

the biblical tradition about the Israelite exodus from Egypt (Exod 12).¹⁰⁹ Paul does in fact present the biblical Exodus story as an example to the Corinthians in 1 Cor 10:1-13 with the purpose of admonishing them against temptations of idolatry.¹¹⁰

The link between the idea of Christ as a paschal lamb in 1 Cor 5:7 and the Lord's Supper makes sense in view of the fact that the Synoptic Gospels relate the Last Supper and Jesus' crucifixion to the time of the Jewish feast of Unleavened Bread and Passover (cf. Mark 14:12.17-25 par.). Thus, 1 Cor 5:6-8 echoes the Christian celebration of Passover in remembrance of Jesus Christ whose sacrifice constitutes a new covenant (1 Cor 11:25). However, the new covenant represented by this cultic imagery is contrasted to the 'old leaven' of the Corinthians, and not to God's covenant with the Israelites through Moses.

5. 1 Corinthians 6:18-20, πορνεία and the body as Temple

5.1 The rhetorical unit of 1 Cor 6:18-20

In 1 Cor 6:19, Paul uses the metaphor of the Temple again, but at this point he applies it to the issue of sexual immorality, πορνεία (cf. e.g. 1 Cor 6:18). The question of how πορνεία should be defined seems more complicated here, since there is no clear-cut case to which Paul refers as in 1 Cor 5:1, in which it stands for a blood relation prohibited by biblical law (Lev 18:8). Many scholars have situated 1 Cor 6:19 within the context of 1 Cor 6:12-20, and, therefore, they often define the issue of πορνεία, to which the metaphor of the Temple is applied in 1 Cor 6:19, as 'prostitution'.¹¹¹

I propose a different division of the text, that is, 1 Cor 6:18-20 as a concluding rhetorical unit on the issue of πορνεία, which in my view comprises all previous connotations given to it by Paul. Since there is no conclusive textual evidence to support the idea of 1 Cor 6:18-20 as a rhetorical unit,¹¹² I will start with arguments from the context of 1 Cor 5-6.

1 Cor 6:18-20 in my view concludes several preceding digressions about cases of injustice from which the Corinthians have not dissociated themselves adequately: the most shameful of which apparently is πορνεία. Thus, a flagrant case of a forbidden blood relation serves as the starting point of 1 Cor 5:1-13. 1 Cor 5:9-13 and 1 Cor 6:1-8 serve as a double exhortation to demarcate the boundaries of the Corinthian congregation by dissociating from sexually immoral men and other unjust people on the one hand and by refraining from lawsuits against each other before the unbelievers on the other hand.

The recurring, underlying issue in 1 Cor 5:1-5, 6:9-11, 6:12-17, and 6:18-20 concerns the exhortation against injustice, among which the exhortation against sexual immorality, πορνεία, is of key importance. Thus, Paul introduces a flagrant case of incest, πορνεία, in 1

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Wolff, *1. Korinther* THKNT, 107.

¹¹⁰ Cf. 1 Cor 10:11 ταῦτα δὲ τυπικῶς συνέβαιεν ἐκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν. Thus, the Exodus story provides 'instruction', νοουθεσία, for Paul and his readers.

¹¹¹ Cf. e.g. Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 249-266 defines the pericope as "On Going to the Prostitutes (6:12-20)"; Schrage, *1Kor 6,12-11,16* EKKNT, 7-37 at 37 refers to πορνεία in terms of "Hurerei als Sünde gegen den eigenen Leib"; Kirchhoff, *Die Sünde gegen den eigenen Leib*, 196 concludes that Paul designates each sexually immoral woman with the term πόρνη, even though in the reality of the Corinthians sexual immorality was most of all related to prostitution.

¹¹² Some examples may suffice here. Codex Sinaiticus (Σ) 70r col. IV marks the beginning of 1 Cor 6:12, 6:13, 6:15, 6:16, 6:18, and 6:19, suggesting separate textual units. Mss. nrs. [*]104 (Harley 5537, p.136v-137r) and 547 (Add. 39590, p. 243r-v) designate 1 Cor 6:12-20 as a paragraph by the words ἀρχή and τέλος, although the latter ms. additionally has the word ἀρχή before the first words of 1 Cor 6:20.

Cor 5:1. Paul invariably starts his enumeration of unjust men in 1 Cor 5:9, 5:11, and 6:9 with the mention of πόρνοι, fornicators. Paul further adds 'adulterers'(μοιχοί), 'catamites' (μαλακοί), and 'pederasts' (ἀρσενοκοῖται) as practisers of injustice, that is, of immoral sexual relations in 1 Cor 6:9. Within the pericope of 1 Cor 6:12-17, Paul's exhortation against sexual immorality in 1 Cor 6:13 and 6:15 focuses on πορνεία as related to sexual union with a prostitute.

Having discussed various kinds of sexual immorality, πορνεία, Paul resumes the exhortation against πορνεία in general in 1 Cor 6:18-20. Thus, he begins 1 Cor 6:18 with the general imperative Φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν, 'shun sexual immorality'.¹¹³ Paul's words in 1 Cor 6:18b about 'every other sin', πᾶν ἁμάρτημα, which a man commits outside the body, as opposed to πορνεία as a sin against one's own body, suggest sins which may be those enumerated in 1 Cor 5:9-11 and 6:9-10. Just as Paul speaks about 'every other sin', πᾶν ἁμάρτημα, outside the body in general, so Paul probably also has in mind a comprehensive idea of πορνεία covering all illicit sexual relations in 1 Cor 6:18-20, from extramarital relations (fornication, adultery) to incestuous relationships (cf. 1 Cor 5:1). Furthermore, the exhortation in 1 Cor 6:20 to 'glorify God with your body' strenghtens the idea that Paul refers to the general and permanent abstinence from any sexual immorality which would blemish this purpose of glorification.

The opposite interpretation, which views πορνεία in 1 Cor 6:18-20 exclusively in the context of 1 Cor 6:12-20, unjustifiably presupposes a disjunction between 1 Cor 5 and 6.¹¹⁴ The interpretation of πορνεία in 1 Cor 6:18-20 is thereby artificially narrowed down to prostitution or at most all those extramarital relations which are illicit.¹¹⁵ Considering 1 Cor 7, Paul's perspective is not only concerned with licit marital relations as opposed to immoral extramarital relations, but also with the unmarried (cf. 1 Cor 7:8,17-26,29-31).

5.2 Text, translation, and variant readings

6:18 Φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν. πᾶν ἁμάρτημα ὃ ἐὰν ποιήσῃ ἄνθρωπος ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν· ὁ δὲ πορνεύων εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα ἁμαρτάνει. 19 ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματός ἐστιν οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐαυτῶν; 20 ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς· δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν.

6:18 *'Shun sexual immorality. Every sin which a human being commits is outside the body; but one who practises sexual immorality sins against his own body. 19 Or do you not know that your body is a Temple of the Holy Spirit among you which you have from God, and*

¹¹³ Cf. the analogy with φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας in 1 Cor 10:14, which recapitulates previous exhortations against aspects of idol worship, that is, food offered to idols in 1 Cor 8:1-13 and temptations in 1 Cor 10:1-13. Most commentators agree on the thematic unity of 1 Cor 8:1-11:1. See my section on 1 Cor 10:14-22.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Strack, *Kultische Terminologie*, 249: "Daß πορνεία in 1 Kor 5 und hier in 1 Kor 6,12-20 auf unterschiedliche Situationen angewendet ist, spricht nicht gegen die Einheit der beiden Kapitel (..) Die in 1 Kor 5 und 6 von Paulus angeprangerte Unzucht weist für diese beiden Kapitel einen zusammenhängenden Konflikt aus". Strack further mentions a description by K. Berger of 1 Cor 5-6 as the 'endangered holiness of the community' (177).

¹¹⁵ Kirchhoff, *Die Sünde gegen den eigenen Leib*, though she may have a point in criticising an older, exclusive interpretation of πόρνη as prostitute (34-36), still focuses on the meaning of πορνεία as determined by 1 Cor 6:12-20, that is, illicit, extramarital sexual relations between men and women. In spite of her objections to the exclusive interpretation of πόρνη as prostitute, Kirchhoff pays much attention to the domain of prostitution in Hellenistic and Roman society (37-68); cf. page 196. Son, *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology*, 147-149 at 149 refers to the contrast between "believers' union with Christ" and the immoral sexual "union with a prostitute".

that you are not of yourselves?20 For you were bought with a price; glorify God then with your body’.

Of the variant readings to the established Greek text of 1 Cor 6:18-20, one presents itself in 1 Cor 6:19, which has important implications for our understanding of Paul’s message in this rhetorical unit. That is, several textual witnesses read the *plural* τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν instead of the *singular* τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν of the established Greek text at the beginning of 1 Cor 6:19. The plural reading τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν concerns the individual bodies of the Corinthians, thereby rendering 1 Cor 6:19 by implication a verse about each Corinthian’s individual body as a separate Temple. The singular reading τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν may denote a corporate understanding of the body, analogous to the metaphor of the Corinthian congregation as the body of Christ (1 Cor 12:12-31 at v. 27). However, τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν may also denote a ‘distributive singular’¹¹⁶ and thus it may also signify the individual body.

The variant reading τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν may be rejected, when we take into account the possibility of a scribe faultily copying the plural τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν from 1 Cor 6:15, a few lines above 1 Cor 6:19. If it were Paul’s consistent thought to write about ‘your bodies’ in 1 Cor 6:19, then the singular ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν in 1 Cor 6:20, for which there is no variant reading in the plural, is left unaccounted for. Moreover, the established text is supported by the most important textual witnesses.¹¹⁷

Nevertheless, the established reading τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν can still be interpreted grammatically in different ways, as we have seen above. Which of these readings is most probable and corresponds better to the context of Paul’s thought in 1 Corinthians? The individualistic reading of 1 Cor 6:19 contrasts with the corporate concept of the community as Gods’ Temple in 1 Cor 3:16-17, and the question of how to understand such divergent applications of the temple concept in 1 Corinthians in relation to each other has been viewed as problematic in the older literature about temple imagery.¹¹⁸

Recent scholarly literature favours the corporate understanding of τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν, implying that the one who commits sexual immorality sins not only against his individual body, but against the corporate body of the congregation.¹¹⁹ Michael Newton has supported this understanding of τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν with the argument that the adjective ἴδιος in the sentence ὁ δὲ πορνεύων εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα ἀμαρτάνει at the end of 1 Cor 6:18 may be read as a general ‘possessive adjective’, meaning “his” rather than “his own”. Newton thereby identifies τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα as the corporate body of the Corinthian congregation.¹²⁰ However, this interpretation of τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα is complicated by the context of the whole verse. For 1 Cor 6:18 presupposes a strong contrast between sin ‘outside the body’, ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος, and sin ‘against one’s own body’, εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα. Since it would not make sense to interpret ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος as referring to the corporate body of the Corinthian congregation, it is also less likely that the counterpart in Paul’s juxtaposition, τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα,

¹¹⁶ See Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, § 140.

¹¹⁷ That is, among other mss., papyrus nr. 46, the Codex Sinaiticus, the original text of the Codex Alexandrinus, the Codex Vaticanus, the Codex Ephraemi Syri rescriptus, the Codex Claromontanus, the Codex Augiensis, the Codex Boernerianus, which are all mentioned as “consistently cited witnesses of the first order” for the text of 1 Corinthians in Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (27th rev.ed., 1993), p. 60*.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 141 n. 2 notes that because of this individualistic reading of 1 Cor 6:19, “many scholars have isolated this text from the idea of the community as a temple, relating it instead to the Hellenistic background”.

¹¹⁹ Thus Newton, *The Concept of Purity*, 57-58, and Son, *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology*, chapters 3, ‘The Church as the Body of Christ’ (83-120), and 4, ‘The Church as the Temple, the House, and the Building of God’ (121-146) understand Paul’s metaphor of the body as Temple in a corporate way.

¹²⁰ Newton, *The Concept of Purity*, 57.

denotes a corporate body. Thus 1 Cor 6:18 does not provide an argument for the corporate understanding of τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν in 1 Cor 6:19.

Nevertheless, there are reasons to suppose that the individual level of sin and the corporate level of communal holiness may intersect in Paul's use of temple imagery in 1 Cor 6:19. Paul's exhortation against πορνεία starts in 1 Cor 6:18 at the corporate level addressing the Corinthians as a community which should be unified in its dissociation from sexual immorality (cf. 1 Cor 5:1-2.9.11, 6:9). Paul then describes the general principle of how sexual immorality, as opposed to other sins, is a sin against one's own body. Even though sexual immorality is an individual sin, Paul here addresses the Corinthians generally, as becomes clear from his general terms πᾶν ἁμάρτημα, ἄνθρωπος, and ὁ πορνεύων in 1 Cor 6:18. 1 Cor 6:19 addresses the individual body as a Temple, but the individual body is part of the social body of the Corinthian congregation in Paul's theology. The sexual sin of one individual member of the social body brings shame on the entire social body, as is reflected by 1 Cor 5:1-5. The communal holiness of the Corinthians is only sustained by purity at the individual level, while it is endangered by the persistence of individual abuses in the midst of the congregation. Therefore, Paul's divergent applications of the temple concept in 1 Cor 3:16-17 and 6:19 do not contradict each other, but presuppose an interrelation between the individual and the corporate body which merits closer attention.

Other passages in 1 Corinthians display to the interrelationship between the individual body and the social body of the Corinthian congregation in Paul's theology. Paul refers to the individual bodies of the Corinthians, τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν, as the members of Christ, μέλη Χριστοῦ, in 1 Cor 6:15. The term μέλος designates a part of the human body. By implication, the bodies of the Corinthians are part of a larger body, the body of Christ. Paul mentions the body of Christ in 1 Cor 10:16 and notes that 'we who are many are one body', ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοί ἐσμεν, in 1 Cor 10:17. Paul further addresses the Corinthians as the body of Christ in 1 Cor 12:27 ('Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους').¹²¹ Thus, the individual bodies of the Corinthians are the parts of a larger, corporate body.

We may summarily conclude from this discussion of τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν in 1 Cor 6:19 that Paul's exhortation to shun sexual immorality concerns the Corinthian congregation at large. Paul addresses the individual responsibility for sins against one's own body, but the persistence of individual sins in the midst of the congregation may also endanger the communal holiness, as 1 Cor 5:1-13 suggests. Paul's idea of the individual body as a Temple is different from the notion of the community as a Temple in 1 Cor 3:16-17, but this should not be seen as a contradiction. The opposite is rather the case, for the idea of the community as Temple is inconceivable for Paul if the injustice of sins such as sexual immorality persists at the individual level in the midst of the Corinthian congregation. The individual and corporate levels of Pauline thought about the body are strongly interrelated, as the context of 1 Cor 5-6 as well as Paul's body theology show. The relation between the individual body and social body requires further attention from an anthropological perspective which I will discuss in a subsequent section.

My translation 'your body is a Temple of the Holy Spirit *among* you which you have from God' is in my view justified by Paul's distinction between the human spirit and the Holy Spirit (cf. 1 Cor 2:11-14). Paul writes about the gifts of the Spirit in 1 Cor 2:12,14. In his digression on spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12:1-11), Paul emphasises the apportioning of these spiritual gifts to individual Corinthians through (διὰ), according to (κατὰ), and by (ἐν) the (Holy) Spirit. Thus, the gifts of the Spirit are internal qualities *in* individual believers, but God can work in every one by giving the *manifestation* of his Spirit *to* human beings (cf. 1

¹²¹ Cf. a similar corporate understanding of the body in 1 Cor 10:17, ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοί ἐσμεν.

Cor 12:6-7). That is, the Spirit is not a matter of natural possession, but of ‘experience’, to speak with J.D.G. Dunn (see my previous discussion in section 3.2).

5.3 Cultic imagery in 1 Cor 6:18-20

Paul takes up the metaphor of the Temple again in 1 Cor 6:19, having already introduced it in 1 Cor 3:16-17. 1 Cor 3:16-17 puts forward the idea of God’s indwelling presence among his people through the metaphor of the Temple in which God’s Spirit dwells among them. 1 Cor 6:19 presents a condensed expression of this same concept, ‘the Temple of the Holy Spirit among you which you have from God’, ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ, but applies it specifically to the body of the Corinthians.

The idea of the body as Temple forbids its profanation by sexual immorality. Thus, the context of 1 Cor 6:18-20 presents a moral concept of the body as Temple addressing the entire Corinthian community.¹²² This moral concept is expressed through the explicitly cultic term of the Temple. In view of Paul’s specific application of the metaphor of the Temple to the body of the Corinthians, the question arises whether and how this particular use of temple imagery interacts with the cultural context of his time.

In the pagan Hellenistic context, a temple, ναὸς, was a place where the cult image or statue of a particular deity was set up.¹²³ Since Paul addresses the Corinthians’ former pagan life in a negative way in 1 Cor 12:2 as ‘how you were attracted, led astray again and again to mute idols’, πρὸς τὰ εἰδωλα τὰ ἄφωνα ὡς ἂν ἤγεσθε ἀπαγόμενοι,¹²⁴ it would be contrary to Paul’s purpose to derive his temple imagery in 1 Cor 6:19 from a pagan context.

The figurative application of temple imagery to the body appears to be foreign to pagan Hellenistic thought in Paul’s time.¹²⁵ When we do find temple imagery applied in a figurative or moral sense in the pagan context, the concept of the temple is of course related to polytheistic cults, not to the idea of the Temple of one God. An example from a text of the early first century CE may make this point clear. The early imperial prose writer Valerius Maximus, who wrote about Roman religion during the late Augustan and Tiberian era, comprises the following case of figurative temple imagery: “indeed, public safety is maintained by the gods, private health by friendship’s forces, and, just as the shrines of gods are consecrated habitations, the faithful hearts of human beings are the temples (*templa*) of friendship, brimming, as it were, with a holy spirit”.¹²⁶ We could add other examples of pagan

¹²² Note Paul’s view on the predominant role of men and the subordinate role of women in the congregation (cf. 1 Cor 11:2-16, 14:33b-36). Witness 1 Cor 7:4.14-16.32-34, Paul addresses the issue of the body and sexual relationships with regard to both the man’s and the woman’s part. Cf. 2 Cor 6:18b about God’s people as sons and daughters to God as Father. On the historical reality of women fellow missionary workers of Paul (Chloe and Prisca in 1 Cor 1:11, 16:19; Euodia and Syntyche in Phil 4:2, Apphia in Phlm 2, Phoebe and Junia in Rom 16:1f.), see M.Y. MacDonald, ‘Reading Real Women Through the Undisputed Letters of Paul’, in R.S. Kraemer & M.R. d’Angelo (eds.), *Women & Christian Origins* (Oxford UP: New York & Oxford, 1999) 199-220.

¹²³ Cf. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 88-92. Cf. *supra*, sections 3.3.2 and 3.3.4.

¹²⁴ Cf. BDAG, p. 16 about 1 Cor 12:2, “where ἂν denotes repetition, and ὡς takes up the preceding ὅτι”.

¹²⁵ BDAG, 666 only lists examples from later writers, that is, a Pythagorean saying in H. Schenkl, *Wiener Studien* 8 (1886) 273 no. 66, the ‘Sentences of Sextus’ 46a from the late 2nd cent. CE, reworked by a Christian hand, and the work Dio 9 p. 49c by Synesius (4th-5th century CE), for the Νοῦς as ‘the real temple of God’.

¹²⁶ *illis enim publica salus, his priuata continentur, atque ut illarum aedes sacra domicilia, harum fida hominum pectora quasi quaedam sancto spiritu referta templa sunt.* Translation and Latin text of Valerius 4.7.ext.1 after Mueller, *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus*, 137.

texts mentioning sanctuaries in a figurative way or with connotations of morality or ritual purity, were it not that these examples date to later periods than Paul's time.¹²⁷

Even though the example from Valerius Maximus makes clear that a figurative, moral usage of the concept of a temple may not have been unfamiliar to Paul's Corinthian readers in their Graeco-Roman world, Paul's application of the metaphor of God's Temple to the body that is free from sexual immorality cannot be explained from this Graeco-Roman context.

We will therefore have to turn to traditions in contemporary Judaism and Christian Judaism to find out whether and how Paul's temple imagery in 1 Cor 6:19, as a concise expression of a larger picture of religious beliefs and practices, may have appealed to the Corinthians.

E. Schüssler Fiorenza has made a distinction between a pre-Pauline missionary setting of "temple tradition", "interested in drawing the boundaries between the Christian community and the world", and Paul's own thought which adapts the pre-existing notion of the community as Temple to the human body (1 Cor 6:19).¹²⁸ Schüssler Fiorenza apparently presupposes an exclusively individualistic reading of 1 Cor 6:18-20, without taking interrelations between the individual and the social body into account. However, in the context of her discussion about the 'theological self-understanding of the missionary movement' (184-198), Schüssler Fiorenza does not make clear beyond reasonable doubt that there indeed was such a missionary setting of 'temple tradition'¹²⁹ on which Paul draws in the first place.

With regard to Paul's focus on the body as Temple, Schüssler Fiorenza, however, argues for a disjunction between Paul's notion of the Temple in 1 Cor 6:19 and temple traditions in Hellenistic Jewish literature which focus on the "soul or mind as the temple in which God or the Spirit dwells".¹³⁰ Gordon D. Fee has similarly argued against "every encroachment of Hellenistic dualism that would negate the body in favour of the soul".¹³¹

Schüssler Fiorenza and Fee may have a point here, for if we compare Paul's metaphor of the body as Temple with Hellenistic Jewish literature, a striking contrast may be noted. Thus, instead of application of temple imagery to the body, Philo's cultic imagery for example gives a central place to the soul, ἡ ψυχή, as superior to the body, τὸ σῶμα.¹³² Philo's idea of the soul as housing rules of wisdom, σοφία, for the perspective on the

¹²⁷ E.g. Arrian's *Discourses of Epictetus* book IV, chapter XI (*Of Cleanliness*), § 32 about cleanliness as precondition for entering temples; Epictetus' *Encheiridion* chap. 32, § 3 on a man cast out of the temple of Apollo at Delphi because he did not defend his own friend against murder; Plutarch's *Moralia* frag. 47 about the moral as well as ritual purity expected of 'those who intend to perform holy rites', οἱ ἱερουργεῖν μέλλοντες.

¹²⁸ Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 193: "the transference of the notion of temple to the human body reflects typical Pauline theology and was, therefore, probably accomplished by Paul".

¹²⁹ Cf. e.g. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 211, after concluding about the uncertainty and even improbability of the idea of the community as Temple already existing among the early Jesus-movement, states: "Damit ist die Tradition, aus der Paulus schöpft, im christlichen Bereich der älteste Ort, an dem die Vorstellung sicher nachweisbar wird". More recently, K.S. Han, *Jerusalem and the Early Jesus Movement. The Q Community's Attitude Toward the Temple* (Sheffield AP, Continuum: London & New York, 2002) 208-213 has argued for the Q community's "opposition to the Temple leadership" in an early stage and detachment by a "new social identity apart from the Temple symbolism" in the later stage (213).

¹³⁰ Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 193.

¹³¹ Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 266.

¹³² Cf. Philo, *Creation* 137: οἶκος γὰρ τις ἢ νεὸς ἱερὸς ἐτεκταίνετο ψυχῆς λογικῆς, ἣν ἔμελλεν ἀγαλατοφορήσειν ἀγαλμάτων τὸ θεοειδέστατον; *Spec. Laws* 1.269 about the importance of the purification of the 'soul before the body', τὴν ψυχὴν πρὸ τοῦ σώματος, before entering the Temple, because of its better and more divine nature in all respects (δεσπότις γὰρ καὶ βασιλεὺς καὶ ἐν ἅπασιν κρείττων ἄτε θειοτέρας φύσεως μεταλαχοῦσα); *Worse* 21 relates genuine worship to the soul, ἡ ψυχή.

universe, *κόσμος* (*Spec.Laws* 1.269) may further be contrasted to Paul's pejorative idea of worldly wisdom and of the 'worldly, unspiritual man', *ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος* in 1 Cor 6-14. Thus, Paul's metaphor of the body as Temple does not correspond with Hellenistic Jewish ideas as expressed by Philo whose temple imagery is instead related to the soul. Paul neither follows the dualism between *σῶμα* and *ψυχή* implied in the Hellenistic Jewish thought of Philo.

Nevertheless, the purification of body and soul which Philo mentions as a precondition for entering the Temple also has moral connotations in his treatise *On the Special Laws* 1.270. Thus, those filled with covetousness and the desires for unjust things (*αἱ πλεονεξίαι καὶ ἐπιθυμίαι τῶν ἀδικιῶν*) are characterised as unholy, *ἀνιεροί*, for whom access to the Temple is prohibited. The unholy persons are contrasted to any virtuous, purified person who may come to the Temple as his or her 'true home' (*εἰς οἰκειότατον αὐτῷ τὸν νεών*).

Paul's moral concept of the body as Temple differs from Hellenistic Jewish temple imagery as expressed by Philo. Nevertheless, Paul's metaphor of the body as Temple may resound contemporary Jewish notions of moral purity and holiness related to participation in the Temple cult. Just as in 1 Cor 3:16-17, the metaphor of the body as Temple in 1 Cor 6:19 is introduced as a rhetorical question with the words *οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι*, suggesting that Paul introduces a fact to his audience. The rhetorical question evokes the idea that Paul refers to a pre-existing temple theological tradition.

Palestinian-Jewish sources contemporary to Paul may provide a temple theological background to Paul's notion of the body as Temple. Pseudepigraphical as well as sectarian Qumranic texts relate the defilement of the Temple to sexual promiscuity and prohibited sexual relations, implying a relation between bodily purity and the holiness of the Temple.

The *Testament of Levi* as found in the Cairo Geniza conveys the instruction of Levi in terms of an exhortation to abstain from all recklessness, uncleanness and from all fornication, *מן כל פחו וטמאה ומן כל זנות*, which would defile the priestly seed which is called holy seed 'like the Temple', *וקדיש זרעך היך קודשא* (CTLevi ar *Bodleian* Col. b 15-19). At the bottom lines of the same column, we read that the body matters very much in the perspective of this pseudepigraphical text on holiness: "You are close to God and close to all his holy ones. Therefore keep yourself pure in your flesh (*בבשרך*) from all the defilement of all men" (CTLevi ar *Bodleian* Col. b 21-23).¹³³ Even though this pseudepigraphical text formally addresses Levi's offspring, it is probable that it circulated among broader circles of Israelite society. The *Testament of Levi* concentrates on priestly, Levitical concerns of purity and holiness.

Two texts from the literature of Qumran may be mentioned here. Respect for the Temple is a central issue to the literature of Qumran.¹³⁴ 4QMMT emphasises the purity of the Temple and juxtaposes the holiness of the priests to the practices of fornication which defile their holy seed (4QMMT B 79-82). Thus, the issue of bodily purity as opposed to prohibited sexual relations is implicitly linked with the purity of the Temple. The other text, the Damascus Document, links the defilement of the Temple, *טמא המקדש*, with wealth, that is, wicked wealth which defiles, and with fornication, *זנות* (CD-A IV, 17-18; V, 6-11; VI, 15-16). Here also, the issue of prohibited sexual relations, *זנות*, translated in biblical Greek as *πορνεία*, is related to the defilement of the Temple.

¹³³ Text and translation from García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition* I, 52-53.

¹³⁴ In the 4QMMT B 49, to "be respectful towards the Temple", *להיות יראים ממקדש*, is ranged among the precepts; Ed.pr. Qimron & Strugnell, *DJD* X. Translation from García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition* II, 793, 797. The *Temple Scroll*, 11QT a XLVI, 11-12 comprises the following ruling: *וקדשו את מקדשי ויראו ממקדשי אשר אנוכי שוכן בתוכמה*, "And they shall sanctify my Temple and they shall be afraid of my Temple, for I dwell in their midst"; text from Qimron, *The Temple Scroll*, 66; translation from García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition* II, 1264-1265.

Thus, the Palestinian Jewish evidence provides a specific connection with Paul's idea of the body as Temple in the context of the exhortation against πορνεία.

Other early Christian writings admittedly comprise the idea of the body as Temple, but this may be a *topos* which became current among Christian writers in the post-Pauline period.¹³⁵ Such writers may have depended and elaborated on traditions within the church, so that their texts do not constitute sources for an interpretation of Paul's temple imagery in its contemporary historical context.¹³⁶

5.4 The body as Temple from an anthropological perspective

In his book about *Paul in other words*, Jerome H. Neyrey mentions six constituent elements which make up a 'symbolic universe': purity, rites, body, sin, cosmology, and evil and misfortune.¹³⁷ In this symbolic universe, "the physical body is perceived as a symbol of the social body".¹³⁸ This idea of a symbolic universe may provide a heuristic tool to discern interrelations between social control and body control.¹³⁹

The case of πορνεία in 1 Cor 5:1 is perceived by Paul as a shocking disruption of the order of purity expected of the Corinthians. As the perpetrator of the incestuous practice defiles the social body, he is also described in pejorative terms, εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός, 1 Cor 5:5, outside the domain of Paul's more positive perception of the body as free from impurity and sin. In the latter case, Paul uses the term σῶμα, as in the case of the body as Temple in 1 Cor 6:19.¹⁴⁰ Among the iniquities listed in 1 Cor 5:10-11, 6:9-10, πορνεία is the dominant subject of Paul's exhortation in 1 Cor 5-6, which thereby focuses on bodily sin and impurity.

The metaphor of the body as Temple in 1 Cor 6:19 shows that bodily purity from sexual immorality is of cardinal importance in Paul's concern for proper community building. Without the communal dissociation from sexual immorality, the Corinthians would fall back in the 'old leaven of evil and wickedness' (1 Cor 5:8). This dissociation entails the absence of contact and table fellowship with perpetrators of immorality and other vices (1 Cor 5:11)¹⁴¹. Thus, social control and body control are strongly related to each other in Paul's message. In this respect, Paul's theology represents a high 'group' perspective and a high 'grid' perspective in relation to the contemporary Jewish culture and to the Christian-Jewish missionary movement (cf. Acts 15:20, 21:25 about πορνεία among other things).¹⁴² In

¹³⁵ E.g. 2 Clement 9:3 about the need to guard the flesh, σάρξ, as God's Temple, ὡς ναὸν θεοῦ; Ignatius, *Philadelphians* 7:2 τὴν σάρκα ὑμῶν ὡς ναὸν θεοῦ τηρεῖτε. Note the contrast between σάρξ in these two documents and σῶμα in Paul's metaphor of the body as Temple in 1 Cor 6:19. *Barnabas* 4:11, 6:15, 16:7-9, may further comprise figurative temple imagery, but it should be noted that the concept of the Temple is coloured by explicit polemic in *Barnabas* 16 against Jewish hopes of the rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple destroyed in 70 CE. This post-70 CE context does not apply to Paul and his Letters.

¹³⁶ Cf. chap. 6, section 2.1 where I have made a comparable point about the Deutero-Pauline Letters.

¹³⁷ Neyrey, *Paul, in other words*, 15.

¹³⁸ Neyrey, *Paul, in other words*, 16.

¹³⁹ Cf. his chapter 5 on 'Perceiving the Human Body: Body Language in 1 Corinthians', in *ibidem*, 102-146.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Kirchhoff, *Die Sünde gegen den eigenen Leib*, 130-145 who points to the meaning of σῶμα vs. σάρξ as standing for man's creation as "made for God" and "in his distance from God" respectively (134).

¹⁴¹ Cf. Gal 2:11-14 about the radical dissociation from any table fellowship with Gentile converts propagated by certain circles among the Jerusalem church, in particular the circle of James, a world view which Paul polemically rejected as opposite to his own gospel mission.

¹⁴² About the grid-group matrix of Mary Douglas, see the beginning of this chapter, at the end of section 1.3.

relation to the surrounding Graeco-Roman culture of the Corinthians, Paul's view would represent a low 'grid' perspective.

The involvement of the Holy Spirit with the body is also attested in the literature of Qumran. 1QS III, 7-9 mentions the purification of body, בשר, soul, נפש, and spirit, רוח by the Holy Spirit.¹⁴³ 1QS V, 10-19 prescribes that the men of the Community, both collectively as 'holy men' (אנשי הקודש, l. 13) and individually as each 'holy man' (איש הקודש - l. 18), keep far away from the wickedness of the "men of injustice" (אנשי העול, l. 10). The interrelation between collective and individual levels of prescription in this case may provide a parallel to the individual and corporate levels of Paul's concept of the Temple.

6. 1 Corinthians 9:1-14, Paul's apostolic rights

1 Cor 9:1-14¹⁴⁴ presents an apologetic defence of Paul's freedom and rights as an apostle, in which he compares himself with the other apostles, of whom Cephas and Barnabas are mentioned by name (1 Cor 9:5-6). Within the larger textual division of 1 Cor 8:1-11:1, this digression seems out of place, but it appears to counteract possible recurring doubts among the Corinthians about Paul's place among other apostles, which was probably one factor in the dissensions (cf. 1 Cor 1:10-17, 3:4-8). From a rhetorical point of view, 1 Cor 9:1-14,15-27 serves to establish the reliability and rightfulness of Paul's position in admonishing the Corinthians against participation in idol worship and pagan sacrificial meals.¹⁴⁵ Paul's defence of his apostleship already starts with the observation in 1 Cor 9:2 that 'if to others I am not an apostle, yet I am an apostle at least to you'. From 1 Cor 9:3 onwards Paul unfolds his 'defence (ἀπολογία) against those who question me' (1 Cor 9:3) which he elaborates in various ways throughout 1 Cor 9.

Within Paul's apologetic defence, we may discern two stages: one underpinning his apostolic rights (1 Cor 9:1-14), the other conveying Paul's adaptation of his gospel mission to those whom he addresses as a necessity instead of a selfish claim on benefits (1 Cor 9:15-27). Significantly, 1 Cor 9:1-14 alludes to at least one explicit *Jewish* example for apostolic authority, that is, Paul's interpretation of words from the law (Deut 25:4 in 1 Cor 9:8-12a), whereas 1 Cor 9:15-27 includes examples from a specifically *Hellenistic* context, that is, examples from the athletic contest in 1 Cor 9:24-27.¹⁴⁶ It could further be noted that even the apparently general example of the planting of a vineyard in 1 Cor 9:7 may be an echo from Scripture, that is, from Deuteronomy 20:6. The sowing of spiritual good, τὰ πνευματικά, among the Corinthians, which Paul relates to the expected harvest of material benefits, τὰ σαρκικά, in 1 Cor 9:11, may imply a missionary relation to the Jerusalem church, just as

¹⁴³ A.E. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (SBLDS 110; Scholars Press: Atlanta, Ga., 1989) in his section on 'Ruah as God's Spirit', 71-93 at 91-93 includes the unusual expression רוח קדושה of 1QS III, 7 in this category because God is always the "principal agent of this [moral purification] in the Scrolls".

¹⁴⁴ About 1 Cor 9:1-14 as a separate pericope, see e.g. Schrage, *1Kor 6,12-11,16* EKKNT, 277-317; Wolff, *1. Korinther* THKNT, 186-196; Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 395-413 distinguishes between 1 Cor 9:1-2 and 9:3-14 ('Paul's apostolic rights').

¹⁴⁵ I have not included discussion of 'cultic' terms from 1 Cor 8, since my focus is on those cases in which Paul couches his own message in cultic terms of traditional language of communal worship, not on the pagan cultic context of the former way of life of the Corinthians which Paul rejects outright.

¹⁴⁶ For the analogy of athletic contest by opponents (ἀγωνιστάι) and boxers (χειρονομοῦντες), see also Philo, *Worse* 29, 41-42. Cf. V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (reprint from JPSA, 1959, with a preface by J.J. Collins; Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass., 1999) 27-28 about the typically Hellenistic institution for training in athletic contest, the *gymnasion*, and 163 for the negative perspective of 2 Macc 4:13-14 on the appeal of athletic contest as a "peak of Hellenism" at the detriment of the priestly Temple service.

in Romans 15:26-27 (cf. 1 Cor 16:1-3). Thus, it seems that there is a pattern of Jewish examples in 1 Cor 9:1-14 and of Hellenistic examples in 1 Cor 9:15-27.

Since Paul's ἀπολογία in 1 Cor 9 stands at the centre of 1 Cor 8-11:1, the larger issue of which is the exhortation against temptations of idol worship, it may be significant that Paul draws an example for his apostolic authority from a cultic context in 1 Cor 9:13. Paul makes a comparison with the cultic service at the altar in 1 Cor 9:13. This example is of interest for our discussion of cultic imagery and we may explore whether and how this cultic example corresponds to the suspected pattern of respective Jewish and Hellenistic examples mentioned above.¹⁴⁷ For an overview of the immediate context, I will cite 1 Cor 9:13-14 below.

9:13 Ὅυκ οἶδατε ὅτι οἱ τὰ ἱερά ἐργαζόμενοι τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐσθίουσιν, οἱ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ παρεδρεύοντες τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ συμμερίζονται; 14 οὕτως καὶ ὁ κυριός διέταξεν τοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καταγγέλλουσιν ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν.

9:13 *'Do you not know that those who perform the Temple rites eat the things from the Temple, those who serve regularly at the altar share with the altar?'*¹⁴⁸ 14 *In this manner, the Lord has also ordered those who proclaim the gospel to live from the gospel'.*

There are a few textual variants of the established Greek text of 1 Cor 9:13-14. The variant reading of 1 Cor 9:13, which has προσεδρεύοντες, that is, 'attending, serving', instead of παρεδρεύοντες, deserves some attention. This variant reading, however, only provides a verbal equivalent to the verb in the established Greek text and does not essentially change the meaning of the cultic service at the altar.

Paul refers to cultic service at the altar as an example of a service which entails certain material rights that are used as an analogy to the material rights of those who proclaim the gospel.¹⁴⁹ What cultic service does Paul have in mind here? Commentators on 1 Corinthians disagree about a definite and specific identification of this cultic service.

W. Schrage has interpreted the phrase Ὅυκ οἶδατε at the beginning of 1 Cor 9:13 as an introduction of either a "second proof from Scripture" (the first having been cited with exegesis through a secondary scriptural allusion in 1 Cor 9:9-10) or a "general rule about cultic order". The "second proof from Scripture" in 1 Cor 9:13 could be Paul's paraphrase of an idea conveyed in Numbers 18:8.31 or Deuteronomy 18:1-3. However, since Paul's way of phrasing it does not literally correspond with words from Scripture, Paul's statement does not necessarily echo a specific scriptural proof-text. The "general rule about cultic order" could theoretically apply to any cultic context according to Schrage, although the context here makes it likely that Paul had the "cult of the Old Testament, not a pagan cult" in mind.¹⁵⁰

Gordon D. Fee refers to 1 Cor 9:13 as the introduction of "one more analogy, but this time from a very comparable situation – the various ministrants in the temples". Fee does not make a case for the identification of Paul's analogy in 1 Cor 9:13 with the 'cult of the Old Testament', but instead assumes that through an analogy with pagan temples Paul "is pressing the argument close to home".¹⁵¹ Nevertheless, one may object to this interpretation that the analogy between cultic service in 1 Cor 9:13 and gospel mission in 1 Cor 9:14 makes an

¹⁴⁷ Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 359 and Schrage, *1Kor 6,12-11,16* EKKNT, 280 generally describe the function of 1 Cor 9 as "illustration, by way of digression, of his [Paul's] own giving up his freedom for the rights of others" and as "*exemplum* to move the Corinthians to *imitatio*" respectively, but characterise 1 Cor 9:1-14 only generally as a "long argument" about apostolic rights.

¹⁴⁸ That is, they share with the altar in the things offered on it for sacrifice.

¹⁴⁹ Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 412-413 and Schrage, *1Kor 6,12-11,16* EKKNT, 308-310 interpret Paul's words οὕτως καὶ ὁ κυριός διέταξεν in 1 Cor 9:14 as an allusion to Jesus tradition as reflected in Luke 10:7, Matt 10:10.

¹⁵⁰ Schrage, *1Kor 6,12-11,16* EKKNT, 306-307 at 307.

¹⁵¹ Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 411-412 at 412.

identification with pagan cults less than likely. Fee's interpretation implies that Paul perceived an analogy between pagan cults and the Jesus tradition on apostolic rights, even though no Jesus tradition handed down to us makes such an analogy likely. Contrary to this, Paul carefully distinguishes between the Lord's instructions and his own views on matters unprecedented in Jesus traditions in 1 Cor 7:6.10.12.17.25.40. Thus, it appears highly improbable to me that Paul would draw an analogy between pagan cults and Jesus tradition in the absence of evidence from Jesus traditions supporting such an analogy. Furthermore, 1 Cor 9:13 refers to the sacred Temple rites, τὰ ἱερά, of *one* Temple, clearly determined by the article as a singular Temple, ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, rather than, as Fee seems to suggest, a plurality of (pagan) temples.

The context of 1 Cor 8-11:1 further makes it unlikely that Paul has an example from pagan cults in mind in 1 Cor 9:13 and provides some ground to suspect that Paul rather alludes to the priestly cult of the one Jerusalem Temple. For Paul has argued against the participation in the sacrificial meal of an idol's temple (1 Cor 8:10), because this would tempt the weak conscience of one's brother (1 Cor 8:10-13). In the chapter following 1 Cor 9, Paul explicitly urges the Corinthians to shun idolatry (1 Cor 10:14f.), while he has already warned them to dissociate from, among others, idolaters in 1 Cor 5:10 and 1 Cor 6:9.

In order to strengthen our grip on Paul's description of cultic service in 1 Cor 9:13, it is necessary to examine the cultic terms in 1 Cor 9:13 more closely. This may help to reach a more conclusive interpretation of the cultic service which Paul had in mind. Certain of the cultic terms which Paul uses in 1 Cor 9:13 are by themselves quite general. Thus, the term τὰ ἱερά may denote the sacred rites of both pagan temples¹⁵² and Jewish religious services,¹⁵³ including that of the Jerusalem Temple (cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 4.279). The singular term τὸ ἱερόν may designate any pagan temple¹⁵⁴ or the Jerusalem Temple¹⁵⁵ in Josephus' works, depending on the context.¹⁵⁶ The expression οἱ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ παρεδρεύοντες, 'those who serve regularly at the altar', necessarily relates to the priestly service at the altar in a particular cultic context. This still leaves us with the question which priestly service Paul could have in mind in 1 Cor 9:13.

¹⁵² E.g. *SEG* XXVII (1977) 545 (Il. 15-16, 35, 37; Samos, 2nd half 3rd c. BCE), 929 (l. 15; Limyra, 288-287 BCE); *SEG* XXIX (1979) 752 (l. 5; Naxos, 1st half 1st c. BCE), 771.11 (Thasos, 2nd half 2nd cent. BCE); 1088 (Il. 4-6; Theangela, 3rd cent. BCE); 1130 bis (Klazomenai, 1st half 2nd cent. BCE; B 25: τὰ δὲ ἱερά παρέχ[ε]ιν); *SEG* XXXI (1981) 803 (Samothrake, 2nd half 3rd c. BCE); *SEG* XXXII (1982) 1642 (ἐπιμελητῆς ἱεροῦ); *SEG* XXXIII (1983) 676 (Naxos, 300 BCE), 679.22 (Paros, 175-150 BCE); *SEG* XXXV (1985) 826 (Mesambria Pontica, end 4th – beginning 3rd cent. BCE; Κόρρας ἱέρεια τῶν τε ἱερῶν); 923 (Chios, 400 BCE). The end of each volume of the *SEG* provides a concordance of inscriptions discussed also in other corpora of Greek inscriptions. Cf. the rubric 'τὸ ἱερόν, τὰ ἱερά als allgemeine Kultwörter', in G. Kittel (ed.), *TWNT* 3 Θ-K (Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1938) 230-231.

¹⁵³ Cf. τὰ ἱερά in Josephus' citation of Roman decrees concerning Jewish communities in the diaspora: *Ant.* 14.213-214 (Delos); 227 (Ephesus), 228, 234, 237, and 240 (ἱερά Ἰουδαϊκὰ ... ἐν Ἐφέσῳ); 242 (Laodicea) and 245 (Miletus) referring to τὰ τε σάββατα καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἱερά / τὰ ἱερά τὰ πάτρια; 258 (Halicarnassus).

¹⁵⁴ Cf. *J.W.* 2.81 (the temple of the Palatine Apollo); 4.661 (the temple of the Casian Zeus); 7.123 (a temple of Isis); *Ant.* 6.374 (a temple of Astarte); 8.147 (the temple of Zeus Olympios); 10.224 (a temple of Bel); 12.261 & 263 (the temple of Zeus Hellenios), 354 (a temple of Artemis), 358 (the temple of Artemis in Persia); 13.100 & 104 (the temple of Dagon); 14.36 (the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus at Rome); 17.301 (the temple of Apollo); 18.65 & 80 (the temple of Isis in Rome); 19.4 ('the temple of Jupiter, which they call the Capitol'), 7 ('the Greek temples', τὰ ἱερά τὰ Ἑλληνικά), 248 (the temple of Jupiter Victor); *Ag.Ap.* 1.113 (the temple of Olympian Zeus), 139 & 192 (the temple of Bel). Note also references to the temple of Dagon in 1 Macc 10:84, 11:4, and to the temple of Nanea in 2 Macc 1:13.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. *J.W.* 1.63; 7.148; *Ant.* 8.14; 9.8; 12.136, 377, 388; 13.54, 77; 16.167; 18.82, *passim*, denoting the Temple complex with its different courts.

¹⁵⁶ About the Jewish temple in Leontopolis and the Samaritan temple on Gerizim, see my chapter one.

Whereas the previously mentioned terms are quite general, the term τὸ θυσιαστήριον, however, does not figure in a contemporary pagan Hellenistic context.¹⁵⁷ Josephus uses the term τὸ θυσιαστήριον exclusively in a biblical and post-biblical Jewish context, particularly in relation to the Jerusalem Temple. Josephus even implies a sharp contrast between the Jewish altar, θυσιαστήριον, of the Jerusalem Temple and a pagan altar, βωμός, which Antiochus Epiphanes built, thereby desecrating the Jerusalem Temple (*Ant.* 12.253). In the context of Josephus' description of the Jerusalem Temple cult, the term τὸ θυσιαστήριον usually designates an altar for whole burnt offerings and sacrifices as opposed to the terms βωμός and θυμιατήριον which designate altars for other offerings like incense.¹⁵⁸ The latter two terms could also figure in a pagan context.¹⁵⁹ For our interpretation of Paul's reference to the cultic service at the altar, τὸ θυσιαστήριον, it is finally significant that, in distinction from the general term βωμός, Josephus does not use the term τὸ θυσιαστήριον in a context of temptations to idolatry in biblical history or pagan cults.

Thus, Paul's analogy with the priestly service at the altar in 1 Cor 9:13 derives from the contemporary *Jewish* context of the Jerusalem Temple service which may further be supported by echoes from Scripture (Num 18:8,31, Deut 18:1-3). This analogy therefore fits into a pattern of other examples from the context of contemporary Judaism and Christian Judaism as mentioned before.

It is, however, characteristic of Paul's rhetoric that he renounces the use of apostolic rights (1 Cor 9:12.15f.) thus underpinned by examples from contemporary Judaism and Christian Judaism. The suggested link between the prerogatives of those engaged in the priestly service of the Temple and the apostles' right according to Jesus-tradition¹⁶⁰ provokes the question whether this comparison between priest and apostle derives from the early Jesus-movement. The Synoptic Gospel traditions about the commission and the instruction of the

¹⁵⁷ The older reference works, like A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt* (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1923) and Kittel (ed.), *TWNT 3 Θ-K* (Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1938) 180-190 do not provide evidence of τὸ θυσιαστήριον in a pagan Greek context. The usual pagan Greek term for altar, βωμός, is reflected in the verb ἐπιβωμίζειν in line 8 of the papyrus text from the correspondence of Zeno, 258/257 BCE, in PSI IV (1917) no. 435, cited by A. Deissmann (121).

There are no entries in the *SEG* XXVI (1976) – XLVIII (1998) for a pagan Greek context in which τὸ θυσιαστήριον might figure; the few entries for τὸ θυσιαστήριον which do occur in the *SEG* (XXIX (1979) 1610; XXXV (1985) 1577; XLVI (1996) 2053) relate to inscriptions from churches in the early Byzantine period. Contrary to this, there is an abundance of entries in the *SEG* for βωμός in a pagan Greek context.

The series 'New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity', *A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1976* (ed. G.H.R. Horsley, 1981), *1977* (ed. Horsley, 1982), *1978* (ed. Horsley, 1983), *1979* (ed. Horsley, 1987), *1980-81* (ed. S.R. Llewelyn, 1992), *1982-83* (vol. 7; ed. Llewelyn, 1994), *1984-85* (vol. 8; ed. Llewelyn, 1998) does only comprise entries on θυσιαστήριον in the context of Jewish presence at Ephesos (*I.Eph.* VII, 2.4130) and early Christian inscriptions.

An Advanced Text Search in the TLG (<http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/inst/textsearch>) for the term θυσιαστήριον yields 1735 instances occurring in Hellenistic-Jewish, early Christian, patristic, and Byzantine literature. None of these instances can be identified as pagan Hellenistic contemporary to Paul.

¹⁵⁸ *J.W.* 5.229; *Ant.* 8.13, 88, 105; 11.13, 76-77, 99, 308; 12.250, etc. Cf. K.H. Rengstorf, *The Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus. Study Edition I A-K* (2002) 342-343, 356-357, 361. Without further specification, θυσιαστήριον stands for an altar for burnt offerings and sacrifices; cf. Luke 1:11 about τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ θυμιάματος.

¹⁵⁹ About βωμός in a pagan context see the previous note 157. About θυμιατήριον in a pagan Hellenistic context, see e.g. *SEG* XXXIX (1989) 1135 Caria, Olymos, temple of Leto, ca. 150-100 BCE, 7/8 (*I.Mylasa* 895) l. 15: [βωμόν λίθινον ἐφ' οὗ τὸ θυμιατήριον ἐπιτεθῆ].

¹⁶⁰ Cf. D.L. Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul. The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life* (Basil Blackwell: Oxford, 1971) 16-21.

disciples and followers of Jesus refer to the apostle's right (cf. Luke 10:7, Matt 10:8-9). According to Acts 6:7, many priests in Jerusalem became obedient to the faith of the Jesus-movement. Thus, there was an intersection between priests and the Jesus-movement which may have led Paul to make this analogy in 1 Cor 9:13-14.

In a different context of Christian-Jewish opposition to his mission (Galatians), Paul in fact sharply polemicises against the appeal to authority based on Jewish tradition, and mainly on the Jewish Law. Nevertheless, Paul presents the contemporary Jerusalem in a very polemical way in Galatians 4:25-26.

In the context of 1 Cor 9, however, Paul's renunciation of his apostolic rights serves the rhetorical purpose of persuading the Corinthians about his unselfish mission (his ἥθος of the rhetor) which addresses each on his or her own terms (1 Cor 9:19-23) in order to save as many as possible for the gospel. A similar emphasis on the unselfish mission of Paul together with his fellow workers occurs already in 1 Cor 4:6-13.

Thus, the context of 1 Cor 9 does not convey a polemic against the Israelite priestly service and its prerogatives, but serves as an example of the general principle that the worker deserves his wage. For Paul, this wage clearly lies in the accomplishment of his gospel mission among the Corinthians. The juxtaposition in 1 Cor 9:5-6 may point to a latent tension between the other apostles, the brothers of the Lord and Cephas on the one hand and Paul and Barnabas on the other. This tension became manifest in the subsequent events which prompted Paul to write down his perspective on the confrontation in Antioch between the 'circumcision party' and Paul himself in Galatians 2:11-14.

7. 1 Corinthians 10:14-22, an exhortation against idolatry

1 Corinthians 10:14-22 is a rhetorical unit in which Paul exhorts his readers to abstain from idolatry,¹⁶¹ having given examples from the biblical history of Israel about temptations to sin. In the context of this exhortation, Paul refers to the sacrificial cult of 'Israel according to the flesh' in 1 Cor 10:18. Since the interpretation of this verse is not beyond dispute among scholars, it is necessary to argue from the context about the meaning of 1 Cor 10:18.

10:14 Διόπερ, ἀγαπητοί μου, φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας. 15 ὡς φρονίμοις λέγω· κρίνατε ὑμεῖς ὃ φημι. 16 Τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; 17 ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἐσμεν, οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν. 18 βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα· οὐχὶ οἱ ἐσθίοντες τὰς θυσίας κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου εἰσίν; 19 Τί οὖν φημι; ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτον τί ἐστίν ἢ ὅτι εἰδωλὸν τί ἐστίν; 20 ἀλλ' ὅτι ἃ θύουσιν, δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῶ θύουσιν· οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι. 21 οὐ δύνασθε ποτήριον κυρίου πίνειν καὶ ποτήριον δαιμονίων, οὐ δύνασθε τραπέζης κυρίου μετέχειν καὶ τραπέζης δαιμονίων. 22 ἢ παραζηλοῦμεν τὸν κύριον; μὴ ἰσχυρότεροι αὐτοῦ ἐσμεν;

¹⁶¹ Cf. Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 462-472 about 1 Cor 10:14-22 as "The prohibition and its basis"; Schrage, *1 Kor 6,12-11,16* EKKNT, 429-449 about 1 Cor 10:14-22 as "The antithesis between the Lord's supper and the pagan sacrificial meal"; Wolff, *1. Korinther* THKNT, 225 refers to 1 Cor 10:15-22 as pericope about "The Lord's supper or pagan cultic meal?". I will not consider the argument by Walker, *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters*, 232-236 that 1 Cor 10:1-22 could be an interpolation, as this discussion mainly depends on a perceived inconsistency between 1 Cor 8 and 10:1-22; cf. A.T. Cheung, *Idol Food in Corinth. Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy* (Sheffield AP: Sheffield, 1999) 95-96: "Abstinence for the sake of the weak [1 Cor 8:1-13] and abstinence in order to avoid idolatry [1 Cor 10: 1-22] are not mutually exclusive arguments. On the contrary, they are mutually reinforcing in their prohibition of the consumption of idol food" (96).

10:14 'Therefore, my beloved, flee from idolatry. 15 I speak as to sensible men: you judge what I say. 16 The cup of the blessing which we pronounce, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ? 17 For with many we are one bread, one body, for we all share from one and the same bread. 18 Consider Israel according to the flesh; are those who eat the sacrifices not sharers in the altar? 19 What do I say then? That food sacrificed to idols is anything or that an idol is anything? 20 But that what they offer for sacrifice, they offer to demons and not to God; that is, I do not want you to become partners with the demons. 21 You cannot drink from the cup of the Lord and from the cup of demons, you cannot partake of the table of the Lord and of the table of demons. 22 Or shall we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we then stronger than him?'

There are a few variant readings of 1 Cor 10:14-22 which do not change the essential meaning of the text.¹⁶² I will list a number of the more interesting textual variants. Thus, one variant reading to 1 Cor 10:16, starting the sentence with Τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐχαριστίας instead of with Τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, makes the context of the Lord's Supper or the Eucharist (cf. 1 Cor 11:23-34), which Paul undoubtedly has in mind, more explicit. Since Paul has the institution of the Lord's Supper in mind here (as previously possibly also in 1 Cor 5:7-8), it is the more important to examine how the cultic imagery in 1 Cor 10:18 relates to this.

The rhetorical question in 1 Cor 10:18b is emphasised in a stronger way by the variant reading which has οὐχί instead of οὐκ, thereby putting even more emphasis on the expected affirmative answer. The omission of the phrase ἢ ὅτι εἰδωλόν τι ἐστὶν at the end of 1 Cor 10:19 from certain manuscripts brings about an exclusive focus on 'food offered to idols'. One variant reading to 1 Cor 10:20 adds the subject τὰ ἔθνη after ἃ θύουσιν in the established text.¹⁶³ The variant reading makes explicit what is already implied by the mere fact that food sacrificed to idols (1 Cor 10:19) is not related to the worship of God, but to Gentile worship of idols or demons (1 Cor 10:20). It is important for our understanding of Paul's use of cultic imagery in 1 Cor 10:18 to analyse the transition from 1 Cor 10:18 to 10:19-20 in the context of the pericope.

The interpretation of 1 Cor 10:18 in the midst of this rhetorical unit is problematic, for this verse is immediately followed by the issue of food offered to idols and the idol whose 'real existence' Paul calls into question (cf. 1 Cor 8:4). How should we understand Paul's use of cultic terminology pertaining to the 'Israel according to the flesh'? What does Paul intend to demonstrate with his example of the sacrificial cult of the 'Israel according to the flesh' in the context of this pericope? Does Paul refer to the idea of participation in the sacrificial cult of Israel in verse 18 as analogous with participation in the Lord's Supper (vv. 16-17) or, instead, with temptations to idolatry (vv. 19-20f.)?

Paul's perspective on the sacrificial cult of Israel in 1 Cor 10:18 has received divergent scholarly interpretations. W. Schrage has interpreted this verse about the Israelite worship cult as an example of temptation to idolatry in light of 1 Cor 10:7 which alludes to the breaking of the covenant in Israel's history through the offering to the golden calf.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶² Certain variant readings only change the word order: τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστὶν instead of ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ for 1 Cor 10:16; twice ἐστὶν τι instead of τί ἐστὶν for 1 Cor 10:19. A variant reading to 1 Cor 10:17 adds καὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς ποτήριου at the end of the verse. This variant seems less likely since 1 Cor 10:17a only refers to the image of the one bread, the one body. The remaining variant readings to 1 Cor 10:14-22 concern minor cases of a slightly different word order and an omission of the second θύουσιν in 1 Cor 10:20a.

¹⁶³ ἃ θύουσιν τὰ ἔθνη is a *constructio ad sensum*, on which see Blass/ Debrunner/ Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, § 134. On the other hand, ms.nr. 1881 reads ἃ θύει τὰ ἔθνη.

¹⁶⁴ Schrage, *IKor 6,12-11,16* EKKNT, 442-444; cf. e.g. J.F.M. Smit, "About the Idol Offerings" (Peeters: Leuven [etc.], 2000) 56 about 1 Cor 10:18: "Here Paul refers back to the two occasions, mentioned in 1 Cor 10:7-8, when Israel had eaten pagan sacrificial meals".

Schrage has further contrasted the term ὁ Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα in 1 Cor 10:18 to the idea of the church as ὁ Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα.¹⁶⁵ G.D. Fee has interpreted 1 Cor 10:18 in light of sacrificial meals as prescribed in Deuteronomy 14:22-27. Fee argued that Paul here presents another analogy, one from contemporary Judaism, to express the idea that God cannot be served while participating in idol worship at the same time. Fee, however, adds that Paul may have had an analogy in mind between the respective Jewish and pagan cultic meals in that they both involved sacrifice which has been substituted by Christ's atoning death in the ritual of the Lord's Supper.¹⁶⁶

In my view the argument about Paul's perspective on the sacrificial cult of Israel depends on the interpretation of 'Israel according to the flesh' and on the connection which one establishes with the context of 1 Cor 8:1-11:1 at large and 1 Cor 10:14-22 in particular. Since 1 Cor 10:18 deals with the partnership in the altar, τὸ θυσιαστήριον, concerning the eating of sacrificial food, an analogy with 1 Cor 9:13 becomes apparent. In 1 Cor 9:13-14, sacrificial food eaten by those engaged in the priestly service at the altar serves as an analogy for material benefits granted to those who preach the gospel. What kind of analogy, however, does Paul have in mind in the present context of 1 Cor 10:14-22?

I disagree with W. Schrage that the sentence which introduces the analogy of Israel's sacrificial cult in 1 Cor 10:18, βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα, evokes the unbelieving Israel as a negative example of temptations which the Corinthians should shun. The imperative βλέπετε may denote an invitation to consider the example of Israel rather than a negative warning.¹⁶⁷ The term κατὰ σάρκα by itself is not necessarily a pejorative designation in Paul's language. Romans 1:3, 4:1, 9:3 about 'my kinsmen according to the flesh', and 9:5 Christ 'according to the flesh' provide examples which are, strictly speaking, not pejorative.¹⁶⁸

Since the interpretation of ὁ Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα clearly depends on the context, let us now turn to the context of 1 Cor 10:1-13 from which W. Schrage draws his argument. Paul's typological interpretation of the biblical Exodus story in 1 Cor 10:1-13 serves as instruction for the Corinthians to take heed of temptations (1 Cor 10:11-12), but at the same time as a reassurance that every temptation is human and that God is faithful (1 Cor 10:13). This typological interpretation repeatedly focuses on the iniquities of 'some of them', τινες αὐτῶν, that is, some of the Israelites (1 Cor 10:7.8.9.10). This bears a striking resemblance to the way Paul has addressed the iniquities committed in the past by some of the Corinthians in 1 Cor 6:11: 'and such were some of you', καὶ ταῦτα τινες ἦτε. Paul in fact reinterprets the biblical Exodus story and likens the situation of the Israelites led out of Egypt by Moses to the situation of the Corinthians exposed to the gospel of Christ. Paul writes about the spiritual food, τὸ πνευματικὸν βρῶμα,¹⁶⁹ eaten by the Israelites, and applies the image of the rock from which they drank water allegorically to Christ. Previously, Paul has admonished the Corinthians that they are not yet spiritual, addressing their situation figuratively as their inability to eat solid food, βρῶμα (1 Cor 3:1-2). By way of analogy, Paul indicates that Israel also had to go through a spiritual learning process by trial and error. 1 Cor

¹⁶⁵ Schrage, *1Kor 6,12-11,16* EKKNT, 442-444 at 443: "Gemeint ist somit Israel, soweit es nicht Gott, sondern Götzen opfert, also das murrende, ungehorsame Israel".

¹⁶⁶ Fee, *First Corinthians* NICNT, 470-471.

¹⁶⁷ Admonitions or negative warnings are instead conveyed by the expressions βλέπετε ἀπό (e.g. in Mark 8:15), βλέπετε / βλέπω (μὴ) ((/)) πῶς (1 Cor 3:10, 8:9, 10:12; Gal 5:15), and βλέπετε ἵνα (1 Cor 16:10).

¹⁶⁸ Note that the RSV translates ὁ Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα in 1 Cor 10:18 as 'the people of Israel', noting that the Greek, translated very literally, has *Israel according to the flesh*.

¹⁶⁹ Probably an allegorical designation for the 'manna' supplied to the Israelites during their wanderings.

10:7, however, relates the iniquity of idol worship to 'some of them', *τινες αὐτῶν*, not to all Israel. Since 1 Cor 10:1-13 provides no explicit clue to interpret iniquities committed by Israelites as iniquities 'according to the flesh', the supposed link between the example of idolatry in 1 Cor 10:7 and the 'Israel according to the flesh' as the idolatrous Israel can not be substantiated in my view.¹⁷⁰

The other factor which determines the argument is the interpretation of 1 Cor 10:18 in the context of 1 Cor 10:14-22. The transition from 1 Cor 10:18 to 1 Cor 10:19 should not be understood as concerning the same subject matter (idolatry), as though 'Israel according to the flesh' were engaged in idolatry, but rather a contrast. The rhetorical question of 1 Cor 10:19 refers back to the whole argumentation in 1 Cor 10:15-18, introduced by 'you judge what I say' in verse 15. Paul does not want the reader to think that, parallel to the monotheistic worship in which believers share and express their sense of belonging to the worship tradition (cf. 1 Cor 10:16-18), participation in idolatrous practices would equally entail a share in something which exists. Here, the issue of ontology is at stake; God exists, but 'an idol has no real existence', *οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ* (1 Cor 8:4). Paul thus makes an emphatic distinction between existing things (participation in monotheistic worship) and non-existing things (idols).

We should further note that 1 Cor 10:20 is implicitly (as in the established text) or explicitly (as in several uncial and minuscular manuscripts, *τὰ ἔθνη*) about the Gentiles who sacrifice to demons and not to God. The implicit version may be explained from the fact that the pagan context of idolatrous practices and sacrifices was all around the Corinthians; it does not even need to be named explicitly anymore, since Paul has already dealt with the issue in 1 Cor 8 and conveys it by the general exhortation against idolatry in 1 Cor 10:14. As a polar opposite to the iniquities, among which idolatry, Paul has in fact introduced the metaphor of God's Temple in 1 Cor 3:16-17 and 6:19. It is therefore hard to imagine how Paul could equate the sacrificial Temple cult with idolatry in 1 Cor 10:18, since idols and the Temple of God exclude each other in Paul's cultic imagery (cf. 2 Cor 6:16 discussed in my next chapter).

We may summarily conclude that a direct link between idolatry and the expression 'Israel according to the flesh' cannot be substantiated. Furthermore, important ancient textual witnesses to 1 Cor 10:20, which make the subject of idolatrous sacrifices explicit as *τὰ ἔθνη*, preclude the assumption that 1 Cor 10:18 and 10:19-20 concern the very same subject.

8. Summary

Considering the fact that 1 Corinthians concerns the overarching issue of proper community building, Paul's temple imagery serves to underpin the holiness and unity of the Corinthian community and to demarcate its boundaries against the impurity of sin. Paul's application of the metaphor of the Temple to the individual body in 1 Cor 6:19 does not stand apart from this concern. As the context of 1 Cor 5-6 reveals, the individual level of the body as Temple relates in important ways to the corporate level of the Corinthians as a social body, and thereby the level of the Corinthian community as Temple. The communal holiness depends on the given that the Corinthians remove injustice from their midst and dissociate themselves from individual cases of injustice.

1 Cor 3:9-17 is a rhetorical unit in which Paul dissuades his readers from individual strife and persuades them of the holiness of the communal building process. The cultic imagery employed in this respect may be contrasted to the image of an idol's temple

¹⁷⁰ *Contra* Schrage, *1Kor 6,12-11,16* EKKNT, 442-444 and Smit, "About the Idol Offerings", 56 who both imply this link between 1 Cor 10:7 and 10:18.

(εἰδωλείον in 1 Cor 8:10). The connections with imagery in contemporary Jewish tradition suggest that contemporary temple theology was a normative model. The context of the larger section of 1 Cor 1-4 makes it unlikely that Paul had a substitution for the Jerusalem Temple in mind. Paul's idea of the community as Temple is inclusive rather than substitutionary, analogous with his inclusive concept of God's covenant with Israel, and includes both Jews and Gentiles, in Rom 9-11.

The sacrificial image of Christ as the paschal lamb in 1 Cor 5:6-8 may be related to the institution of the Lord's supper. Since Paul's overarching concern in 1 Cor 5:1-13 concentrates on the Corinthians' dissociation from sexual immorality and other vices, the interpretation of the 'old leaven of evil and wickedness' in 1 Cor 5:8 applies to the Corinthian situation. The sacrificial imagery in 1 Cor 5:7 reflects the institution of the Christian celebration of Passover. The direct context of 1 Cor 5:1-13 suggests that Paul's cultic imagery presupposes the new life in Christ which replaces the Corinthians' former life in pagan unbelief and vices. The general context of Pauline theology suggests that the new covenant in Christ celebrated through the Lord's Supper (1 Cor 11:23-34) does not necessarily substitute the old covenant or contemporary Jewish worship, but serves to disclose or unveil the full revelatory power of Scripture (2 Cor 3:4-18; cf. Rom 9-11).

1 Cor 6:18-20 recapitulates preceding discussions of πορνεία in 1 Cor 5-6 by applying the metaphor of the Temple to the body. There is a significant contrast with 1 Thess 4:3-8, where the issue of πορνεία is also discussed, but without a connection to explicit cultic imagery. Paul's metaphor of the body as Temple in 1 Cor 6:19 is difficult to situate in a Graeco-Roman or Hellenistic Jewish context. Parallels from Hellenistic-Jewish literature (Philo, *Creation* 137) of a temple for the reasonable soul do not match with Paul's temple imagery in view of Philo's negative perspective on the body, σῶμα, as inferior to the soul, ψυχή (*Creation* 137; *Spec. Laws* 1.269). Nor do parallels from a pagan context, for instance, the hearts of human beings as temples of friendship in Valerius Maximus 4.7.ext.1, match with Paul's idea of the body as Temple. Nevertheless, the Jewish context of the idea of the Temple, as we may derive it from Philo, requires the ritual as well as moral purity of both body and soul as a precondition for access to the Temple. A comparison with Palestinian Jewish evidence provides specific connections with Paul's notion of the body as Temple in the context of his exhortation against sexual immorality. Palestinian Jewish temple theological traditions provide an important background to 1 Cor 6:18-20.

The cultic imagery in 1 Cor 9:13 is more firmly related to the priestly service of the Jerusalem Temple cult than it has sometimes been assumed in scholarship, as becomes clear from the exclusively Jewish and Christian-Jewish evidence for the term θυσιαστήριον. This has important consequences for our understanding of Paul's attitude to the Jerusalem Temple. He refers to the rights of the Jerusalemite priests as analogous to the apostle's right. However, he emphatically states that he will not make use of this right. Paul does not consider it necessary to depend on the analogy with the Jerusalemite priestly establishment as a source of authority, but he does not portray this priestly service negatively either. In line with his ἀπολογία, Paul renounces the appeal to authority or rights analogous to those of the Jerusalemite priesthood. On the other hand, Paul appraises the irrevocable gifts of God to the Israelites in his Letter to the Romans, including the gift of worship (Rom 3:2, 9:1-5, 11:25-36). Paul suggests an analogy between the priestly service and the apostle's right (1 Cor 9:13-14) which provides a link with Jesus traditions about apostolic commission as transmitted in the early Jesus movement.

With regard to cultic terminology in 1 Cor 10:18 within the context of the pericope 1 Cor 10:14-22 and the preceding section 1 Cor 10:1-13, it may be concluded that the scholarly arguments about Paul's representation of the Israelite cult stand in need of reconsideration. The argument that Paul associates the Israelite cult with idolatry or understands it as

Paul and God's Temple

superseded by Christian worship is less evident than has been supposed by scholars. My interpretation of ὁ Ἰσραήλ κατὰ σάρκα and its priestly cult in its rhetorical context suggests that Paul had the Jewish Israel in mind apart from his theological, inclusive concept of Israel. The partnership with the altar, which has also been expressed in 1 Cor 9:13, provides the example of Israel's monotheistic worship cult.

CHAPTER 8

CULTIC IMAGERY IN 2 CORINTHIANS

1. The rhetorical situation of 2 Corinthians

1.1 The exigence

Paul writes his Second Letter to the Corinthians on the occasion of his plan to come to the Corinthians for the third time (cf. 2 Cor 12:14, 13:1). Paul refers back to his previous writing to the Corinthians in 2 Cor 2:3-4, the identification of which, as in the case of 1 Cor 5:9-13, has led certain scholars to formulate partition theories about letter fragments.¹ The most influential partition theory considers 2 Cor 1-9 and 2 Cor 10-13 as originally separate Letters, Paul appending the latter to 2 Cor 1-9 to exhort the Corinthians against the growing influence of Paul's opponents on them.²

It should be noted that, parallel to the closing part of 1 Corinthians, 2 Cor 9 refers to the issue of the collection, the offering for the saints (2 Cor 9:1f.), and expresses the relation between other congregations and the Corinthians in thanksgiving (2 Cor 9:13-15). 2 Cor 10-13 focuses very explicitly on Paul's opponents who suspect him of acting in a worldly fashion (2 Cor 10:2), and the passage admonishes the Corinthians for the sake of edifying their church (2 Cor 10:8, 13:10) in order that he may not have to use severe authority when visiting them (2 Cor 10:1-2, 13:10). This appears to be evidence for the integrity of 2 Cor 1-9 and 2 Cor 10-13 respectively as compositional units. The closing part of 2 Cor 13:11-14 brings the two separate parts of 2 Corinthians together.

Since the open opposition to Paul's mission by rival missionaries of the gospel characterises Paul's Letter to the Galatians so plainly, the change of tone in the transition from 2 Cor 1-9 to 2 Cor 10-13 may equally reflect these changed circumstances. While in 2 Cor 1-9 Paul still urges the Corinthians to solidarity with him in suffering and comfort for the sake of the gospel (cf. Cor 1:8-11, 6:1-13, 7:2-4), 2 Cor 10-13 expresses bitter polemic against Paul's opponents and the way in which they lead the Corinthians astray and make Paul's mission a failure (cf. 2 Cor 10:10-12, 11:1-23f., 12:11-12, 13:5-7).

Nevertheless, the notion of opponents to Paul's mission is not absent from 2 Cor 1-9. Thus, Paul writes that he is not ignorant of Satan's designs in 2 Cor 2:11 and he observes the divergent reception of his gospel in 2 Cor 2:16. Paul's remark that, being sincerely commissioned by God (2 Cor 2:17) he does not need letters of recommendation as some do (2 Cor 3:1), presupposes a contrast with rival missionaries. In fact, Paul writes about his opponents as servants of Satan disguising themselves as servants of righteousness (2 Cor 11:13-15) and as people who commend themselves (2 Cor 10:12).

The exigence of 2 Corinthians is Paul's focus on the sincerity of his gospel mission to the Corinthians in face of the growing opposition to this mission by rival missionaries and

¹ Cf. e.g. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 101-111 for a survey of hypotheses about 2 Cor 1:1-2:13, 2:14-7:4, 6:14-7:1, 8, 9, and 10-13 as separate letter fragments.

² Cf. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 103-105, 108-111 for arguments against identifying 1 Cor 10-13 with the 'tearful letter' mentioned in 2 Cor 2:3-4; J.L. Sumney, *Identifying Paul's opponents. The Question of Method in 2 Corinthians* (Sheffield AP, JSOT Press; Sheffield, 1990) 123-179 discusses 1 Cor 1-9 and 1 Cor 10-13 as two separate letters.

their potential influence on the Corinthians. Therefore, Paul repeatedly stresses his own unselfish, open attitude to them and counters the rival missionaries who emphasise a Jewish way of life by expressing his confidence in the gospel mission as the new covenant (2 Cor 3:4-18). In relation to Paul's focus on his sincere mission, the Corinthians are urged to show solidarity with Paul, while Paul at the same time expresses his confidence in them (cf. e.g. 2 Cor 7:4.16).

In view of the theme of solidarity, it is perhaps not surprising that Paul includes himself in the metaphor of the Temple in 2 Cor 6:16, using the first person plural (see section 3 on this). Paul's concern with the social imperfections which endanger communal holiness also characterises his writing in 2 Corinthians, as becomes clear from 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 and his exhortation in 2 Cor 12:19-21 in the interest of the Corinthians' edification.

1.2 The Corinthian audience and Paul's opponents

In 2 Corinthians, Paul addresses his audience in a way different from 1 Corinthians. While Paul exhorted the Corinthians about pride on worldly wisdom in 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians reflects a defence of Paul's mission against the accusation by his opponents about his own boasting (cf. 2 Cor 1:12). Paul stresses that his competence comes from God (2 Cor 3:5-6) and that he does not preach about himself, but about Jesus Christ as Lord (2 Cor 4:5). Dieter Georgi has observed that, in contrast to 1 Corinthians, Paul did not have to face opposite views within the Corinthian congregation but the challenge of adversaries from outside the congregation, as 2 Cor 3:1 and 11:4 show; these adversaries therefore were of a "religio-historical formation and theology different from the indigenous Corinthian believers" according to Georgi.³

Paul's message about the hidden and secret wisdom of God (cf. 1 Cor 2:6-13, 4:1-5) was probably taken to be a 'veiled gospel' by his opponents (2 Cor 4:3-4f.), whom Paul perceived as unbelievers. Paul instead characterises the 'old covenant', the source of authority for his opponents, as veiled. The strong emphasis on openness and solidarity throughout 2 Cor 1-9 urges the Corinthians to share Paul's perspective and takes this solidarity as a point of departure, as Paul's repeated remark about his confidence in them reveals. Thus, 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 presupposes the disjunction between the perspectives of believers and unbelievers.

In his study about the identification of Paul's opponents in 2 Corinthians, Jerry L. Sumney has noted that the opponents have a clear profile as Pneumatics in 2 Cor 10-13, whereas 2 Cor 1-9 lacks such a profile.⁴ Sumney nevertheless concludes that the opponents in 2 Cor 1-9 and 2 Cor 10-13 are the same group.⁵ This affirms the idea of a growing opposition by rival missionaries against Paul's gospel, as reflected throughout 2 Corinthians. These circumstances may also inform our reading of cultic imagery in 2 Corinthians, especially the passage with temple imagery, 2 Cor 6:14-7:1.

³ D. Georgi, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians* (ET from the German *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2 Korintherbrief*, 1986; T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1987) 317.

⁴ Sumney, *Identifying Paul's opponents*, 183; cf. page 177: "the problems at Corinth stem from the disagreement between Paul and his rivals over the way that the Spirit operates in apostles' lives".

⁵ Sumney, *Identifying Paul's opponents*, 183-186.

1.3 The constraints

Paul's persuasion of the holiness and sincerity of his gospel mission was constrained by the suspicion that this mission was a worldly activity, as aroused by Paul's opponents. In defence against these suspicions, Paul emphasises the Corinthians' need to apply his instructions and exhortations to themselves and to test their faith and obedience (cf. 2 Cor 2:9f., 7:9-11, 13:5-10).

2. 2 Corinthians 2:14-17, the sincerity and truth of Paul's gospel

Within 2 Corinthians, Paul first uses language with cultic connotations in 2 Cor 2:14-17.⁶ This passage forms an excursion from the preceding verses (2 Cor 2:12-13) which recount events in Paul's missionary journey. The verses following 2 Cor 2:14-17, that is, 2 Cor 3:1-6, comprise Paul's defence of his gospel against opponents who boast of the authority of their rival mission. 2 Cor 2:14-17 defines the place of Paul's gospel between the congregations that are touched by his mission and his opponents. Paul trusts on the eventual success of his mission, as is revealed by his record of triumph in 2 Cor 2:14. The text of 2 Cor 2:14-17 follows below.

2:14 Τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τὴν ὄσμην τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ φανεροῦντι δι' ἡμῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ· 15 ὅτι Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ θεῷ ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, 16 οἷς μὲν ὄσμη ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὄσμη ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν. καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα τίς ἰκανός; 17 οὐ γάρ ἐσμεν ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ εἰλικρινείας, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκ θεοῦ κατέναντι θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν.⁷

2:14 *'But thanks to God who leads us in triumph at all times in Christ and reveals the fragrance of the knowledge of him through us in every place; 15 for we are the fragrance of Christ for God among those who are saved and among those who perish, 16 for some a fragrance from death to death, for others a fragrance from life to life. Who is fit even for these things? 17 for we are not like the many who peddle the word of God, but as people with pure motives, but from God we speak before God in Christ'.*

In 2 Cor 2:14-16, Paul expresses the power of his gospel of Christ through cultic terms which evoke the idea of a pleasing fragrance to God in the sacrificial cult. The cultic terms of 'fragrance', ὄσμη, and 'aroma', εὐωδία mentioned in this passage have been interpreted by scholars against the background of figurative usage derived from the contemporary Jewish Temple cult. Hans-Josef Klauck has pointed to parallels to the figurative usage of these cultic terms in Jewish literature of the Second Temple period.⁸ In a recent study, David A. Renwick has interpreted 2 Cor 2:14-17 by connecting the cultic significance of the sacrificial terms 'fragrance', ὄσμη, and 'aroma', εὐωδία, with the theme of the "suffering apostleship".⁹

⁶ This passage is considered to be part of a larger pericope, 2 Cor 2:14-3:6, by R.P. Martin, *Word Biblical Commentary* 40 *2 Corinthians* (Word Books: Waco, Tex., 1986) 43-56, designating it as "The Apostle's Adequacy for Ministry", and by C. Wolff, *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* THKNT 8 (Evangelische Verlagsanstalt: Berlin, 1989) 53-59, designating it as "Thanksgiving to God for the magnitude of the apostleship. The capacity for the apostleship".

⁷ The established Greek text of 2 Cor 2:14-17 is hardly changed by minor variant readings. These comprise Clement of Alexandria's reading of κυρίου εὐωδία instead of Χριστοῦ εὐωδία in 2 Cor 2:15; the double omission of the preposition ἐκ from 2 Cor 2:16; οἱ λοιποί, 'the others' instead of οἱ πολλοί, and κατενώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ instead of κατέναντι θεοῦ in 2 Cor 2:17.

⁸ Klauck, 'Kultische Symbolsprache bei Paulus', 112 referring to Sir 24:15, 39:14 and 1QS VIII, 9.

⁹ D.A. Renwick, *Paul, the Temple, and the presence of God* (BJS 224; Brown University, 1991) 61-94.

In the cultic context of the contemporary Jewish sacrificial cult, the terms of fragrance and aroma mentioned above apply to the covenant with God, as mediated by the priestly service. Sirach 45:7 presents the prototypical idea of a priestly covenant in which the priesthood given to Aaron mediates between God and the people. Sirach 45:16 mentions the 'pleasing odour', εὐωδία, among other cultic offerings as a memorial offering, in order to make atonement for the people. In Sirach 50:15 we read about a case of libation that is 'a pleasing aroma to the Most High, the King of all', ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας ὑψίστω παμβασιλεῖ.¹⁰ The compound term ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας in the Septuagint renders the expression ריח הניחח in the Hebrew Bible. In the Dead Sea Scrolls, there are also many instances of the expression of ריח ניחוח (plene spelling) in relation to the theme of atonement for the land of Israel (in 1QS VIII, 9; 1QSb III, 1; 4QJub^{a,hd,e}; 4QD^a; 11QT^a).

Paul's use of cultic terminology here appears to underline Paul's sincere engagement with his mission in relation to God, even if those who receive the gospel do not all accept it. The idea of a commission from God (1 Cor 2:17) in combination with the cultic terms further evokes an analogy with the priestly service, with which Paul has already compared his apostleship in 1 Cor 9:13.

3. 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1, God's Temple and the communal way of life

3.1 The rhetorical unit and literary status of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1

The rhetorical unit of 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 again includes the metaphor of the community as Temple (2 Cor 6:16) and refers to issues of purity and defilement (2 Cor 6:17, 7:1). Its unity as a pericope is generally granted in scholarly literature, but the evaluation of its style and contents as well as its place within 1 Cor 6-7 have led to continuous debate about the (in)authenticity of this passage. Scholarly positions on the literary status of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 have been and continue to be divided between the hypotheses of interpolation, of a Pauline edition of a pre-Pauline tradition, and of the Pauline origin of this pericope.¹¹ Certain types of evidence for the testing of the hypothesis of an interpolation, as categorised by William O. Walker (see my chap. 6, section 2.2), appear to predominate the debate. Thus, many commentators refer to the linguistic evidence of *hapax legomena*, words not otherwise figuring in Paul's Letters, and to *locational* evidence, that is, the understanding of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 as an abrupt interruption of the stream of thought expressed in 2 Cor 6:13 and continued in 2 Cor 7:2. As a pericope out of place, 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 would therefore be an interpolation.

¹⁰ On the evidence of cultic imagery in the different textual witnesses to Sirach, see also F.W. Reiterer, 'Gott und Opfer' and the same author's synoptic survey 'Opferterminologie in Ben Sira', in R. Egger-Wenzel (ed.), *Ben Sira's God. Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference, Durham – Ushaw College 2001* (BZAW 321; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin & New York, 2001) 136-179 and 371-374 at 175 noting that atonement and the forgiveness of sins in Sirach is not a matter of proper ritual conduct but of religious sincerity and social justice.

¹¹ For a recent survey of scholarly positions, see e.g. M.E. Thrall, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians I Introduction and Commentary on II Corinthians I-VII* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1994) 25-36; cf. H.D. Betz, "2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?", *JBL* 92 (1973) 88-108; G.D. Fee, "II Corinthians VI.14-VII.1 and food offered to idols", *NTS* 23 (1977) 140-161; V.P. Furnish, *II Corinthians* (AB; Doubleday: Garden City, NY, 1984) 371-383; J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Relating 2 Corinthians 6.14-7.1 to its Context", *NTS* 33 (1987) 272-275; idem, "Philo and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1", *RB* 95 (1988) 55-69; R. Bieringer, "Der 2. Korintherbrief in den neuesten Kommentaren", *ETL* 67 (1991) 107-130; G. Saß, "Noch einmal: 2 Kor 6,14-7,1. Literarkritische Waffen gegen einen >unpaulinischen< Paulus?", *ZNW* 84 (1993) 36-64; R. Bieringer, '2 Korinther 6,14-7,1 im Kontext des 2. Korintherbriefes. Forschungsüberblick und Versuch eines eigenen Zugangs', in idem & J. Lambrecht, *Studies on 2 Corinthians* (BETL 112; Leuven UP / Peeters: Leuven, 1994) 551-570.

In my view, 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 may be included into our survey of cultic imagery in Paul's Letters as a *Pauline* passage, taking the possibility of Pauline transformation into account. In my defence of this idea, I will draw different types of evidence into the argument, without pretending to convey a complete answer to all issues in the debate. Nevertheless, it may be possible to comment on some of the main lines of thought represented by the interpolation hypothesis to refute at least this position and to integrate the evidence of cultic terminology from 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 into our discussion.

3.1.1 *Hapax legomena*

The *hapax legomena* are numerous according to scholars who favour the interpolation hypothesis. They usually refer to the following examples: μετοχή, μέρος, καθαρίζω, συμφώνησις, συγκατάθεσις, Βελιάρ, παντοκράτωρ, μολυσμός, έτεροζυγέω, and έμπεριπατέω.¹² However, Ralph P. Martin has noted that many of these *hapax legomena* are hardly convincing as an argument in favour of interpolation. Themes expressed by the contrasts between ναός θεοῦ and είδωλον (2 Cor 6:16), δικαιοσύνη and άνομία (2 Cor 6:14), φῶς and σκότος (2 Cor 6:14), πιστός and άπιστος (2 Cor 6:15), and between πνεῦμα and σάρξ (2 Cor 7:1) also occur in 1 Corinthians and Romans. Furthermore, some of these terms figure in 'quotations' from Scripture,¹³ while other terms can be tied to verbs otherwise used by Paul (e.g. μετοχή - μετέχειν; μολυσμός - μολύνειν).¹⁴

The figure of Beliar occurs only in 2 Cor 6:15, but this by itself does not point to a non-Pauline provenance of the passage. The contrast between Beliar and Christ underpins the christological idea in 2 Cor 6:15. The parallels in contemporary Jewish literature to Paul's reference to Belial suggest that Paul used common imagery of his time. Interestingly, the defilement of the Temple figures in the *Damascus Document*, in a digression about the 'three nets of Belial', שלוש מצודות בליעל (CD-A IV, 15), in the context of an interpretation of Isaiah 24:17. Thus, these three nets stand for the three iniquities of the defilement of the Temple, fornication (הזנות), and wealth (ההון).¹⁵ Beliar, a variant of Belial, figures in 2 Cor 6:15 at the beginning of our rhetorical unit which recapitulates the metaphor of the community as Temple of God in 2 Cor 6:16 called the "Temple of the living God", ναός θεοῦ ζῶντος. The figure of Belial, however, is not limited to the sectarian literature of Qumran.¹⁶ The works of Belial are further opposed to the law of the Lord in the *Testament of Levi* 19:1, which adds the contrast between light and darkness.

¹² Cf. e.g. the lists of *hapax legomena* in Furnish, *II Corinthians* AB, 376; Wolff, *2. Korinther* THKNT, 146; Thrall, *II Corinthians I-VII* ICC, 29; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 106.

¹³ Paul's 'quotation' from Scripture in 2 Cor 6:16-18 does not concern literal, *verbatim* quotation.

¹⁴ Martin, *2 Corinthians* WBC, 192, who further refers to the parallel of σύζυγος in Phil 4:3 to έτεροζυγεῖν and to Fee's argument in *NTS* 23 (1977) 147 that "the authenticity of this passage is not called into question by the *hapax legomena*".

¹⁵ CD-A IV, 14-18. Cf. García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition* I, 557 translating הון as 'wealth', and the textual note on the confusion of הן to be read as הן in Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20*, 108, 116-118 ("a vagueness in distinction between *waws* and *yods*, a common feature in numerous sectarian DSS, as well as in Hebrew MSS of medieval times", 108).

¹⁶ Apart from the passage about the nets of Belial in CD-A IV, 15, the presence of the figure of Belial is further pervasive in Qumranite dualism: 4QMMT C 29; 1QS I 18, 23-24, II 5; CD-A V 18, VIII 2, XII 2; 5Q13 fr. 5, 2; 1QH^a XI 28-29, 32, XII 13-14, XIII 39, XIV 21, XV 3; 4Q88 X 10; 4Q286 fr. 7, II, 1-6; 1QM I 1, 5, 13, 15, IV 2, XIII 2, 4, 11, XIV 9, XV 3, 17, XVI 11, XVII 15, XVIII 1, 3; 4Q175 I. 23; 11Q13 II 13, 25, III 7; 4Q171 II 10-11; 4Q176 frgs. 8-11, I. 15; 4Q174 frgs. 1 col. I, 21, 2, lines 8-9, frgs. 1 col. II, 3, 24, 5, line 2, fr. 4, line 3; 4Q177 II 4, III 8, 10, IV 9, 11-12, 14, 16, V 5, 10; 4Q253 fr. 3, line 2; 4Q225 fr. 2, col. II, 14; 4Q390 fr. 2, I, 4.

The prominence of Belial in the pseudepigraphical Testaments literature¹⁷ relativises the idea of specific affinities between 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 and Essene or Qumranite thought, as suggested by some scholars.¹⁸ This pseudepigraphical literature also circulated outside sectarian circles.¹⁹ Moreover, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor has countered this exclusive comparison with Qumranite and Essene thought on the basis of a comparative study of parallels with Philo.²⁰ We may summarily conclude that 'hapax legomena' by themselves do not provide evidence for a non-Pauline, even sectarian provenance of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. It is therefore necessary to go beyond the mere linguistic question of hapax legomena and to turn to the question of the ideas expressed in our passage, in comparison with Pauline thought in the undisputed parts of Paul's Letters.

3.1.2 *Non-Pauline ideas*

Another argument, related to the language of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, is the idea that the use of certain concepts in this pericope are otherwise foreign or even opposed to Paul's thought, as conveyed by the rest of the Pauline Letters. As a fundamental point in his survey of 'non-Pauline features', Victor Paul Furnish has stressed that "nowhere else does the apostle counsel the kind of separation from *unbelievers* envisioned here (6:14-16a, 17a)".²¹ More recently, Christoph Heil has noted that the language of separation with its cultic connotations in 2 Cor 6:17 contrasts with the idea of separation as found in Paul's undisputed Letters.²² Since the interpretation of the kind of separation is of basic importance for our understanding of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, my argument here focuses mainly on this issue. I will deal with other features which could be non-Pauline when going through the text.

The idea of separation in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 and anthropology

Should 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 be read as reflecting a Jewish sectarian idea of separation from unbelievers or as an early Christian, even Pauline idea of maintaining communal boundary lines? How can we decide in favour of the former or the latter reading? The grid-group matrix of Mary Douglas (discussed in the previous chapter 7, section 1.3) may provide a heuristic tool for comparing the theology in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 with that of the undisputed Pauline Letters. If this theology can be identified as sectarian (high group / low grid) in contrast to the theology in Paul's undisputed Letters, this would be an argument in favour of the non-Pauline provenance of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. If this cannot be demonstrated, the argument of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 as a non-Pauline fragment should be repudiated.

¹⁷ *T. Reu.* 4:11, 6:3, *T. Levi* 18:12, 19:2, *T. Jud.* 25:3, *T. Iss.* 6:1, *T. Zeb.* 9:8, *T. Dan* 4:7, 5:1.10-11, *T. Naph.* 3:1, *T. Ash.* 1:8, 3:2, *T. Jos.* 7:4, *T. Benj.* 3:3, 7:1-2. See also *The Lives of the Prophets* 4:6.20, 17:2; *Jubilees* 1:20, 15:33, and *Sib.Or.* 2.167, 3.63.73.

¹⁸ See J. Gniska, '2 Cor 6:14-7:1 in the light of the Qumran texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', in J. Murphy-O'Connor (ed.), *Paul and Qumran. Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (G. Chapman: London, 1968) 48-68 at 66; J.A. Fitzmyer, S.J., 'Qumran and the interpolated paragraph in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1', in idem, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (G. Chapman: London, 1971) 205-217; Martin, *2 Corinthians* WBC, 195f.

¹⁹ Cf. Kee, 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', in *OTP* I, 775-781.

²⁰ Murphy-O'Connor, 'Philo and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1', *RB* 95 (1988) 55-69.

²¹ Furnish, *II Corinthians* AB, 376.

²² C. Heil, 'Die Sprache der Absonderung in 2 Kor 6,17 und bei Paulus', in R. Bieringer (ed.), *The Corinthian Correspondence* (BETL 125; Leuven UP / Peeters: Leuven, 1996) 717-729.

2 Cor 6:14-16a with its many antitheses seems very rigid in its admonishment to a certain form of separation from unbelievers when read at face value. However, much depends on the interpretation of the exhortation. The antitheses suggest a total incompatibility between the entities contrasted to each other. Does this mean that any contact with unbelievers is prohibited in this passage? A number of arguments speak against this idea.

First, the rhetorical force of the antitheses may be to get the message across that unbelievers should not have the kind of influence to make the effect of conversion of the believers undone or vain. This could explain the use of the Greek verb ἐτεροζυγεῖν in the opening exhortation, which denotes the activity of yoking unevenly or mismating, that is, the creation of an uneven, unbalanced situation. The unbalanced situation of a persistence in former sins is in fact what Paul fears to find among the Corinthians, as 2 Cor 12:20-21 reveals. It cannot be proved that the exhortation of 2 Cor 6:14 signifies the prohibition of every contact with unbelievers. In this respect, the exhortation of 2 Cor 6:14 is less unequivocal than the much clearer and stricter language of dissociation in 1 Cor 5:9,11, for the Greek μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι and μηδὲ συνεσθῆναι leave hardly any room for ambiguity. In my view, the exhortation rather serves to raise the awareness of the addressees about the necessity of keeping the way of life as believers untainted by sin. Thus, the exhortation aims to alert the mentality of the believers in a way probably similar to Paul's quotation of the contemporary proverb from Menander that 'bad company ruins good morals' in 1 Cor 15:33.

Secondly, if our passage reflected the interests of law-abiding Jews or Christian Jews who would strongly argue for separation from the Gentiles as 'unbelievers', it is striking that 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 lacks a direct reference to the Law. Our passage is further not as much focused on the observance of specific regulations as certain sectarian texts are. The *Testament of Levi* 19:1 also conveys antitheses, between light and darkness, and between the Law of the Lord and the works of Beliar. This last antithesis mirrors a clear concern with observance of the Law. The antithesis in 2 Cor 6:14 between righteousness and lawlessness or iniquity, depending on the translation of ἀνομία, is far less explicitly or demonstrably concerned with the observance of the Law.

The third argument which speaks against the idea of an absolute prohibition of contact with unbelievers may be drawn from Paul's Letter to the Romans. Romans 6:19 contrasts a former situation, without baptism and initiation into the faith in Christ as impurity (ἀκαθαρσία) and lawlessness (ἀνομία), to the new situation in which the Christian is marked by righteousness for sanctification (ἡ δικαιοσύνη εἰς ἁγιασμόν). In the context of this passage, Paul speaks the bodies of those whose changed situation through conversion he addresses. Interestingly, 2 Cor 6:14-16a, which refers to the contrast between righteousness and lawlessness, is followed up by a section which turns to the issue of separation from uncleanness for the purpose of holiness (2 Cor 6:16b-7:1). Thus, the antitheses in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 are paralleled in Pauline thought in the undisputed Pauline Letters.

Although the antitheses in 2 Cor 6:14-16a probably constitute a rhetorical mode through which the addressees are urged to a right mentality in their Christian way of life, it remains a fact that these antitheses express a strong sense of dualism. Paul's undisputed Letters, however, are not devoid of dualism either, considering the terminology in 1 Thess 5:5 about the 'sons of light' and the 'sons of the day' in contrast to the idea of belonging 'to the night or to darkness'. Likewise, Gal 5:16-26 conveys a sharp contrast between the 'works of the flesh' and the 'fruit of the Spirit'.

The dualism reflected by the antitheses in 2 Cor 6:14-16a may serve to protect the Corinthian community against the threat of corrupting influences from outside. Significantly, the passage following 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 includes references to mourning and repentance (2 Cor 7:7-10). 2 Cor 12:21 emphasises mourning and repentance for those among the Corinthians who continue to practise sins of impurity, immorality and licentiousness.

Mary Douglas has succinctly noted that the function of boundary marking and separation is not so much the imposition of a rigid dualism, but the creation of a “semblance of order” in view of an “inherently untidy experience”.²³ Since the dualist tendency of 2 Cor 6:14-16a is not supplemented by a detailed, descriptive account of separation as in the Qumranite sectarian text, the *Rule of the Community*, we are not justified to conclude that the passage evokes a sectarian social setting. The last antithesis between the Temple of God and idols is, however, particularly reminiscent of a contemporary Jewish background.

Non-Pauline and anti-Pauline features

It may be noted that the scriptural testimony in 2 Cor 6:16c-18²⁴ is not introduced by the more usual formula γέγραπται in Paul but by the words καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι. The verses quoted and altered are followed by the words λέγει κύριος (v.17) and λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ (v.18), whereas κύριος in Paul otherwise frequently refers to Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, as Margaret E. Thrall has noted, the phrase λέγει κύριος is paralleled by expressions in Rom 12:19, 14:11, and 1 Cor 14:21.²⁵ Furthermore, if the combination κύριος παντοκράτωρ in 2 Cor 6:18 is unique to Paul's Letters, so is the combination κύριος σαβαώθ, while both combinations are biblical Greek frequently occurring in the Septuagint.

The concept of the ‘believer’, πίστος, in 2 Cor 6:15 has been interpreted as a non-Pauline term.²⁶ This interpretation can be countered by reference to 1 Cor 4:17 in which Paul talks about Timothy as πίστὸν ἐν κυρίῳ. Furthermore, 1 Cor 14:22 contrasts ἀπίστοι to τοῖς πιστεύουσιν in the context of discourse about that which edifies the church.

The sanctification mentioned in 2 Cor 7:1 “in the fear of the Lord”, ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ, has further been interpreted as a non-Pauline idea of an action for which all responsibility falls on the believers, independent from God's supervision.²⁷ The concept of fear of the Lord is, however, paralleled in Isaiah 11:2 which relates godly fear to the Spirit of God (πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, LXX; יהוה ירוח, MT). The idea of sanctification may be compared with the use of the verb שׁקדוּת which signifies sanctification in 1QH^a XIX, 10-11.13. Thus, the seemingly non-Pauline idea of sanctification expressed by the verb ἐπιτελεῖν in 2 Cor 7:1 is understandable against the background of contemporary Jewish tradition. Josephus often uses this same verb in the context of offering sacrifices in the Jerusalem Temple cult.

Finally, we may challenge the idea of ‘anti-Pauline features’²⁸ in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 on general grounds. The early church, as represented in the later New Testament writings such as the Acts of the Apostles, has granted Paul an important place in the apostolic mission to the diaspora. The pseudepigraphic authors who supposedly wrote the Deutero-Pauline Letters can neither have been opponents of Paul with regard to his mission to the Gentiles in the diaspora. It is therefore unlikely that opponents of Paul could have inserted 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 as an ‘anti-Pauline’ fragment into the manuscript tradition of that same church concerning Paul's Second Letter to the Corinthians. The manuscript tradition, which does not provide a single example

²³ Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 5.

²⁴ Cf. Furnish, *II Corinthians* AB, 371-383 at 373; Fitzmyer, ‘4QTestimonia and the New Testament’, *TS* 18 (1957) 513-37, referring to the beginning of the *testimonia* hypothesis postulated by E. Hatch in 1889.

²⁵ Thrall, *II Corinthians I-VII* ICC, 478.

²⁶ Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 373.

²⁷ Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 376.

²⁸ Cf. Furnish, *II Corinthians* AB, 376-377 mentions ‘anti-Pauline features’, “in no way incompatible with the views of Paul's opponents” referring to the position of H.D. Betz.

of omission of this pericope,²⁹ does not support such an ingenious theory either, for if the idea conveyed in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 were anti-Pauline, traces of controversy with the Pauline camp within the church could be expected to be extant in the manuscript tradition.

3.1.3 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 in the context of 2 Cor 6-7

Finally, the argument that 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 is out of place in the context of 2 Cor 6-7 depends on whether one interprets this pericope as an interruption of a subject treated in the verses preceding and following 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. As we have seen before, however, Paul does not write a systematic digression in which he closes the discussion of one subject before he opens the discussion of another.

The subject of exhortation to the Corinthians, at the instrument to open their hearts to Paul in 2 Cor 6:13 and 7:2 is not necessarily contradicted by 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. This pericope might be read as Paul's instruction for the Corinthians' sanctification which may help remove the restrictions in the Corinthians' hearts (2 Cor 6:12) caused by their possible lack of dissociation and repentance from iniquities in their midst (cf. 2 Cor 7:8-9f., 13:19-21). 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 may thus recapitulate the idea of boundary marking.

3.1.4 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 as a Pauline passage

The interpolation theory has been defended in older scholarship,³⁰ and revived by William O. Walker, Jr. However, more recently several scholars have tended to argue in favour of authenticity on the basis of a theory according to which Paul used a pre-existing composition and adapted it to his own purpose.³¹ Recently, scholars have also become more sceptical about the argument that perceived similarities between 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 and the sectarian thought of Qumran would point to the non-Pauline nature of the pericope.³² Having outlined some of the arguments concerning the interpolation hypothesis which may be refuted, I join the growing consensus about 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 as a *Pauline* passage, at least in its end-redaction.

In the case of Pauline redaction, the question arises whether 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 in its entirety or only the testimonium in 2 Cor 6:16c-18 should be regarded as of pre-Pauline origin. In view of the divergent introductory formulas to the scriptural quotations in 2 Cor 6:16c-18, and the analogy between the themes in 2 Cor 6:14-16b.7:1 and Paul's other Letters, I favour the latter possibility that only the 'testimonium' is of pre-Pauline origin. The stylised dialectic in 2 Cor 6:14-16a.7:1 conveys issues of purity from iniquities and idolatry related to Paul's use of temple imagery in 1 Corinthians. The testimonium thus serves as proof-text.

²⁹ The manuscript tradition of the New Testament does provide examples of the omission of an entire verse or passage, for instance, Mark 7:16, 11:26, 16:9-20, which may attest to different levels of redaction.

³⁰ Cf. e.g. the articles by Fitzmyer, 'Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1', 271-280, and Gnilka, '2 Cor 6:14-7:1: in the light of the Qumran texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', 48-68.

³¹ On this cf. e.g. Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 383: "What evidence there is would seem to be best satisfied by the hypothesis that the passage is of non-Pauline composition, but was incorporated by the apostle himself as he wrote this letter"; Martin, *2 Corinthians* WBC, 193-194: "we see 6:14-7:1 as authentic in the sense that Paul was the one to place it in the letter at this curious juncture"; Thrall, *II Corinthians I-VII* ICC, 35: "The discussion has shown that neither contextual nor theological arguments are sufficient to prove conclusively that 2 Cor 6.14-7.1 is non-Pauline". Cf. Bieringer, '2 Korinther 6,14-7,1 im Kontext des 2. Korintherbriefes', 570 about "eine gewisse Tendenz in der neueren Forschung, die Authentizität und Integrität von 6,14-7,1 zu bejahen".

³² Cf. e.g. Thrall, *II Corinthians I-VII* ICC, 35 about the supposition of an 'un-Pauline' hortatory tradition in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1: "That this tradition should be seen as specifically Qumranian is doubtful", thus arguing against a persisting idea in previous scholarship, e.g. that of J.A. Fitzmyer, J. Gnilka, R.P. Martin (193-195) as cited in previous notes.

3.2 Text, translation, and variant readings

6:14 Μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις· τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀνομία, ἢ τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος; 15 τίς δὲ συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελιάρ, ἢ τίς μερίς πιστῶ μετὰ ἀπίστου; 16 τίς δὲ συγκατάθεσις ναῶ θεοῦ μετὰ εἰδώλων; ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἔσμεν ζῶντος, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεὸς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μου λαός. 17 διὸ ἐξέλθατε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν καὶ ἀφορίσθητε, λέγει κύριος, καὶ ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἄπτεσθε· κἀγὼ εἰσδέξομαι ὑμᾶς 18 καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθε μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ. 7:1 Ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀγαπητοί, καθαρῶμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἀγιωσύνην ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ.

‘6:14 Do not become unevenly yoked with unbelievers; for what participation is there between righteousness and lawlessness, or what fellowship does light have with darkness? 15 And what agreement is there between Christ and Belial, or what does the believer share with the unbeliever? 16 And what union is there of God's Temple with idols? For we are the Temple of the living God, as God has said:

I will dwell among them and walk among them,³³ and I will be their God and they will be my people. 17 Therefore, go out of their midst and be separate, says the Lord, and do not remain in contact³⁴ with what is unclean; and I will receive you 18 and I will be a father to you and you will be sons and daughters to me, says the Lord Almighty.

7:1 Thus, having these promises, beloved ones, let us cleanse ourselves from every defilement of flesh and spirit, accomplishing sanctification through³⁵ fear of God.

The verse in which the metaphor of the Temple figures, 2 Cor 6:16 b, is problematic. The established Greek text, reading ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἔσμεν ζῶντος, is supported by various important codices (e.g. B, D, L, P) and minuscular manuscripts.³⁶ The main variant reading, ὑμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἔστε ζῶντος, supported by various ancient witnesses of the text, appears to harmonise 2 Cor 6:16 with Paul's temple imagery in 1 Corinthians. The rhetorical context of 2 Corinthians is, however, different from that of 1 Corinthians. In 1 Corinthians, Paul introduces the metaphor of the Temple through rhetorical questions to exhort his readers to stop their quarreling and iniquities. At the same time Paul presupposes the effect of such exhortations in 2 Corinthians and includes his addressees in the first person plural (cf. 2 Cor 3:18).³⁷

³³ The Hellenistic Jewish context does not necessarily prescribe a notion of God's 'indwelling in', as Philo's exegesis of LXX Num 14:9, ἀφέστημεν ὁ καιρὸς ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ὁ δὲ κύριος ἐν ἡμῖν, in *Posterity* 122 attests. Thus, F.H. Colson & G.H. Whitaker, *Philo* II (Harvard UP: Cambridge, Mass. & London, 1929) 398-399 translate ὡσθ' οἷς μὲν ὁ ψυχῆς βίος τετίμηται, λόγος θεοῦ ἐνοικεῖ καὶ ἐμπεριπατεῖ, οἷς δ' ὁ τῶν ἡδονῶν, ἐφήμερον καὶ κατεψευσμένην ἔχουσιν εὐκαιρίαν, as "From this we see that the Divine word dwells and walks among those for whom the soul's life is an object of honour, while those who value the life given to its pleasures, experience good times that are transient and fictitious". Cf. my chap. 7, section 3.2, n. 61.

³⁴ This translation corresponds in my view best with the preceding verbs in 2 Cor 6:17. About the sense of the middle form ἄπτεσθαι as 'clinging to, remaining in contact with', cf. John 20:17.

³⁵ On this use of ἐν, Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (171990) § 219.

³⁶ B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (UBS: London & New York, 1975) 580 notes that the established Greek text is "strongly supported by both *Alexandrian* and *Western* witnesses" and further suggests that it is a *lectio difficilior* in view of the fact that the variant reading ὑμεῖς ... ἔστε reminds one of 1 Cor 3:16 and of the context, "while there is no reason for putting ἡμεῖς ... ἔσμεν in its stead".

³⁷ In many other cases in Paul's Letters, however, the first person plural denotes Paul's part in addressing his readers.

How does Paul's emphatic *we* in 2 Cor 6:16b affect our understanding of the temple imagery? One possible interpretation could be that Paul implies and doubly emphasises a contrast between '*we*', the believers as God's Temple, and '*they*', the unbelievers who persist in moral impurity. A second possible interpretation could be that Paul emphasises his relation and solidarity with the Corinthians as '*we*' against '*they*'; the opponents of Paul's gospel mission. Evidence for this interpretation occurs in 2 Cor 11, where Paul alludes to the opposition against his mission by other missionaries and apostles (cf. 2 Cor 11:2-29) and to his fear of the Corinthians' susceptibility to them (2 Cor 11:2-4).³⁸ A third possible interpretation concerns the contrast between '*we*', the Christian believers as God's Temple, and '*they*', the Israelites of the old covenant (cf. 2 Cor 3) who worship God in the Jerusalem Temple cult. *Mutatis mutandis*, this third interpretation is supported by scholars who advocate the idea that Paul's temple imagery substituted the Jerusalem Temple cult.

The problem of interpretation of Paul's temple imagery outlined above requires further discussion in the subsequent section. It should be noted here that Paul does not oppose the Israelites in general but the unbelievers who boast of their Jewish descent (cf. 2 Cor 3:4-18, 4:3-4f., 11:21-22). Paul even identifies with the Israelites, albeit in a polemical context of rival claims made by Paul's opponents (2 Cor 11:1-22f.).

The minor variant reading ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναοὶ θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ζῶντος to 2 Cor 6:16b contradicts the line of thought in 2 Cor 6:16 which begins with the rhetorical contrast between the *singular* ναὸς θεοῦ and the *plural* εἰδωλα. Other variant readings can be omitted here, since they are far less significant for the meaning of the text or since they are not supported by enough textual witnesses to make them appear credible.

3.3 Cultic imagery in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1

2 Cor 6:14-7:1 incorporates concepts which are clearly derived from a contemporary Jewish context, while 2 Cor 6:16c-18 constitutes a 'testimonium' of verses from Scripture. The search for any substantial parallels on the pagan Hellenistic side can therefore be precluded as an issue beforehand. Nevertheless, the interpretation of the terms 'believer' and 'unbeliever' in the context of the pericope and in the wider context of 2 Corinthians could provide a clue to what extent pagan unbelievers, Paul's Christian-Jewish opponents or unbelievers in general are implied by the term ἄπιστοι.

2 Cor 6:16 most explicitly contrasts the concept of God's Temple, ναὸς θεοῦ, as applied to the community, to idolatry, the worship of εἰδωλα. The idea of this absolute contrast is firmly rooted in the Jewish monotheistic tradition. The perception of a disjunction between idolatry and the worship of God is characteristically Pauline, as the evidence of his other Letters, in particular in 1 Corinthians (cf. 1 Thess 1:9; 1 Cor 5:10-11, 6:9, 8:1.4-10f., 10:7.14-22, 12:2; Gal 5:20; Rom 2:22), reveals. Since Paul has been so intensively engaged in the exhortation against iniquities, among which idolatry is spelled out in 1 Cor 8 and 10, it is not surprising that the contrast between God's Temple and idols occurs in 2 Cor 6:16. Paul, after all, fears that the iniquities persist among the Corinthians (cf. 2 Cor 12:20-21).

With regard to 2 Cor 6:16, scholarly opinions differ on the question whether the interpretation of the entire pericope 2 Cor 6:17-7:1 can be related to the theme of the community as Temple in 2 Cor 6:16. Victor Paul Furnish has argued against this idea, even though he grants that 2 Cor 7:1 conveys *cultic* language.³⁹ In other scholarly literature, 2 Cor

³⁸ Note that in 2 Cor 11:22 Paul compares himself to his opponents in particularly *Israelite* categories.

³⁹ Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 375 against G.D. Fee.

6:14-7:1 in its entirety is in fact regarded as a passage focused on the issue of the community as the Temple of God.⁴⁰

2 Cor 6:17a-c, a verse quoting Isaiah 52:11, has been interpreted as the imperative of maintaining a cultic separation from uncleanness. C. Heil contrasted this idea of separation (ἀφορίζειν) to that which occurs in Paul's other Letters (Gal 1:15, 2:12; Rom 1:1).⁴¹ However, Paul's undisputed Letters are not entirely devoid of the idea of cleanness as a ritual boundary. In Paul's viewpoint in 1 Cor 7:13-14, the consecration of the unbeliever by the believer in a mixed marriage makes the difference between the holiness or, in the case of no consecration, uncleanness of the offspring.⁴² It may therefore not be anomalous for Paul to quote a proof-text about abstinence from every uncleanness, whose original context was motivated by cultic separation from impurity. The context of 2 Cor 6:17 precludes the idea of a purely cultic concern with separation from uncleanness, as the antithesis between righteousness and lawlessness (2 Cor 6:14) also attests to a moral concern.

Finally, 2 Cor 7:1 refers to defilement, μολυσμός, of both body and spirit, and contrasts this to the ideal of purification and perfect holiness. What kind of purification from what kind of defilement does Paul have in mind? We have an example in 1 Corinthians 8:7 of a reference to defilement: 'However, the knowledge is not with all people, but some, through their consciousness up to the present time of the idol, eat food as food offered to idols, and their conscience being weak is defiled'. In this example, the related verb μολυνεῖν is used and concerns defilement which comprises aspects of both body and mind. This is not to say that we should interpret 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 only in the light of the issue of food offered to idols.⁴³ In my view, we should rather understand 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 as serving a more comprehensive purpose of condemning all aspects in relationships with unbelievers which could cause an unbalanced situation by tending to the pagan, idolatrous side.

The 'we', which represents the Temple of the living God in 2 Cor 6:16b, links the apostle firmly with the addressees of his mission, thereby implicitly countering the claims of Jewish descent of Paul's opponents. As Paul has defined those who reject his gospel as unbelievers in 2 Cor 4:3-4, his purpose is not the substitution of the Israelite covenant, but its fulfilment through the gospel of Christ. Paul's notion of the community as the Temple of the living God should be understood in contrast to unbelief from the part of Gentiles, Jews and opponents of Paul alike.

4. Summary

The Second Letter to the Corinthians comprises a response to the growing opposition to Paul's gospel mission, urging the Corinthians to show solidarity with him. These circumstances also determine Paul's use of cultic imagery in 2 Corinthians.

2 Cor 2:14-17 represents the apostolic mission in cultic terms. Paul's positive analogy with the cultic service of the Temple cult underlines God's true commission of Paul's

⁴⁰ Cf. Martin, *2 Corinthians* WBC, 189-191, referring to this pericope as 'The Temple of the Living God (6:14-7:1)'; Thrall, *II Corinthians I-VII*, 478 about 2 Cor 6:17d-18: "The quotations serve to make the point that believers, as God's temple and God's people, are welcomed into a familial relationship with God"; Albl, "And Scripture cannot be broken", 177-178 refers to 'A Temple Testimonia Collection in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1'.

⁴¹ See Heil, 'Die Sprache der Absonderung in 2 Kor 6,17 und bei Paulus', 717-729 at 721-726. Cf. my discussion in section 3.1.2 above on 'non-Pauline ideas'.

⁴² Cf. Gillihan, 'A New Halakhic Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7:14', 711-744.

⁴³ As done by Fee, 'II Corinthians VI.14-VII.1 and food offered to idols', 140-161 at 143: "I propose that this paraenesis has a direct relationship to the question of food offered to idols".

apostleship and the ultimate triumph of his gospel of Jesus Christ. In this connection, Paul contrasts his commission by God and the sincerity of his own apostleship to the insincerity of others who “peddle the word of God”

With regard to the rhetorical unit 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, we have shown that this unit can be integrated as a *Pauline* passage in the discussion about cultic terminology. Within 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, 2 Cor 6:16c-18 should be considered as Paul’s redaction of a pre-existing testimonium, as the theocentric notion of Lord (as apart from Paul’s christological usage) in this passage and the divergent introductory formula to the scriptural quotation reveal.

Paul identifies both the Corinthians and himself with the concept of the Temple of the living God in 2 Cor 6:16. The contrast between God’s Temple and idols in 2 Cor 6:16 is comparable to that between the service of the ‘living and true God’ and idols in 1 Thess 1:9 and to various exhortations against or negative references to idolatry in 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 5:10-11, 6:9, 8:1.4-10f., 10:7.14-22, 12:2).

The emphatic *we* as subject of the metaphor of the Temple in 2 Cor 6:16 provokes the question whether Paul may have in mind a particular contrast between ‘we’ and ‘they’, however identified. A closer examination of the context yields the idea that the unbeliever stands as a collective noun for the ‘they’, that is, those who do not believe Paul’s gospel and even oppose it. The emphatic self-definition as the Temple of the living God does not necessarily entail a substitution for the Jerusalem Temple, since those called to faith come from both Jewish and Gentile backgrounds. Furthermore, in spite of his reference to the Israelites in the context of the old ‘veiled’ covenant (2 Cor 3:4-18), Paul also identifies himself with the Israelites (cf. 2 Cor 11:22; Rom 11:1).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Paul's cultic imagery in context

Paul wrote his Letters during the late Second Temple period, that is, before the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple. Paul's cultic imagery has been understood largely in connection with other early Christian writings. However, most of the New Testament writings are dated after 70 CE and reflect different concerns with regard to the growth of the church and to the relation with Judaism. The later evidence of the Acts of the Apostles provides indications about the importance of the historical context of the Second Temple period for our understanding of the beginnings of Christianity. The commitment of the Jewish followers of Jesus to the Temple cult is abundantly attested (cf. e.g. Acts 3:1.11, 5:25, 21:17-26). Paul himself refers to the contemporary Israelite cult, that is, the Jerusalem Temple cult (1 Cor 9:13, 10:18; Rom 9:4).

The distinction between pre-70 CE and post-70 CE historical contexts matters for a proper understanding of Paul in contrast to post-70 CE Christian polemics against Judaism. Moreover, we should also distinguish between Paul's Letters and the later contexts of other New Testament writings. A historically sound comparison of Paul's temple imagery with the other early Christian writings depends on the careful reconstruction of pre-70 CE levels of tradition about the early Jesus-movement and the Temple. The critical comparison between canonical and apocryphal Gospel traditions, especially those in the Jewish-Christian Gospels and the *Gospel of Thomas*, creates the impression that certain narrative contexts of polemic against the Jerusalemite authorities are editorial. This may for instance be the case with the parable of the vineyard. The cultic imagery in the Deutero-Pauline Letters is different from Paul's cultic imagery, since it stands in the context of ecclesiological, apocalyptic, and moral concerns different from those of Paul. A synoptic comparison between Pauline and Deutero-Pauline passages, as attempted by scholars like G. Klinzing and W. Strack, may therefore be useful only for an understanding of post-Pauline developments.

The influential approach of 'spiritualisation', introduced by the study of H. Wenschkewitz in 1932, is an important example of the search for a historical context to cultic imagery in the New Testament writings which is flawed by uncritical assumptions. The idea of 'spiritualisation' as a historical process within Judaism, of which the New Testament supposedly constitutes its culmination, has become challenged since the 1970s. However, the approach of 'spiritualisation' has not definitely been replaced by a new paradigm, as recent scholarly literature indicates. Paul's temple imagery in the Corinthian correspondence is typically understood as a 'spiritual Temple' in connection with spiritualised ideas of cult in other New Testament writings. The idea of the spiritualisation of cult in Paul's Letters is in my view unfounded. Romans 12:1 provides an interesting general example in which ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία has been interpreted as 'spiritual worship'; the equation of λογικός with 'spiritual' on the basis of 1 Peter 2:2-5 amounts to a harmonisation which unjustly imposes later Christian notions of the Temple on Paul's text. Romans 12:1-2 rather denotes 'reasoned worship' which does not conform to the surrounding world even in the face of hardship and persecution. The issue of interpretation is the more important for the Corinthian correspondence which comprises the only explicit temple imagery among Paul's undisputed Letters.

A proper historical interpretation of Paul's cultic imagery takes the historical context contemporary to the apostle into account rather than uncritically comparing Paul's Letters with other early Christian writings. In Paul's time the idea of cult was centered around a

sanctuary in the case of both pagan Graeco-Roman religions and Jewish religion. Paul's cultic imagery of sacrifice, priesthood, and temple derives from this ancient cultural context, since there was no separate Christian cult in this sense in Paul's time. Paul uses cultic imagery in both literal and figurative senses. The interpretation of Paul's cultic imagery depends on the way in which one perceives the relation between these different senses of cult. Paul's temple imagery in the Corinthian correspondence has clearly monotheistic connotations. Paul also refers to Israel's cult in 1 Cor 10:18. It is therefore useful to look for perspectives on the Temple within pre-70 CE Judaism and the early Jesus-movement as a context to Paul's cultic imagery.

2. Paul's Judaism in context

2.1 Paul's Judaism and Second Temple Judaism

Paul's own ideas about his relation to Judaism determine the interpretation of his cultic imagery in the contemporary context of Second Temple Judaism. The question of Paul's relation to Judaism is by itself a matter of interpretation. Paul's information about his previous way of life in Judaism therefore requires close examination. This information, occurring mainly in Galatians and fragmentarily in Philippians, cannot be read as purely autobiographical testimony. Paul writes his Letters in the context of a particular rhetorical situation. It may thus be expected that information given by Paul about his Jewish background and his relation to Judaism serves a particular purpose within the argumentation of his respective Letters.

J. Knox's study about Paul has set down the methodological principle to give priority to Paul's Letters rather than to Acts for the study of Paul's life and thought. However, Knox's idea that Jerusalem, as the location of Paul's Pharisaic study, is the invention of Luke-Acts contrary to Paul's information in his own Letters cannot be justified. A rhetorical-critical reading of Galatians 1:13-2:14 yields the idea that Paul does not aim to give a complete account of his visits to Jerusalem, but only lists his post-conversion visits to the city. As much as there is a silence in Paul's Letters about Jerusalem as the place of his Pharisaic education, this is also the case with Damascus. Contextual evidence, mainly from the works of Flavius Josephus, speaks for Jerusalem as the place of Pharisaic education rather than any other place. Paul's connection with Jerusalem is important for our understanding of his exposure to Israelite traditions.

My rhetorical interpretation of Gal 1:13-14 concludes that this passage should be read as Paul's breakaway from his former understanding of Judaism which had to be kept uncorrupted from challenges to the ancestral traditions. According to this understanding of Judaism Paul broke away from a way of life which led him to persecution of the church. In my view, this passage does not justify the conclusion of Paul's breakaway from Judaism and Jewish traditions at large. On the contrary, Paul expresses his sense of an Israelite identity and of belonging to Israelite traditions (cf. Rom 9:1-5, 11:1; 2 Cor 11:22). That which Paul has come to count as a loss because of Christ in Philippians 3:4-7 is the pride of the flesh as displayed by Paul's opponents. In another context, Paul writes about the advantages of the Jews to whom the oracles of God have been entrusted (Rom 3:2) and whose calling by God is irrevocable (Rom 11:29).

Paul's Jewish background is also reflected in his relation to the contemporary Jewish culture of scriptural interpretation. Paul's language comprises several cases of Semiticisms (Hebraisms and Aramaisms), while certain expressions, such as 'works of the Law' in Galatians, resound theological concepts current in contemporary Palestinian Jewish culture, as

the evidence of 4QMMT shows. The language of Paul's 'quotations' from Scripture cannot be understood as corresponding exclusively to the Septuagint as a fixed text tradition. Several Pauline 'quotations' diverge significantly from the Septuagint and may be interpreted as exponents of Paul's familiarity with the Semitic scriptural culture. The synagogues provided the predominant socio-religious context to Jewish scriptural reading and interpretation in Israel as well as the in Diaspora in Paul's time. The pluriformity of religious culture in Jerusalem may have constituted a connection for Paul with Palestinian-Jewish exegetical traditions and ideas about the Temple known from his previous life as a Pharisee.

These Palestinian-Jewish traditions and ideas about the Temple are reflected in the works of Philo and Josephus, the pseudepigrapha, the literature of Qumran, and early rabbinic literature. Patristic sources, like Hippolytus' *Refutation of all heresies*, sometimes add certain details to this evidence. In my view, the discussion about the boundary lines between sectarian and non-sectarian texts among the literature of Qumran provides some room for supposing that certain sectarian ideas about the Temple circulated in broader strata of Judean society. For instance, the idea of God's indwelling presence among his people, which occurs several times in the Temple Scroll in connection with the temple theme, could well be related to broader Jewish traditions of temple theology. Certain ideas of the defilement of the contemporary Temple in Qumran sectarian literature are also paralleled in pseudepigraphical literature. Jewish temple-theological traditions contemporary to Paul provide evidence not only of ideas of ritual purity, but also of moral connotations to holiness and purity.

2.2 Paul's Judaism and the early Jesus-movement

Paul's relation to Jesus and early Jesus-traditions has itself been the subject of a long-standing debate. Since Paul's Letters do not aim to give a biography of Jesus, they cannot be compared to the Gospels for details about the historical Jesus. The levels of Jesus-tradition which can be dated before 70 CE yield a picture of Jesus and the early Jesus-movement in confrontation with the priestly establishment of Jerusalem. However, Jesus' prophetic criticism of the Temple cult does not preclude his concern about purity, as is revealed by the case of the healed leper whom Jesus refers to the priest. Nor did the early Jesus-movement in its early stages break away from Jewish temple religiosity. Paul's analogy between the priestly service and the apostolic commission in 1 Cor 9:13-14 may reflect this early Jesus-tradition.

The polemic against the Jerusalem Temple in Stephen's speech may mirror the bitter antagonism between the early Jesus-movement, which found its gospel rejected, and the Jerusalemite leadership. By way of analogy, Paul's contrast between the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem in Gal 4:25-26 also occurs in the rhetorical context of a polemic against his opponents. Nevertheless, the idea *per se* of Israel's worship is not presented as idolatry in Paul's Letters. Thus Paul differs from the radical standpoint of Stephen.

The conflict within Syro-Palestinian Christianity about the question whether Gentile converts should live like Jews probably fuelled the opposition between Jewish-minded circles (the leaders of the Jerusalem church) and Pauline circles about the Gentile mission. This antagonism may explain the negative rhetorical context of several passages in Paul's Letters which speak about Judaism and a Jewish way of life. Paul's bottom line position is that each state of calling, whether as a Jew or a Greek, is respectable (1 Cor 1:22-24, 7:17-24, 10:32).

While 1 Cor 9:13-14 provides a case for Paul's dependence on early Jesus-tradition, it cannot be demonstrated that Paul's temple imagery is rooted in pre-Pauline Christianity. Moreover, in 1 Cor 3:10 Paul stresses his own role in the process of community building as that of a skilled master builder. It may be assumed that Paul's temple imagery derives from

the apostle's own thought which interweaves certain pre-existing connotations to the temple concept with the application of the metaphor of the Temple.

3. Cultic imagery in the Corinthian correspondence and its interpretation

3.1 The community as Temple: a substitution for the Jewish worship cult?

Most scholars have interpreted the temple imagery in the Corinthian correspondence (1 Cor 3:16-17, 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16) as a substitution for the Jewish worship cult. This interpretation often depends on the reading of other passages in Paul's Letters, such as Rom 3:21-26, 1 Cor 5:6-8, 1 Cor 10:18, and 2 Cor 3:4-18. Paul's temple imagery is usually read in the light of how one perceives Christ's sacrifice and atoning death in Paul's theology. That is, the christology which supposedly underlies Paul's temple imagery determines the scholarly perspective on Paul's relation to the Jewish worship cult.

Is it possible to link Paul's idea of Christ's sacrifice with the 'theocentric orientation' of his temple imagery (to borrow a term from R.J. McKelvey)? The view of Christ's sacrifice as a substitution for all sacrifices in the Temple appears in a systematical way only in later New Testament writings, such as Hebrews. Paul does not write about a Temple of Christ or 'holy Temple in the Lord' as in Eph 2:21 either. The explicit equation of the church as the body of Christ with the 'true', 'spiritual' Temple occurs in patristic literature and reflects later, post-70 CE theology. In conflating one Pauline metaphor (the body of Christ) with the other (God's Temple), we run the risk of imposing later developments in christology on the interpretation of Paul's temple imagery.

In my study, I agree with the objection against the current scholarly notion of substitution, as tentatively raised in an article by Böttrich. I have taken the objection a step further and tested ideas about Paul's cultic imagery on the basis of a detailed analysis of each relevant passage in the Corinthian correspondence, at times informed by information from Romans and Philippians. Consequently, I have come to the conclusion that the idea of substitution is not demonstrable from Paul's own Letters. The institution of Christian rituals, such as the Lord's Supper, is expressed in cultic terms in 1 Cor 5:6-8. Does this expression by itself denote a substitution for the contemporary Jewish worship cult? In my view the metaphor of Christ as the paschal lamb rather signifies a symbolism which is universal in its outlook, applying to the realm of converts from among both the Jews and the Gentiles. The new covenant in Christ, expressed through the Lord's Supper (1 Cor 11:23-32), does not constitute the abrogation of or substitution for the old covenant, but serves as its renewal and fulfilment in Paul's theology (cf. 2 Cor 3:14, Rom 3:21-31). A previously neglected passage with regard to its significance for Paul's attitude to the Jerusalem Temple cult, 1 Cor 9:13, shows that the priestly service served as a positive model or parallel for the apostolic commission. 1 Cor 10:18 refers to the cult of the Israel 'according to the flesh'. Does the evidence of 1 Cor 10:18 in its rhetorical context convey a rejection and supersession of the Israelite cult? In my view this reading of 1 Cor 10:18 is not supported by the context. The Jerusalem Temple cult is instead presented as another example of the incompatibility between worship of God and idolatry.

3.2 Paul's temple imagery as a normative model

Paul's temple imagery should in my view be interpreted as a normative model which serves a paideutic purpose of teaching the Corinthians a holy way of life. Paul envisages the

Summary and Conclusions

Corinthian congregation as the body of Christ in other rhetorical contexts. Paul's christology presupposes the gospel of Christ as the foundation for the Corinthians as God's building (1 Cor 3:9-11). While Paul introduces the metaphor of the community as Temple, he also builds on contemporary Jewish temple-theological traditions, just as he elaborates on Jewish monotheism in the context of the gospel of Christ in 1 Cor 8:4-6. The Temple as the expression of God's presence exists for the sake of God's people in Jewish temple theology. Therefore, metaphorical levels of thought about the Temple and cultic symbolism are not necessarily in tension with the institution of the concrete Jerusalem Temple in contemporary Jewish traditions.

Paul's christology explicitly contrasts the worship of the Lord Christ with the worship of demons, that is, idolatry (1 Cor 10:14-22; 2 Cor 6:14-7:1). This contrast is modelled on Jewish monotheism which presupposes the incompatibility between the worship of God and idol worship. Paul prohibits table fellowship with those who practise certain forms of wickedness (1 Cor 5:9-13) rather than institutionalising an absolute separation of table fellowship between converts from among Jews and Gentiles, as proposed by his opponents (Gal 2:11-14). The fact that Paul does draw a boundary line between idolatry and monotheism strengthens the conclusion that his temple imagery also has positive connections with Jewish temple-theological traditions.

There is a general connection with metaphorical levels of thought about the Temple and cultic symbolism in Palestinian Jewish as well as Hellenistic Jewish traditions, as reflected in the works of Philo, Josephus, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. In this respect, it is remarkable that we encounter cultic symbolism not only with regard to the sectarian movements of the Therapeutae, the Essenes, and the Qumran community, but also in relation to pre-70 CE synagogues (cf. *J.W.* 4.408-409; *CII* 2.1433). Paul's idea of God's indwelling Spirit among his community as Temple can be connected to the context of Jewish temple-theological developments in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

There is a specific connection of Paul's metaphor of the body as Temple in 1 Cor 6:19 with Palestinian Jewish traditions which also presuppose an interrelationship between the purity of the body and the purity of the Temple. This is the case in the *Damascus Document* and the different textual traditions of the *Testament of Levi*. In the *Damascus Document*, the image of the 'three nets of Belial' presupposes an interrelation between sexual immorality and the defilement of the Temple. The Aramaic *Testament of Levi* from the Cairo Geniza explicitly likens the priestly seed to a sanctuary, and emphasises bodily purity as distinct from all defilement, including defilement by sexual immorality. Since Paul has introduced the metaphor of the community as God's Temple, he can also apply this idea of holiness to the individual members of the community. Paul therefore shares moral connotations in his temple imagery with Palestinian-Jewish culture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Sources

1.1 Biblical literature

- The Bible in Aramaic. Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts.* (A. Sperber, ed.). 5 volumes. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959-1973.
- Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (R. Kittel, K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, eds., in cooperation with H.P. Rüger and J. Ziegler). Fourth revised edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990.
- Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (R. Weber, B. Fischer, H.I. Frede, H.F.D. Sparks, W. Thiele, and R. Gryson, eds.). Fourth revised edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus. The New Testament, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas.* Facsimile edition. (H. and K. Lake, eds.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.
- The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible. The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (M. Abegg, Jr., P. Flint, and E. Ulrich eds.). HarperSanFrancisco, 1999.
- The Jerusalem Bible* The English text revised and edited by H. Fisch. Jerusalem: Koren Publishers, 1998.
- The New Oxford annotated Bible with the Apocrypha. Revised Standard Version. Containing the Second Edition of the New Testament and an Expanded Edition of the Apocrypha.* An Ecumenical Study Bible (H.J. May and B.M. Metzger eds.). New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Novum Testamentum Graece* (E. and E. Nestle, B. and K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C.M. Martini, and B.M. Metzger eds.). Twenty-seventh revised edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.
- Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes. Duo volumina in uno.* volumen I *Leges et historiae*; volumen II *Libri poetici et prophetici* (A. Rahlfs ed.). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.

1.2 Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and other Jewish literature

Aramaic and Hebrew Letters

Lindenberger, J.M. *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters.* Edited by K.H. Richards. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1994, SBLWAW, 4.

Flavius Josephus

Niese, B. *Flavii Iosephi opera.* (With apparatus criticus). Berlin: Weidmann, 1888-1895.

Thackeray, H. St J., R. Marcus, A. Wikgren, and L.H. Feldman, eds. *Josephus.* LCL, 9 volumes, London: W. Heinemann & Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926-1965.

Mishnah

Albeck, C. *Shishah Sidre Mishnah.* 6 volumes. Jerusalem, 1952-1958.

Danby, H. *The Mishnah translated from the Hebrew with introduction and brief explanatory notes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Old Testament Pseudepigrapha

Charlesworth, J.H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* 2 volumes. Volume 1, *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*; volume 2, *Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works.* New York [etc.]: Doubleday, 1983 & 1985.

Puech, É. 'Le Testament de Lévi en araméen de la Geniza du Caire', *RevQ* 20/4 (2002) 511-556 (critical edition).

Philo of Alexandria

Cohn, L. and P. Wendland, eds. *Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt.* 7 volumes. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1896-1930.

Colson, F.H. and G.H. Whitaker (ed., transl., and notes), and J.W. Earp (indices) *Philo.* LCL, 10 volumes & 2 supplements, Cambridge, Mass. & London, England: Harvard University Press, 1927-1962.

Bibliography

1.3 The Dead Sea Scrolls and other texts from the Judaean Desert

Principal Editions

- Allegro, J.M. and A.A. Anderson *Qumran Cave 4. I (4Q158-4Q186)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969, DJD V.
- Alexander, P.S., and G. Vermes *Qumran Cave 4. XIX: 4Q Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998, DJD XXVI.
- Baillet, M., J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân. Exploration de la falaise. Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q. Le rouleau de cuivre*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962, DJD III.
- *Qumran grotte 4. III (4Q482-4Q520)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982, DJD VII.
- Barthélemy, D. and J.T. Milik *Qumran Cave 1*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955, DJD I.
- Baumgarten, J.M., ed. *Qumran Cave 4. XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996, DJD, XVIII.
- Burrows, M. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Volume II. Fascicle 2: Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline*. New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951.
- De Vaux, R. and J.T. Milik, eds. *Qumran grotte 4. II (4Q128-4Q157)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977, DJD VI.
- Eshel, E., H. Eshel, C. Newsom, B. Nitzan, E. Schuller, and A. Yardeni, eds. *Qumran Cave 4. VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts. Part 1*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998, DJD, XI.
- García Martínez, F., E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and A.S. van der Woude *Qumran Cave 11. II: 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998, DJD, XXIII.
- Newsom, C., *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1985.
- *et al.*, eds. *Qumran Cave 4. VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts. Part 1*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Qimron, E. 'The text of CDC', in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. (M. Broshi, ed.). Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992, 9-49.
- and J. Strugnell *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat ma'aseh ha-Torah*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994, DJD, X.
- *The Temple Scroll. A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions*. Bibliography by F. García Martínez. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Ben Gurion University of the Negev Press, 1996.
- Skehan, P.W., E. Ulrich, and J.E. Sanderson *Qumran Cave 4. IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992, DJD, IX.
- Sukenik, E.L. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press / Hebrew University, 1955.
- Tov, E., R.A. Kraft, and P.J. Parsons *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)*. (The Seiyal Collection I). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990, DJD, VIII.
- Ulrich, E. and F.M. Cross *Qumran Cave 4. VII: Genesis to Numbers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994, DJD, XII.
- , F.M. Cross, S.W. Crawford, J.A. Duncan, P.W. Skehan, E. Tov, and J. Trebolle Barrera *Qumran Cave 4. IX: Deuteronomy to Kings*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995, DJD, XIV.
- , F.M. Cross, R.E. Fuller, J.E. Sanderson, P.W. Skehan, and E. Tov *Qumran Cave 4. X: The Prophets*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997, DJD, XV.
- Yadin, Y. *Megillat ham-miqdash – The Temple Scroll*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, The Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Shrine of the Book. Hebrew edition, 1977; Revised English edition, 1983.

Electronic Edition

The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library on CD-ROM (© 1984-1999). Word Cruncher Publishing Technologies, Inc.; Brigham Young University / Academic Publishers Brill.

Study Editions

- Charlesworth, J.H. *et al.*, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations 1 Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck / Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project.
- *et al.*, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Rule of the Community. Photographic Multi-Language Edition*. Philadelphia: American Faith Institute / World Alliance & New York: Continuum, 1996.
- and Carol A. Newsom, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations 4B Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck / Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999). The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project.
- *et al.*, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translations 6B Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck / Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project.

Bibliography

García Martínez, F. and E.J.C. Tigchelaar *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition*. 2 volumes; 1 *1Q1-4Q273*, 2 *4Q274-11Q31*. Paperback edition. Leiden: Brill & Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000 (First published by Brill 1997 (vol. 1), 1998 (vol. 2)).

1.4 New Testament Apocrypha and other early Christian literature

Apocryphon of James (also known as *Epistula Jacobi*)

Malinine, M. *et al.*, eds. *Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha: Codex Jung F. I r – F. VIII v (p. 1-16)*. Zürich & Stuttgart, 1968.

Williams, F.E. 'The Apocryphon of James: I, 2:1.1-16.30', in *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex): Introductions, Texts, Translations, Indices*, H.W. Attridge, ed. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1985, NHS, 22, pp. 13-53.

Apostolic Fathers

Holmes, M.W., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers. Greek Texts and English Translations*. Updated edition of *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations of Their Writings*, 2d ed. (1st ed. 1891; 2d. ed. 1992) Edited and translated by J.B. Lightfoot and J.R. Harmer; edited and revised by M.W. Holmes. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1999.

Dialogue of the Saviour

Emmel, S., H. Koester, and E. Pagels, eds. *Nag Hammadi Codex III, 5: The Dialogue of the Saviour*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1984, NHS, 26.

Egerton Papyrus 2

Bell, H.I. and T.C. Skeat, eds. *Fragments of an unknown Gospel and other early Christian papyri*. With Five Plates. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1935.

Fayyum Fragment

Bickell, G. *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer I* (1887) 54-61.

Klostermann, E. *Apocrypha II Evangelien*. Third Edition. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1929, p. 23.

Gospel According to Thomas

The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Published under the auspices of the Department of Antiquities of the Arab Republic of Egypt in conjunction with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974, II, <32> - <51>, pp. 42-63.

Layton, B., ed. *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7 together with XIII, 2**, *Brit. Lib. Or. 4926 (1)*, and *P. Oxy. 1, 654, 655 I Gospel According to Thomas, Gospel According to Philip, Hypostasis of the Archons, and Indexes*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1989, NHS, 20, pp. 37-128, 264-289.

Gospel of Peter

Mara, M.G. *L'Évangile de Pierre*. Paris, 1973, SC, 201.

Neiryneck, F. 'The Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark', in *The New Testament in Early Christianity. La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif*, J.-M. Sevrin, ed. Leuven: Leuven University Press & Peeters, 1989, BETL, 86, pp. 171-175.

Gospel of the Egyptians

Klostermann, E. *Apocrypha II Evangelien*. Third Edition. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1929, pp. 15-16.

Hippolytus

Marcovich, M. *Hippolytus. Refutatio omnium haeresium*. Berlin [etc.]: Walter de Gruyter, 1986, PTS, 25.

Wendland, P. *Hippolytus Werke III Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1916, GCS, 26.

Jewish-Christian Gospels

Klijn, A.F.J. *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1992, VC Sup, 17.

Justin

Goodspeed, E.J. *Die ältesten Apologeten. Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen*. Iustinus Martyr. *Dialogus* (XI, pp. 90-265). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914.

Bibliography

New Testament Apocrypha

- de Santos Otero, Aurelio *Los Evangelios Apocrifos*. Madrid: Editorial Catolica, 1956.
- Schneemelcher, W., ed. *New Testament Apocrypha*. 2 volumes. Volume I, *Gospels and Related Writings*; volume II, *Writings relating to the Apostles; Apocalypses and related subjects*. Second Revised Edition. ET by R. McL. Wilson of *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989-1990. Cambridge: J. Clarke & Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991-1992.

Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 840

- Grenfell, B.P. and A.S. Hunt *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* V. London, 1908, no. 840.
- Stroker, W.D. *Extracanonical Sayings of Jesus*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1989, SBLRBS, 18, pp. 22-23.

Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1224

- Grenfell, B.P. and A.S. Hunt *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* X. London, 1914, pp. 1-10.
- Klostermann, E. *Apocrypha II Evangelien*. Third Edition. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1929, p. 26.

Secret Gospel of Mark

- Smith, M. *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973, pp. 445-453.

1.5 Documentary evidence

- Bruneau, P. 'Les Israélites de Délos et la juiverie délienne', *BCH* 106 (1982) 465-504.
- Bulletin Épigraphique*, vols. 1 (1938/1939) – 10 (1983), included in the *Revue des Études Grecques*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1888) - ..
- Clermont-Ganneau, M. *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* (1871) 132 (Greek inscription prohibiting foreigners to enter the second court of the Herodian Temple of Jerusalem).
- Corpus inscriptionum iudaicarum: recueil des inscriptions juives qui vont du IIIe siècle avant Jésus Christ au VIIe siècle de notre ère* (J.-B. Frey, ed.). 2 volumes. Rome: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologica Cristiana, 1936-1952.
- Deissmann, A. *Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt*. Fourth Revised Edition. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1923.
- Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe*. 2 volumes. (D. Noy, ed.). Vol. 1, *Italy (excluding the City of Rome), Spain and Gaul* (1993); vol. 2, *The City of Rome* (1995). Cambridge [etc.]: Cambridge University Press, 1993-1995.
- Lemaire, A. 'Burial Box of James the Brother of Jesus', *BAR* 28/6 (2002) 24-33, 70.
- A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1976* (vol. 1, 1981) – 1986-87 (vol. 9, 2002), G.H.R. Horsley and S.R. Llewelyn, eds. Nine volumes hitherto published. North Ryde: Macquarie University, The Ancient History Documentary Research Centre; Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1981-2002 - .., New Documents illustrating early Christianity.
- Reynolds, J. and R. Tannenbaum *Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Supplementum epigraphicum graecum*. Vol. I, 1923, Leiden: Sijthoff - .., Amsterdam, Gieben.

1.6 Greek and Latin Authors on Judaism and early Christianity

- Den Boer, W. *Scriptorum paganorum I-IV saec. de Christianis testimonia*. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Reinach, T., ed. *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au judaïsme*. Paris: Publications de la Société des études juives, 1895, *Fontes rerum Judaicarum*, 1.
- Stern, M., ed. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. 3 volumes. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974-1984, Publications of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Section of Humanities / *Fontes ad res Judaicas spectantes*.

1.7 Thesaurus Linguae Graecae

- Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. CD ROM Packard Humanities Institute. University of California. *TLG, A Digital Library of Greek Literature* (<http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/inst/textsearch>).

Bibliography

2. Tools

2.1 Dictionaries, grammars, concordances, indexes

- Bauer, W., F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt & F.W. Gingrich, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. Third Edition. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and F. Rehkopf, eds. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Seventeenth Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Crum, W.E. *A Coptic Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.
- Even-Shoshan, A. *A New Concordance of the Bible. Thesaurus of the Language of the Bible. Hebrew and Aramaic Roots, Words, Proper Names, Phrases and Synonyms*. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1996.
- Hatch, E. and H.A. Redpath *A Concordance to the Septuagint. And the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. “Introductory Essay” by R.A. Kraft & E. Tov; “Hebrew/ Aramaic Index to the Septuagint” by T. Muraoka. Second Edition. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1998.
- Jastrow, M. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. With an Index of Scriptural Quotations. New York: The Judaica Press, 1971.
- Junod, E. *et al.*, eds. *Biblia Patristica, Supplément: Philon d’Alexandrie*. Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 1982.
- Kautzsch, E. and A.E. Cowley, eds. *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*. Second English Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich, eds. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932-1979.
- Koehler, L. & W. Baumgartner, eds. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985.
- , W. Baumgartner and J.J. Stamm *The Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament*. ET from the German and ed. under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson. 5 volumes. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1994-2000.
- Lampe, G.W.H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961-1968.
- Liddell, H.G., R. Scott, and H.S. Jones, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Ninth Edition with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Qimron, E. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986, HSS, 29.
- Rengstorff, K.H., ed. *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus. Study Edition*. 2 volumes. First published 1972-1975. Including supplement I, Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus von Abraham Schalit. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 2002.
- Schmoller, A. *Handkonkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament*. Third Revised Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Smyth, H.W. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by G.M. Messing. Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Turner, N. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek IV Style*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976.
- Waltke, B.K. and M. O’Connor *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

2.2 Commentaries and other reference works

Bible and ancient context

- Freedman, D.N., ed. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 volumes. Vol. 1, A-C; vol. 2, D-G; vol. 3, H-J; vol. 4, K-N; vol. 5, O-Sh; vol. 6, Si-Z. New York, N.Y. [etc.]: Doubleday, 1992.
- Rochberg-Halton, F. ‘Calendars. Ancient Near East’, in *ABD 1 A-C*. New York, N.Y. [etc.]: Doubleday, 1992, 810-814.

Hebrew Bible

- Kelley, P.H., D.S. Mynatt, and T.G. Crawford *The Masorah of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Introduction and Annotated Glossary*. Grand Rapids, Mich., and Cambridge, U.K.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998.
- Tov, E. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Second Revised Edition. Minneapolis: Fortress & Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2001.

Septuagint

- Jellicoe, S., *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968. Reprinted by Eisenbrauns: Winon Lake, Ind., 1993.
- Jobes, K.H. and M. Silva *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic & Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000.

Bibliography

Swete, H. B. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Revised by R. R. Ottley, with an appendix containing the Letter of Aristeas by H. St J. Thackeray. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914. Reprinted by Hendrickson Publishers: Peabody, Mass., 1989.

Engel, H. *Das Buch der Weisheit*. Stuttgart, 1998.

Dead Sea Scrolls

Beyer, K. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Braun, H. *Qumran und das Neue Testament I*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966.

Campbell, J.G. 'The Qumran sectarian writings', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period* (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 798-821.

Cotton, H.M. 'Greek', in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1* (L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam, eds.). Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2000, 324-326.

Davila, J.R. *Liturgical Works*. Grand Rapids, Mich. & Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 2000, Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls.

García Martínez, F. and D.W. Parry *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970-95*. Arranged by Author with Citation and Subject Indexes. (with the assistance of the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, Provo, Utah). Leiden: Brill, 1996, STDJ, 19.

Golb, N. 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pre-Tannaitic Judaism', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period* (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 822-851.

Levine, L.I. 'Synagogues', in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls 2* (L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam, eds.). Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2000, 905-908.

Pinnick, A. *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1995-2000)*. Leiden: Brill, 2001, STDJ, 41.

Schiffman, L.H. and J.C. VanderKam, eds. *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls. 2 volumes*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

VanderKam, J.C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans & London: SPCK, 1994.

Vermes, G. *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: SCM, 1999.

Philo of Alexandria

Mondésert, C. 'Philo of Alexandria', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period* (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 877-900.

Flavius Josephus

Feldman, L.H. *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980)*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.

—— 'Josephus (CE 37-c. 100)', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period* (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 901-921.

Graeco-Roman literature and culture

Anderson, R.D., Jr. *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms Connected to Methods of Argumentation, Figures and Tropes from Anaximenes to Quintilian*. Leuven: Peeters, 2000, CBET, 24.

Burkert, W. *Greek Religion*. ET by J. Raffan from the German edition, *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche*, W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1977. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985.

Long, A.A. *Hellenistic Philosophy. Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*. Second Edition. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986.

Porter, S.E., ed. *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period (330 B.C. – A.D. 400)*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1997.

—— 'Paul of Tarsus and His Letters', in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period (330 B.C. – A.D. 400)*. (S.E. Porter, ed.). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1997, 533-585.

Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period

Betz, O. 'The Essenes', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period*. (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 444-470.

Bloedhorn, H. and G. Hüttenmeister 'The synagogue', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period*. (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 267-297.

Bibliography

- The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period*, W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Goodman, M. 'Galilean Judaism and Judaean Judaism', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period*. (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 596-617.
- Hayward, C.T.R. *The Jewish Temple: a non-biblical sourcebook*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Reif, S.C. 'The early liturgy of the synagogue', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period*. (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 326-357.
- Schaper, J. 'The Pharisees', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period*. (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 402-427.
- Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)* volumes I-III.2. A New English Version revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman. Literary Editor, P. Vermes; Organizing Editor, M. Black. First edition and reprints in German, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 1885-1924. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973-1987.
- Stemberger, G. 'The Sadducees', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period*. (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 428-443.
- Williams, M. 'The contribution of Jewish inscriptions to the study of Judaism', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period*. (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 75-93.

New Testament

Reference works

- Aland, K. and B. Aland *Der Text des Neuen Testaments. Einführung in die wissenschaftlichen Ausgaben sowie in Theorie und Praxis der modernen Textkritik*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1981.
- Bailey, J.L. and L.D. VanderBroek *Literary Forms in the New Testament. A Handbook*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.
- Bockmuehl, M., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Conzelmann, H. and A. Lindemann *Arbeitsbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Thirteenth Revised Edition. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000, UTB, 52.
- Ehrman, B.D. *The New Testament. A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. Second Edition. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Klauck, H.-J. *Die antike Briefliteratur und das Neue Testament*. Ein Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch. Paderborn [etc.]: Schöningh, 1998, UTB 2022.
- 'Brieftheorie und Rhetorik', in H.-J. Klauck *Die antike Briefliteratur und das Neue Testament*. Ein Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch. Paderborn [etc.]: Schöningh, 1998, UTB 2022, 165-180.
- Metzger, B.M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. London & New York: UBS, 1975.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'Corinth', in *ABD 1 A-C*. New York, N.Y. [etc.]: Doubleday, 1992, 1134-1139.
- Porter, S.E., ed. *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1997, NTTTS, 25.
- Schnelle, U. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Second Revised Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996, UTB, 1830.
- Spicq, C. *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire*. 3 volumes. Fribourg Suisse: Éditions universitaire / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978-1982.
- Stamps, D.L. 'Rhetorical and Narratological Criticism', in *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. (S.E. Porter, ed.). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1997, NTTTS, 25, 219-239.
- Theißen, G. and A. Merz *Der historische Jesus. Ein Lehrbuch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Tomson, P.J. 'Jesus and his Judaism', in *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus*. (M. Bockmuehl, ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, 25-40.
- Wilcox, M. 'Semiticisms in the NT', in *ABD 5 O-Sh*. New York, N.Y. [etc.]: Doubleday, 1992, 1081-1086.

Commentaries

- Barrett, C.K. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: A&C Black, 1968.
- *The Acts of the Apostles I 1-14*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Betz, H.D. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- Brown, R.E. *The Gospel according to John (i-xii). Introduction, translation, and notes*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966, AB, 29.
- Bruce, F.F. *The Book of Acts*. Revised Edition. NICNT. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1988.
- Conzelmann, H. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Danker, F.W. *2 Corinthians*. Augsburg commentary on the New Testament. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg,

Bibliography

- 1989.
- Davies, W.D. and D.C. Allison *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew III Commentary on Matthew XIX-XXVIII*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Dunn, J.D.G. *Romans 1-8* WBC 38A, *Romans 9-16* WBC 38B. Dallas, Tex: Word Books, 1988.
- *The Epistle to the Galatians*. BNTC. London: A&C Black, 1993. Reprinted by Hendrickson Publishers: Peabody, Mass.: 1993.
- Esler, P.F. *Galatians*. New Testament Readings. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Evans, C.A. *Mark 8:27-16:20*. WBC 34B. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001.
- Fee, G.D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1987.
- *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1995.
- Fitzmyer, J.A., S.J. *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV). Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1985.
- *Romans. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York [etc.]: Doubleday, 1993, AB, 33.
- *The Acts of the Apostles. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: [etc.] Doubleday, 1998, AB, 31.
- Furnish, V.P. *II Corinthians. Translated with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984.
- Gould, E.P. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1896.
- Guelich, R.A. *Mark 1-8:26*. WBC 34A. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1989.
- Hagner, D.A. *Matthew 1-13*. WBC 33A. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1993.
- *Matthew 14-28*. WBC 33B. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1995.
- Hawthorne, G.F. *Philippians*. WBC 43. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1983.
- Lang, F. *Die Briefe an die Korinther*. Göttingen & Zürich, 1986.
- Lincoln, A.T. *Ephesians*. WBC 42. Dallas, Tex.: 1990.
- Lindemann, A. *Der Epheserbrief*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1985.
- Malherbe, A.J. *The Letters to the Thessalonians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York [etc.]: Doubleday, 2000, AB, 32B.
- Marcus, J. *Marcus 1-8. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York [etc.]: Doubleday, 2000, AB, 27.
- Malina, B.J. and R.L. Rohrbaugh *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Martin, R.P. *2 Corinthians*. WBC 40. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1986.
- Moloney, F. J., S.D.B. *The Gospel of John*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1998, Sacra Pagina Series, 4.
- Munck, J. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967, The Anchor Bible.
- 'Stephen's Samaritan background', in J. Munck *The Acts of the Apostles*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967, The Anchor Bible, 285-304.
- Nolland, J. *Luke 1-9:20*. WBC 35A. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1989.
- *Luke 9:21-18:34*. WBC 35B. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1993.
- Pesch, R. *Das Markusevangelium II Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27-16,20*. HTKNT. Freiburg [etc.]: Herder, 1977.
- Robertson, A. and A. Plummer *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*. ICC. Second Edition. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1914.
- Schrage, W. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther 1 IKor 1,1-6,11*. EKKNT VII/1; *2 IKor 6,12-11,16*. EKKNT VII/2. Solothurn and Düsseldorf: Benziger & Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1991 & 1995.
- Thrall, M.E. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians 1 Introduction and Commentary on II Corinthians I-VII*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Walther, J.A. *I Corinthians. A New Translation. Introduction with a Study of the Life of Paul, Notes, and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976.
- Witherington III, B. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Wolff, Ch. *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*. THKNT 8. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1989.
- *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*. THKNT 7. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996.
- Judaism and Christianity in the Graeco-Roman world***
- Carleton Paget, J. 'Jewish Christianity', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period*. (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 731-775.
- Meyers, E.M. 'Recent archaeology in Palestine: achievements and future goals', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period*. (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge:

Bibliography

- Cambridge University Press, 1999, 59-74.
- Rudolph, K. 'The baptist sects', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period*. (W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 471-500.
- Stern, E., ed. *The new encyclopedia of archaeological excavations in the Holy Land*. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society / Carta, The Israel Map and Publishing Company, 1993.
- Whittaker, M. *Jews and Christians*. Cambridge [etc.]: Cambridge University Press, 1984, Cambridge commentaries on writings of the Jewish and Christian world 200 BC to AD 200, v. 6.

Rabbinic Literature

- Elbogen, I. *Jewish Liturgy. A Comprehensive History*. ET by R.P. Scheindlin, based on the original 1913 German edition, and the 1972 Hebrew edition edited by J. Heinemann, et al. Philadelphia & Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society / New York & Jerusalem: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1993.
- Gleßner, U. *Einleitung in die Targum zum Pentateuch*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- Le Déaut, R. *Introduction à la littérature targumique. Première Partie*. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1966.
- Strack, H.L. and G. Stemberger *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. ET by M. Bockmuehl from the original German edition, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Oscar Beck), München, 1982. Second printing, 1996, with emendations and updates. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.

3. Literature

- Abegg, M.G., Jr. '4QMMT, Paul, and "Works of the Law"', in *The Bible at Qumran. Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. (P.W. Flint, ed., with the assistance of T.H. Kim). Grand Rapids, Mich. & Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 2001, Studies in the Dead Sea scrolls and related literature, 203-216.
- Albl, M.C. "And Scripture cannot be broken": *The form and function of the early Christian Testonia collections*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1999, NovTSup, 96.
- Alexander, L. 'Fact, fiction and the genre of Acts', *NTS* 44 (1998) 380-399.
- Alexander, P.S. 'The Redaction-History of *Serekh ha-Yahad*: a Proposal', *RevQ* 17 (1996) 437-456.
- Allison, D.C., Jr. *The Jesus Tradition in Q*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1997.
- Amphoux, C.-B. 'L'Évangile selon les Hébreux. Source de l'Évangile de Luc', *Apocrypha* 6 (1995) 67-77.
- Anderson, R.D., Jr. *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*. Ph. D Dissertation. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996, CBET, 18.
- 'Relations of Rhetoric to Epistolography', in R.D. Anderson, Jr. *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*. Ph. D Dissertation. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996, CBET, 18, 93-109.
- 'Paul's Outlook on Rhetoric: 1 Ep. Cor. 1-4', in R.D. Anderson, Jr. *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*. Ph. D Dissertation. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996, CBET, 18, 239-248.
- Angerstorfer, A. 'Übersetzungen zu Sprache und Sitz im Leben des Toratargums 4Q Tg Lev (4Q156), sein Verhältnis zu Targum Onkelos. In memoriam Prof.dr. Werner Stenger (1938-1990)', *BN* 55 (1990) 18-35.
- Attridge, H.W. *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1976, HDR, 7.
- Avery-Peck et al., eds. *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls 2 World View, Comparing Judaisms*. HO, I, The Near and Middle East. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 2001.
- , J. Neusner, and B.D. Chilton, eds. *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls II Theory of Israel*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Baarda, T., H.J. de Jonge, and M.J.J. Menken, eds. *Jodendom en vroeg christendom: continuïteit en discontinuïteit. Opstellen van leden van de Studiosorum Novi Testamenti Conventus*. Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1991.
- Bachmann, M. *Jerusalem und der Tempel. Die geographisch-theologischen Elemente in der lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums*. Stuttgart [etc.]: Kohlhammer, 1980, BWANT, 109.
- '4QMMT and Galaterbrief, מעשי התורה und ἔργα τῶν μμτ', *ZNW* 89 (1998) 91-113.
- Bardet, S. *Le Testimonium Flavianum. Examen historique, considérations historiques*. Paris: Cerf, 2002, Collection «Josèphe et son temps», V.
- Barrett, C.K. 'Attitudes to the Temple in Acts', in *Templum Amicitiae. Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. (W. Horbury, ed.). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSOT Press, 1991, JSNTSup, 48, 345-367.
- Bastiaensen, A.A.R., A. Hilhorst and C.H. Kneepkens, eds. *Fructus Centesimus. Mélanges offerts à Gerard*

Bibliography

- J.M. Bartelink à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire.* Steenbrugge, 1989, *Instrumenta Patristica*, 19.
- Bauckham, R., ed. *The Book of Acts in its first century setting 4 The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans / Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995.
- ‘The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes’, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity.* Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001. (J.R. Davila, ed.). Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2001, *STDJ*, 46, 63-89.
- Bauer, W. *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1934, *Beiträge zur historischen Theologie*, 10.
- Baumgarten, A.I., ‘*Korban* and the Pharisaic *Paradosis*’, *JANES* 16-17 ‘Ancient Studies in Memory of Elias Bickerman’ (1984-1985) 5-17.
- ‘The Pharisaic *Paradosis*’, *HTR* 80 (1987) 63-77.
- ‘Josephus on Essene Sacrifice’, *JJS* 45 (1994) 169-183.
- *The flourishing of Jewish sects in the Maccabean era: an interpretation.* Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1997, *JSJ Sup* 55.
- Baumgarten, J.M. *Studies in Qumran Law.* Leiden: Brill, 1977, *SJLA*, 24.
- ‘The Essenes and the Temple. A Reappraisal’, in J.M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law.* Leiden: Brill, 1977, *SJLA*, 24, 57-74.
- ‘The Laws of the *Damascus Document* in Current Research’, *The Damascus Document Reconsidered.* (M. Broshi, ed.). Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992, 51-62.
- , E.G. Chazon, and A. Pinnick, eds. *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery.* Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998. Leiden: Brill, 2000, *STDJ*, 34.
- ‘The Laws of the *Damascus Document* between Bible and Mishnah’, in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery.* Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998. (J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon, and A. Pinnick, eds.). Leiden: Brill, 2000, *STDJ*, 34, 17-26.
- Beattie, D.R.G. and M.J. McNamara, eds. *The Aramaic Bible. Targums in their Historical Context.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994, *JSOTSup* 166.
- Beckwith, R.T. ‘The Pre-History and Relationships of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes: A Tentative Reconstruction’, *RevQ* 11 (1982) 3-46.
- Bennett, C. *In Search of the Sacred. Anthropology and the Study of Religions.* London & New York: Cassell, 1996.
- Berger, K. ‘Jesus als Pharisäer und frühe Christen als Pharisäer’, *NovT* 30 (1988) 231-262.
- *Wer war Jesus wirklich?* Stuttgart: Quell Verlag, 1995. Pagination from the Dutch translation by F. Hijzeler, *Wie was Jezus werkelijk?* Second Edition, Kok: Kampen, 1996.
- Berkey, R.F. and S.A. Edwards, eds. *Christological Perspectives.* FS H.K. McArthur. New York, 1982.
- Bernstein, M. J., F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen, eds. *Legal texts and Legal Issues.* Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995. Published in honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten. Leiden: Brill, 1997, *STDJ*, 23.
- ‘The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations’, in *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History.* (J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein, eds.). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996, *SBLSymS*, 2, 29-51.
- Betz, H.D. ‘2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?’, *JBL* 92 (1973) 88-108.
- ‘Jesus and the Purity of the Temple (Mark 11:15-18): A Comparative Religion Approach’, *JBL* 116 (1997) 455-472.
- Betz, O. *Jesus. Der Herr der Kirche. Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie II.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990.
- ‘Die Qumrangemeinde und die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde’, in O. Betz *Jesus. Der Herr der Kirche. Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie II.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990, 3-89.
- ‘The Qumran Halakhah Text Miqsat Ma‘asê Ha-Tôrâh (4QMMT) and Sadducean, Essene, and Early Pharisaic Tradition’, in *The Aramaic Bible. Targums in their Historical Context.* (D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara, eds.). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994, *JSOTSup* 166, 176-202.
- Beutler, J. ‘The Identity of the ‘Jews’ for the Readers of John’, in *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel. Papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000.* (R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt, and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuille, eds.). Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2001, *Jewish and Christian Heritage Series*, 1, 229-238.
- Bieringer, R. ‘Der 2. Korintherbrief in den neuesten Kommentaren’, *ETL* 67 (1991) 107-130.
- and J. Lambrecht *Studies on 2 Corinthians.* Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters, 1994, *BETL*, 112.
- ‘2 Korinther 6,14-7,1 im Kontext des 2. Korintherbriefes. Forschungsüberblick und Versuch eines eigenen Zugangs’, in *Studies on 2 Corinthians.* (R. Bieringer and J. Lambrecht, eds.). Leuven: Leuven

Bibliography

- University Press / Peeters, 1994, BETL, 112, 551-570.
- ed. *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters, 1996, BETL, 125.
- , D. Pollefeyt, and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, eds. *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel. Papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000*. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2001, Jewish and Christian Heritage Series, 1.
- Binder, D.D. *Into the Temple Courts. The Place of the Synagogue in the Second Temple Period*. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999, SBLDS, 169.
- Bitzer, L.F. 'The Rhetorical Situation', *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968) 1-14.
- Black, M. 'The Christological use of the Old Testament in the New Testament', *NTS* 18 (1972) 1-14.
- Bockmuehl, M. *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches: Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001.
- Borg, M.J. *Conflict, Holiness, and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus*. Second Edition. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- Böttrich, C. '„Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes“. Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus', in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. (B. Ego, et al., eds.) Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999, WUNT, 118, 411-425.
- Bovon, F. 'Fragment Oxyrhynchus 840. Fragment of a Lost Gospel, Witness of an Early Christian Controversy over Purity', *JBL* 119 (2000) 705-728.
- Braun, W. 'Were the New Testament Herodians Essenes? A Critique of an Hypothesis', *RevQ* 14 (1989) 75-88.
- Brooke, G.J. 'Qumran Peshet: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre', *RevQ* 10 (1981) 483-503.
- *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985, JSOTSup, 29.
- 'The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT', in *Legal texts and Legal Issues*. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995. Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten. (M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen, eds.). Leiden: Brill, 1997, STDJ, 23, 1-20.
- 'Shared intertextual interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament', in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996. (M. Stone et al., eds.). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1998, STDJ, 28, pp. 35-57.
- 'The Scrolls and the Study of the New Testament', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty. Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. (R.A. Kugler and E.M. Schuller, eds.). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999, 61-76.
- 'Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community', in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. (B. Ego, et al., eds.). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999, WUNT, 118, 285-301.
- Brooton, B.J. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1982, BJS, 36.
- Broshi, M., ed. *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992.
- Burchard, Ch. 'Zur Nebenüberlieferung von Josephus' Bericht über die Essener Bell 2,119-161 bei Hippolyt, Porphyrius, Josippus, Niketas Choniates und anderen', in *Josephus-Studien. Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet* (O. Betz et al., eds.). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974, 77-96.
- 'Die Essener bei Hippolyt. Hippolyt, Ref. IX 18,2-28,2 und Josephus, Bell. 2, 119-161', *JSJ* 7 (1978) 1-41.
- Campbell, D.A. *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21-26*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSOT Press, 1992, JSNTSup, 65.
- Campbell, J.G. *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.
- Campbell, W.S. 'Romans III as a Key to the Structure and Thought of Romans', in *The Romans Debate*. (K.P. Donfried, ed.). Revised and Expanded Edition. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991, 251-264.
- Cansdale, L. *Qumran and the Essenes. A Re-Evaluation of the Evidence*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- Capper, B.J. 'The Palestinian Cultural Context of Earliest Christian Community of Goods', in *The Book of Acts in its first century setting 4 The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*. (R. Bauckham, ed.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans / Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995, 323-356.
- '“With the oldest monks ...”. Light from Essene history on the career of the Beloved Disciple?', *JTS* n.s. 49 (1998) 1-55.

Bibliography

- Carcopino, J. *Daily Life in Ancient Rome. The People and the City at the Height of the Empire*. ET by E.O. Lorimer from the French edition, 1941. Harmondsworth: Peregrine Books, 1962.
- Carmichael, C.M. 'The Story of Joseph and the *Book of Jubilees*', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*. (T.H. Lim, et al., eds.). Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000, 143-158.
- Carson, D.A. and H.G.M. Williamson, eds. *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Carter, T.L. '“Big Men” in Corinth', *JSNT* 66 (1997) 45-71.
- Charlesworth, J.H. and C.A. Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', in *Studying the historical Jesus: evaluations of the state of current research*. (B. Chilton and C.A. Evans, eds.). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1994, *NTTS*, 19, 479-533.
- and B.A. Strawn 'Reflections on the Text of *Serekh ha-Yahad* found in Cave IV (1)', *RevQ* 17 (1996) 403-435.
- Chazon, E.G. 'Liturgical Communion with the Angels at Qumran', in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet. (D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E.M. Schuller, eds.). Leiden: Brill, 2000, *STDJ*, 35, 95-105.
- Cheung, A.T. *Idol Food in Corinth. Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999, *JSNTSup*, 176.
- Chilton, B.D. and C.A. Evans, eds. *Studying the historical Jesus: evaluations of the state of current research*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1994, *NTTS*, 19.
- and C.A. Evans, eds. *Jesus in Context. Temple, Purity, and Restoration*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1997, *AGJU*, 39.
- 'John the Purifier', in *Jesus in Context. Temple, Purity, and Restoration*. (B.D. Chilton and C.A. Evans, eds.). (First published in B.D. Chilton *Judaic Approaches to the Gospels*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994, 1-37). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1997, *AGJU*, 39, 203-220.
- 'The Whip of Ropes ([ὥς] φραγγέλιον ἐκ σχοινίων in John 2:15', in *Jesus in Context. Temple, Purity, and Restoration*. (B.D. Chilton and C.A. Evans, eds.). (First published as '[ὥς] φραγγέλιον ἐκ σχοινίων (John 2:15)', in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. W. Horbury, ed. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991, *JSNTSup*, 48, 330-344). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1997, *AGJU*, 39, 441-454.
- Chyutin, M. *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran. A Comprehensive Reconstruction*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, *JSPSup*, 25.
- Cohen, S.J.D. *Josephus in Galilee. His Vita and Development as an Historian*. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Collins, A. Yarbro 'The Function of "Excommunication" in Paul', *HTR* 73 (1980) 251-263.
- Collins, J.J. and G.E. Sterling, eds. *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- 'Cult and Culture. The Limits of Hellenization in Judea', in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (J.J. Collins and G.E. Sterling, eds.). Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001, 38-61.
- Congar, Y. *Le mystère du Temple*. Paris, 1958.
- Cook, E.M. 'A New Perspective on the Language of Onqelos and Jonathan', in *The Aramaic Bible. Targums in their Historical Context*. (D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara, eds.). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994, *JSOTSup*, 166, 142-156.
- Coppens, J.C. 'The Spiritual Temple in the Pauline Letters and its Background', *Studia Evangelica VI* Papers presented to the Fourth International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Oxford, 1969, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973, pp. 53-66.
- Crossan, J.D. *Four Other Gospels. Shadows on the Contours of Canon*. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985.
- *The Cross that Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative*. San Francisco, 1988.
- Cryer, F.H. and T.L. Thompson, eds. *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, *JSOTSup*, 290 / Copenhagen International Seminar, 6.
- Daniel, C. 'Les "Hérodiens" du Nouveau Testament sont-ils des Esséniens?', *RevQ* 6 (1967) 31-53.
- 'Les Esséniens et "Ceux qui sont dans les maisons des rois" (Matthieu 11, 7-8 et Luc 7, 24-25)', *RevQ* 6 (1967) 261-277.
- 'Nouveaux arguments en faveur de l'identification des Hérodiens et des Esséniens', *RevQ* 7 (1970) 397-402.
- Davies, P.R. *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1982, *JSOTSup*, 25.
- 'The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document', *JJS* 33 (1982) 287-301.
- *Sects and Scrolls. Essays on Qumran and Related Topics*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996.
- 'Hasidim in the Maccabean Period', in P.R. Davies, *Sects and Scrolls. Essays on Qumran and Related Topics*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996, 5-21.

Bibliography

- ‘Reflections on DJD XVIII’, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty. Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. (R.A. Kugler and E.M. Schuller, eds.). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999, 151-165.
- ‘The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document’, in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998. (J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon, and A. Pinnick, eds.). Leiden: Brill, 2000, STDJ, 34, 27-43.
- Davies, W.D. ‘Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit’, in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. (K. Stendahl, ed.). London: SCM, 1958, 157-182.
- Davila, J.R., ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity*. Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2001, STDJ, 46.
- De Lacey, D.R. ‘οἰτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς: The Function of a Metaphor in St Paul’, in *Templum Amicitiae. Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. (W. Horbury, ed.). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSOT Press, 1991, JSNTSup, 48, 391-409.
- Dimant, D. ‘4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple’, in *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* ל"א, A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel, and J. Riaud, eds., Leuven & Paris: Peeters, 1986, pp. 165-189.
- & U. Rappaport, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research*. Leiden: Brill & Jerusalem: Magnes Press / Hebrew University / Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992, STDJ, 10.
- Donahue, J.R., S.J. *The Gospel in Parable*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Donfried, K.P., ed. *The Romans Debate*. First Edition 1977. Revised and Expanded Edition. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*. London & New York: T&T Clark, Continuum, 2002.
- ‘Shifting Paradigms: Paul, Jesus and Judaism’, in K.P. Donfried *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*. London & New York: T&T Clark, Continuum, 2002, 1-20.
- Doudna, G.L. *4Q Pesher Nahum. A Critical Edition*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001, JSPSup, 35 / Copenhagen International Series, 8.
- Douglas, M. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. Pagination from the Routledge Classics Edition, 2002, with a new preface by the author. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.
- ‘Ritual Uncleaness’, in M. Douglas *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966. Pagination from Routledge Classics Edition, 2002, 8-35.
- ‘Internal Lines’, in M. Douglas *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966. Pagination from Routledge Classics Edition, 2002, 160-172.
- *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*. Third Edition. New York: Pantheon, 1982.
- *Implicit Meanings. Selected Essays in Anthropology*. Second Edition. London & New York: Routledge, 1999.
- ‘Pollution’, in M. Douglas *Implicit Meanings. Selected Essays in Anthropology*. Second Edition. London & New York: Routledge, 1999, 106-115.
- Dungan, D.L. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul. The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.
- Dunn, J.D.G. ‘4QMMT and Galatians’, *NTS* 43 (1997) 147-153.
- *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. London & New York: T&T Clark, Continuum, 1998.
- ‘Jesus and Purity: An Ongoing Debate’, *NTS* 48 (2002) 449-467.
- Edwards, D.R. and C.T. McCullough, eds. *Archaeology and the Galilee. Texts and Contexts in the Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Egelhaaf-Gaiser, U. and A. Schäfer, eds. *Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike. Untersuchungen zu Organisation, Ritual und Raumordnung*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002, STAC, 13.
- Egger-Wenzel, R., ed. *Ben Sira's God*. Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference, Durham – Ushaw College 2001. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, BZAW, 321.
- Ego, B., A. Lange and P. Pilhofer, eds. (in cooperation with Kathrin Ehlers), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999, WUNT, 118.
- Elgvin, T. (in collaboration with S.J. Pfann) ‘An Incense Altar from Qumran?’, *DSD* 9 (2002) 20-33.
- Elliott, J.H. ‘The Jewish messianic movement. From faction to sect’, in *Modelling Early Christianity. Social-Scientific studies of the New Testament in its Context*. (P.F. Esler, ed.). London & New York, Routledge, 1995, 75-95.
- Ellis, E.E. ‘Short Studies. A Note on Pauline Hermeneutics’, *NTS* 2 (1955-1956) 127-133.

Bibliography

- ‘Luke xi.49-51: An Oracle of a Christian Prophet?’, *ExpTim* 74 (1962-1963) 157-158.
- and M. Wilcox, eds. *Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*. Edinburgh, 1969.
- ‘Midrash, Targum and New Testament Quotations’, in *Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*. (E.E. Ellis and M. Wilcox, eds.). Edinburgh, 1969, 61-69.
- Elman, Y. ‘Some Remarks on 4QMMT and the Rabbinic Tradition: or, When Is a Parallel Not a Parallel?’, in *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. (J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein, eds.). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996, SBLSymS, 2, 99-128.
- Engberg-Pedersen, T., ed. *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*. Louisville, London & Leiden: WJK, 2001.
- Eshel, E. ‘4QLev^a: A possible source for the Temple Scroll and *Miqsat Ma‘ase ha-Torah*’, *DSD* 2 (1995) 1-13.
- Eshel, H. ‘4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period’, in *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. (J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein, eds.). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996, SBLSymS, 2, 53-65.
- Esler, P.F. *The First Christians in their Social Worlds. Social-scientific approaches to New Testament interpretation*. London & New York: Routledge, 1994.
- ‘Making and Breaking an Agreement Mediterranean Style: A New Reading of *Galatians* 2:1-14’, *BibInt* 3 (1995) 285-314.
- ed. *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context*. London & New York: Routledge, 1995.
- ‘Introduction. Models, context and kerygma in New Testament interpretation’, in *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context*. (P.F. Esler, ed.). London & New York: Routledge, 1995, 1-20.
- Evans, C.A. ‘Predictions of the Destruction of the Herodian Temple in the Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Scrolls, and Related Texts’, *JSP* 10 (1992) 89-147.
- ‘Jesus in Non-Christian Sources’, in *Studying the historical Jesus: evaluations of the state of current research*. (B.D. Chilton and C.A. Evans, eds.). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1994, NTTS, 19, 466-477.
- ‘Are the Wicked Tenant Farmers “Peasants”? Jesus’ Parable and Lease Agreements in Antiquity’, in *Jesus in Context. Temple, Purity, and Restoration*. (B.D. Chilton and C.A. Evans, eds.). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1997, *AGJU*, 39, 231-250.
- ‘Jesus’ Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction?’, in *Jesus in Context. Temple, Purity, and Restoration*. (B.D. Chilton and C.A. Evans, eds.). (An earlier version of this study appeared in *CBQ* 51 (1989) 237-270). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1997, *AGJU*, 39, 395-439.
- ‘From “House of Prayer” to “Cave of Robbers”. Jesus’ prophetic criticism of the Temple establishment’, in *The Quest for Context and Meaning. Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*, C.A. Evans and S. Talmon, eds., Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1997, 417-442.
- Falk, D.K., F. García Martínez, and E.M. Schuller, eds. *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet. Leiden: Brill, 2000, *STDJ*, 35.
- ‘Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple’, in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet. (D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E.M. Schuller, eds.). Leiden: Brill, 2000, *STDJ*, 35, 106-126.
- Faßbeck, G. *Der Tempel der Christen. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Aufnahme des Tempelkonzepts im frühen Christentum*. Tübingen & Basel: Francke Verlag, 2000, *TANZ*, 33.
- Fassberg, S.E. ‘The Linguistic Study of the Damascus Document: A Historical Perspective’, in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998. (J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon, and A. Pinnick, eds.). Leiden: Brill, 2000, *STDJ*, 34, 53-67.
- Fee, G.D. ‘II Corinthians VI.14-VII.1 and food offered to idols’, *NTS* 23 (1977) 140-161.
- Feldman, L.H. ‘The Testimonium Flavianum: The State of the Question’, in *Christological Perspectives*. FS H.K. McArthur (R.F. Berkey and S.A. Edwards, eds.), New York, 1982, 179-199, 288-293.
- ‘How much Hellenism in the Land of Israel?’, *JSJ* 33 (2002) 290-313.
- Fieger, M., K. Schmid & P. Schwagmeier, eds. *Qumran – Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer. Vorträge des St. Galler Qumran-Symposiums vom 2./3. Juli 1999*. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001, *NTOA*, 47.
- Fine, S., ed. *Sacred Realm: The Emergence of the Synagogue in the Ancient World*. Catalog of an Exhibition held at the Yeshiva Museum in New York. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Fitzmyer, J.A., S.J. ‘4QTestimonia’ and the New Testament’, *TS* 18 (1957) 513-537.
- ‘The Aramaic Qorban Inscription from Jebel Hallet Et-Turi and Mk. 7:11 / Mt. 15:5’, *JBL* 78 (1959) 60-65.

Bibliography

- 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament', *NTS* 7 (1960-1961) 297-333.
- 'Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1', *CBQ* 23 (1961) 271-280.
- 'Jewish Christianity in Acts in the light of the Qumran Scrolls', in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Paul Schubert*, L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn, eds. London: SPCK, 1966, 233-257.
- 'Qumran Aramaic and the New Testament', *NTS* 20 (1973-1974) 382-407.
- 'The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D.', in J.A. Fitzmyer, S.J. *A Wandering Aramaean: Collected Aramaic Essays*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1979, 29-56.
- 'The Phases of the Aramaic Language', in J.A. Fitzmyer, S.J. *A Wandering Aramaean: Collected Aramaic Essays*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1979, 57-84.
- *The Semitic Background of the New Testament*. Combined Edition of *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (originally published by G. Chapman, London, 1971) and *A Wandering Aramaean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (originally published by the Scholars Press, Atlanta, Ga., 1979). With new Appendix. Grand Rapids, Mich. and Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans / Livonia, Mich.: Dove Booksellers, 1997, The Biblical Resource Series.
- 'Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment II* (P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam, eds.). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1999, 599-621.
- Flesher, P.V.M. 'Does the James Ossuary really refer to Jesus Christ?', http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/James_Ossuary.htm. (2003).
- Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T. *All the Glory of Adam. Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 2002, STDJ, 42.
- Flint, P.W., and J.C. VanderKam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls after fifty years. A Comprehensive Assessment 2 volumes*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1998-1999.
- ed. (with the assistance of T.H. Kim) *The Bible at Qumran. Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, Mich. & Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 2001, Studies in the Dead Sea scrolls and related literature.
- Flusser, D. 'Pharisäer, Sadduzäer und Essener im Pescher Nahum', in *Qumran. Wege der Forschung* 410. (K.E. Grözinger, et al., eds.). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftlicher Buchgesellschaft, 1981, 121-166.
- Foerster, G. 'Remains of a Synagogue at Corinth', in *Ancient Synagogues revealed*. (L.I. Levine, ed.). Jerusalem, 1981, 185.
- Fraade, S.D. 'To whom it may concern: 4QMMT and its addressee(s)', *RevQ* 19:4 (2000) 507-526.
- 'Rhetoric and Hermeneutics in Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (4QMMT): The Case of the Blessings and Curses', *DSD* 10/1 (2003) 150-161.
- Frey, J. 'Temple and Rival Temple – The Cases of Elephantine, Mt. Gerizim, and Leontopolis', in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. (B. Ego, et al., eds.). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999, WUNT, 118, 171-203.
- 'Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments', in *Qumran – Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer. Vorträge des St. Galler Qumran-Symposiums vom 2./3. Juli 1999*. (M. Fieger, K. Schmid and P. Schwagmeier, eds.). Freiburg: Universitätsverlag / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001, NTOA, 47, 129-208.
- Freyne, S. *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 BCE to 135 CE. A Study of Second Temple Judaism*. Reprint 1998 with a new preface by the author. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980.
- 'How Revolutionary was Galilee?', in S. Freyne *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 BCE to 135 CE. A Study of Second Temple Judaism*. Reprint 1998 with a new preface by the author. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980, 208-255.
- 'The Galileans and the Temple', in S. Freyne *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 BCE to 135 CE. A Study of Second Temple Judaism*. Reprint 1998 with a new preface by the author. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980, 259-304.
- 'Galilee and the Halakhah', in S. Freyne *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 BCE to 135 CE. A Study of Second Temple Judaism*. Reprint 1998 with a new preface by the author. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980, 305-334.
- *Galilee and Gospel. Collected Essays*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000, WUNT, 125.
- 'Galilee-Jerusalem Relations According to Josephus' *Life*', in S. Freyne *Galilee and Gospel. Collected Essays*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000, WUNT, 125, 73-85.
- 'Archaeology and the Historical Jesus', in S. Freyne *Galilee and Gospel. Collected Essays*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000, WUNT, 125, 160-182.
- 'The Geography of Restoration: Galilee-Jerusalem Relations in Early Jewish and Christian Experience', *NTS* 47 (2001) 289-311.
- García Martínez, F. 'Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis', *FO* 25 (1988) 113-136.
- and A.S. van der Woude 'A "Groningen" Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History', *RevQ* 14

Bibliography

- (1990) 521-541.
- ‘Sources et rédaction du *Rouleau du Temple*’, *Henoch* 13 (1991) 219-232.
- *Qumran and Apocalyptic. Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1992, STDJ, 9.
- ‘The «New Jerusalem» and the future Temple of the manuscripts from Qumran’, in F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic. Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1992, STDJ, 9, 180-213.
- and J. Trebolle Barrera, eds. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ET by W.G.E. Watson). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1995.
- ‘The Origins of the Essene Movement and of the Qumran Sect’, in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera, eds.). English translation by W.G.E. Watson. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1995, 77-96.
- ‘4QMMT in a Qumran Context’, in *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. (J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein, eds.). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996, SBLSymS, 2, 15-27.
- ‘More fragments of 11QNJ’, in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich, eds.). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1999, STDJ, 30, 186-198.
- Gärtner, B. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran texts and the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, SNTSMS, 1.
- Gaston, L. *No Stone on Another. Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*. Leiden: Brill, 1970, NovTSup, 23.
- Geertz, C. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. London: Hutchinson, 1975.
- ‘Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture’, in C. Geertz *The Interpretation of Cultures*. London: Hutchinson, 1975, 3-30.
- Georgi, D. *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians*. Translation, supervised by D. Georgi, from the German *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2 Korintherbrief: Studien zur Religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike*, Neukirchen - Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964. English Translation and Epilogue Copyright 1986 by Fortress Press. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.
- Gillihan, Y.M. ‘Jewish Laws on Illicit Marriage, the Defilement of Offspring, and the Holiness of the Temple: A New Halakhic Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7:14’, *JBL* 121 (2002) 711-744.
- Gnilka, J. ‘2 Cor 6:14-7:1 in the light of the Qumran texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs’, in *Paul and Qumran. Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. (J. Murphy-O’Connor, ed.). London: G. Chapman, 1968, 48-68.
- Goodblatt, D., A. Pinnick, and D.R. Schwartz, eds. *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27-31 January, 1999. Leiden: Brill, 2001, STDJ, 37.
- Goranson, S. ‘Posidonius, Strabo and Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa as Sources on Essenes’, *JJS* 45 (1994) 295-298.
- Gordon, J.D. *Sister or Wife? 1 Corinthians 7 and Cultural Anthropology*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, JSNTSup, 149.
- Grabbe, L.J. ‘4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society’, *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995. Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten. (M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen, eds.). Leiden: Brill, 1997, STDJ, 23, 89-108.
- Grossfeld, B. ‘Targum Onqelos, Halakha and the Halakhic Midrashim’, in *The Aramaic Bible. Targums in their Historical Context*. (D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara, eds.). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994, JSOTSup, 166, 228-246.
- Grossman, M. ‘Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History’, *RevQ* 20 (2001) 3-22.
- *Reading for History in the Damascus Document. A Methodological Study*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 2002, STDJ, 45.
- Grözinger, K.E. et al., eds. *Qumran. Wege der Forschung* 410. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981.
- Hahn, F. ‘Das Verständnis des Opfers im Neuen Testament’, in *Das Opfer Jesu Christi und seine Gegenwart in der Kirche. Klärungen zum Opfercharakter des Herrenmahles*. (K. Lehmann and E. Schlink, eds.). Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder & Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983, 51-91.
- Hahn, J., ed. (in cooperation with Christian Ronning) *Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels. Geschehen – Wahrnehmung – Bewältigung*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002, WUNT, 147.
- Han, K.S. *Jerusalem and the Early Jesus Movement. The Q Community’s Attitude Toward the Temple*. London and New York: Sheffield Academic Press, Continuum, 2002, JSNTSup, 207.

Bibliography

- Heil, C. 'Die Sprache der Absonderung in 2 Kor 6,17 und bei Paulus', in *The Corinthian Correspondence*. (R. Bieringer, ed.). Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters, 1996, BETL, 125, 717-729.
- Hemer, C.J. *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.
- 'Acts and Historicity', in C.J. Hemer *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989, 1-29.
- Hempel, Ch. *The Laws of the Damascus Document. Sources, Traditions, and Redaction*. Leiden: Brill, 1998, STDJ, 29.
- 'The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT', in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998. (J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon, and A. Pinnick, eds.). Leiden: Brill, 2000, STDJ, 34, 69-84.
- 'The Place of the *Book of Jubilees* at Qumran and beyond', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*. (T.H. Lim, et al., eds.). Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000, 187-196.
- Hengel, M. (in collaboration with R. Deines) *The Pre-Christian Paul*. London: SCM & Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991.
- 'Pharisaic Study of the Law in Judaism', in idem (in collaboration with R. Deines) *The Pre-Christian Paul* London: SCM & Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991, 40-53.
- 'Greek-speaking Jerusalem and Greek Synagogue Education', in idem (in collaboration with R. Deines) *The Pre-Christian Paul*. London: SCM & Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991, 54-62.
- and A.M. Schwemer *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien. Die unbekannt Jahre des Apostels*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998, WUNT, 108.
- Hermisson, H.-J. *Sprache und Ritus im altisraelitischen Kult. Zur Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe im Alten Testament*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965, WMANT, 19.
- Hilhorst, A. *Sémitismes et Latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Herma*. Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1976, Graecitas Christianorum Primaeva. Studia ad sermonem graecum christianum pertinentia edenda curat Christine Mohrmann, fasciculus quintus.
- 'Sémitismes et Latinismes', in idem *Sémitismes et Latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Herma*. Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1976, Graecitas Christianorum Primaeva. Studia ad sermonem graecum christianum pertinentia edenda curat Christine Mohrmann, fasciculus quintus, 36-56.
- '“Servir Dieu” dans la terminologie du judaïsme hellénistique et des premières générations chrétiennes de langue grecque', in *Fructus Centesimus. Mélanges offerts à Gerard J.M. Bartelink à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire* (A.A.R. Bastiaensen, A. Hilhorst, and C.H. Kneepkens, eds.). Steenbrugge, 1989, Instrumenta Patristica, 19, 177-192.
- Hill, C.C. *Hellenists and Hebrews. Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992.
- Holmberg, B. *Sociology and the New Testament. An Appraisal*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Horbury, W., ed. *Templum Amicitiae. Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSOT Press, 1991, JSNTSup, 48.
- 'Herod's Temple and 'Herod's Days'', in *Templum Amicitiae. Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. (W. Horbury, ed.). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSOT Press, 1991, JSNTSup, 48, 103-149.
- Horrell, D.G., ed. *Social-scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. (Selected essays from previous scholarly publications, 1973-1995, with updated introductions and a new introduction by D.G. Horrell) Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
- 'Introduction. Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament: Retrospect and Prospect', in *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. (D.G. Horrell, ed.). Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999, 3-27.
- Horsley, R.A. *Galilee, History, Politics, People*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- 'Jerusalem and Galilee', in R.A. Horsley *Galilee, History, Politics, People*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1995, 128-157.
- van der Horst, P.W. 'Het 'Geheime Markusevangelie'. Over een nieuwe vondst', *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 33 (1979) 27-51.
- 'Het grafschrift van Jakobus, de broer van Jezus?', *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 57 (2003) 1-9.
- Houtman, A., M.J.H.M. Poorthuis, and J. Schwartz, eds. *Sanctity of time and space in tradition and modernity*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1998, Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series, 1.
- Jakab, A. 'Une lettre «perdue» de Clément d'Alexandrie? Morton Smith et l'«Évangile secret» de Marc', *Apocrypha* 10 (1999) 8-15.
- Jeremias, J. *Jerusalem in the time of Jesus. An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. ET by F.H. and C.H. Cave based on the third edition of *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962 with the author's own revisions up to 1967. Philadelphia:

Bibliography

- Fortress, 1969. First Paperback Edition 1975.
- Johnson, S.E. 'The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem church of Acts', in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. (K. Stendahl, ed.). London: SCM, 1958, 129-142.
- Jokiranta, J.M. '“Sectarianism” of the Qumran “Sect”: Sociological Notes', *RevQ* 20 (2001) 223-239.
- Kaestli, J.-D. and D. Marguerat, eds. *Le mystère apocryphe. Introduction à une littérature méconnue*. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1995, Essais Bibliques, 26.
- 'L'Évangile de Thomas. Que peuvent nous apprendre les «paroles cachées de Jésus?»', in *Le mystère apocryphe. Introduction à une littérature méconnue*. (J.-D. Kaestli and D. Marguerat, eds.). Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1995, Essais Bibliques, 26, 47-66.
- 'L'Évangile secret de Marc. Une version longue de l'Évangile de Marc réservée aux chrétiens avancés dans l'Église d'Alexandrie?', in *Le mystère apocryphe. Introduction à une littérature méconnue*. (J.-D. Kaestli and D. Marguerat, eds.). Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1995, Essais Bibliques, 26, 85-106.
- Kampen, J. 'The Eschatological Temple(s) of 11QT', in *Pursuing the Text. Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (J.C. Reeves and J. Kampen, eds.). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994, JSOTSup, 184, 85-97.
- and M.J. Bernstein, eds. *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996, SBLSymS, 2.
- and M.J. Bernstein, 'Introduction', in *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. (J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein, eds.). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996, SBLSymS, 2, 1-7.
- '4QMMT and New Testament Studies', in *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. (J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein, eds.). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996, SBLSymS, 2, 129-144.
- 'The Significance of the Temple in the Manuscripts of the Damascus Document', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty. Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. (R.A. Kugler and E.M. Schuller, eds.). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999, 185-197.
- Kazen, T. *Jesus and Purity Halakhah. Was Jesus Indifferent to Impurity?* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2002, ConBNT, 38.
- Kennedy, G.A. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill & London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Kern, P.H. *Rhetoric and Galatians. Assessing an approach to Paul's epistle*. Cambridge [etc.]: Cambridge University Press, 1998, SNTSMS, 101.
- Kertelge, K. 'Die »reine Opfergabe«. Zum Verständnis des »Opfers« im Neuen Testament', in *Freude am Gottesdienst. Aspekte ursprünglicher Liturgie*. FS Dr. Josef G. Plöger. (J. Schreiner, ed.). Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983, 347-360.
- Kim, J.D. *God, Israel, and the Gentiles. Rhetoric and Situation in Romans 9-11*. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000, SBLDS, 176.
- Kirchhoff, R. *Die Sünde gegen den eigenen Leib. Studien zu πόρνη und πορνεία in 1 Kor 6,12-20 und dem sozio-kulturellen Kontext der paulinischen Adressaten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994, SUNT, 18.
- Klauck, H.-J. 'Kultische Symbolsprache bei Paulus', in *Freude am Gottesdienst. Aspekte ursprünglicher Liturgie*. FS Dr. Josef G. Plöger. (J. Schreiner, ed.). Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983, 107-118.
- Klinzing, G. *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971, SUNT, 7.
- Knibb, M.A. 'The Place of the Damascus Document', in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran site. Present realities and future prospects*. (M.O. Wise, et al., eds.). New York, 1994, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 722, 149-162.
- Knox, J. *Chapters in a Life of Paul*. New York & Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950.
- Koch, D.-A. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986, BHT, 69.
- Koester, H. *Ancient Christian Gospels. Their History and Development*. London: SCM / Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990.
- Koet, B.J. 'As close to the synagogue as can be: Paul in Corinth (Acts 18, 1-18)', in *The Corinthian Correspondence*. (R. Bieringer, ed.). Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters, 1996, BETL, 125, 397-415.
- Kooten, G.H. van *The Pauline Debate on the Cosmos: Graeco-Roman Cosmology and Jewish Eschatology in Paul and in the Pseudo-Pauline Letters to the Colossians and the Ephesians*. Ph. D Dissertation. Leiden, 2001.
- Kosmala, H. 'The three nets of Belial. A Study in the Terminology of Qumran and the New Testament', *ASTI* 4 (1965) 91-113.

Bibliography

- Kraemer, R.S. and M. Rose d'Angelo, eds. *Women and Christian Origins*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Kraft, R.A. 'Pliny on the Essenes, Pliny on Jews', *DSD* 8 (2001) 255-261.
- Krauss, S. *Synagogale Altertümer*. Hildesheim, 1966.
- Kugler, R.A. and E.M. Schuller, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty. Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999.
- 'Priesthood at Qumran', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after fifty years. A Comprehensive Assessment II* (P.W. Flint & J.C. VanderKam, eds.). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1999, 93-116.
- Kuhn, H.-W. 'The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the understanding of Paul', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research*. (D. Dimant & U. Rappaport, eds.). Leiden: Brill / Jerusalem: Magness Press, Hebrew University, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992, *STDJ*, 10, 327-339.
- Labahn, M. and A. Schmidt, eds. *Jesus, Mark and Q. The Teaching of Jesus and its Earliest Records*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001, *JSNTSup*, 214.
- LaSor, W.S. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1972.
- Le Déaut, R. *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible (Targum)*. Revised edition, English translation by S.F. Miletic of the French original, *Liturgie juive et Nouveau Testament*, 1965. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982, *SubBi*, 5.
- Lehmann, K. and E. Schlink, eds. *Das Opfer Jesu Christi und seine Gegenwart in der Kirche. Klärungen zum Opfercharakter des Herrenmahles*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder & Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
- Lentz, J.C. *Luke's portrait of Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, *SNTSMS*, 77.
- Levine, L.I., ed. *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*. Jerusalem, 1981.
- *The Ancient Synagogue. The First Thousand Years*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Levinskaya, I. *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 5 The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans / Carlisle: Paternoster, 1996.
- Levison, J.R. 'Josephus' Interpretation of the Divine Spirit', *JJS* 47 (1996) 234-255.
- *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1997.
- Lim, T.H. *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- 'Midrash Peshet in the Pauline Letters', in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures. Qumran Fifty Years After*. (S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans, eds.). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, 280-292.
- *et al.*, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.
- Liver, J. 'The "Sons of Zakok the Priests" in the Dead Sea Sect', *RevQ* 6 (1967) 3-30.
- Lohmeyer, E. *Lord of the Temple. A Study of the Relation between Cult and Gospel*. ET from the German original, *Kultus und Evangelium* 1942, by S. Todd. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1961.
- Longenecker, B.W. 'Contours of Covenant Theology in the Post-Conversion Paul', in *The Road from Damascus. The Impact of Paul's Conversion on His Life, Thought, and Ministry*. (R.N. Longenecker, ed.). Grand Rapids, Mich. / Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 1997, *McMaster New Testament Studies*, 125-146.
- Longenecker, R.N., ed. *The Road from Damascus. The Impact of Paul's Conversion on His Life, Thought, and Ministry*. Grand Rapids, Mich. / Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 1997, *McMaster New Testament Studies*.
- Luttikhuisen, G.P. *Op zoek naar de samenhang van Paulus' gedachten*. Inaugural lecture. Kampen, 1990, 13-24.
- 'Vroeg-christelijk jodendom', in *Jodendom en vroeg christendom: continuïteit en discontinuïteit. Opstellen van leden van de Studiosorum Novi Testamenti Conventus*. (T. Baarda, H.J. de Jonge, and M.J.J. Menken, eds.). Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1991, 163-189.
- *De veelvormigheid van het vroegste christendom*. Delft: Eburon, 2002.
- 'Vroegchristelijk jodendom', in G.P. Luttikhuisen *De veelvormigheid van het vroegste christendom*. Delft: Eburon, 2002, 75-100.
- MacDonald, M.Y. 'Ritual in the Pauline Churches', in *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. (D.G. Horrell, ed.). (Reprint from M.Y. MacDonald *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-Historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and deuterio-Pauline Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, 61-71). Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999, 233-247.
- 'Reading Real Women Through the Undisputed Letters of Paul', in *Women and Christian Origins*. (R.S. Kraemer and M. Rose d'Angelo, eds.). New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, 199-220.
- Magness, J. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids, Mich. & Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Malina, B.J. and J.H. Neyrey *Portraits of Paul. An Archaeology of Ancient Personality*. Louisville, Ky.: WJK, 1996.
- Martin, R.A. *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents*. Cambridge, Mass.: 1974, *Septuagint*

Bibliography

- and Cognate Studies, 3.
- Mason, S. 'Was Josephus a Pharisee? A Re-Examination of *Life* 10-12', *JJS* 40 (1989) 31-45.
- *Josephus and the New Testament*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1992.
- 'Josephus and Luke-Acts', in S. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1992, 185-229.
- 'Chief Priests, Sadducees, Pharisees and Sanhedrin in Acts', in *The Book of Acts in its first century setting* 4 *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*. (R. Bauckham, ed.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans / Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995, 115-177.
- Matthews, S. *First Converts: Rich Pagan women and the Rhetoric of Mission in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- McFague, S. *Speaking in Parables. A Study in Metaphor and Theology*. 2002 Reprint with preface by Gerard Loughlin. London: SCM, 1975.
- 'Metaphor: The Heart of the Matter', in S. McFague *Speaking in Parables. A Study in Metaphor and Theology*. 2002 Reprint with preface by G. Loughlin. London: SCM, 1975, 33-53.
- McKelvey, R.J. *The New Temple. The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969, Oxford Theological Monographs.
- McLaren, J.S. 'Ananus, James and earliest Christianity. Josephus' account of the death of James', *JTS* 52 (2001) 1-25.
- Meeks, W.A. 'Judaism, Hellenism, and the Birth of Christianity', in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*. (T. Engberg-Pedersen, ed.). Louisville, London & Leiden: WJK, 2001, 17-27.
- Metso, S. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. Leiden: Brill, 1997, STDJ, 21.
- 'The Relationship between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule', in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998. (J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon, and A. Pinnick, eds.). Leiden: Brill, 2000, STDJ, 34, 85-93.
- Mimouni, S.C. 'Les Nazoréens. Recherches étymologique et historique', *RB* 105/2 (1998) 208-262.
- , ed. *Le judéo-christianisme dans tout ses états. Actes du colloque de Jérusalem 6-10 juillet 1998*. Paris: Cerf, 2001.
- Mitchell, M.M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation. An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991, HUT, 28.
- Mohrmann, C. 'Rationabilis - ΛΟΓΙΚΟΣ', in eadem, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens I Le latin des chrétiens*. Rome: Ed. di Storia e Letteratura, 1961, pp. 179-187.
- Moody Smith, D. 'The Pauline literature', in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. (D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, 265-291.
- Morag, S. 'סגנון ולשון במגילת מקצת מעשי התורה - האם כתב 'מורה הצדק' איגרת זאת?' [Language and Style in Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah – Did Moreh Ha-Sedeq Write This Document?], *Tarbiz* 65 (1995-1996) 210-223, V-VII (English Summary).
- Murray-Jones, C.R.A. 'The Temple Within. The Embodied Divine Image and its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources', in *Society of Biblical Literature 1998 Seminar Papers, Part One*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1998, SBLSP, 37, 400-431.
- Moule, C.F.D. 'Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament', *JTS* n.s. 1 (1950) 29-41.
- Mowinkel, J. *Psalmstudien I-VI*. Kristiania, 1921-1924.
- Mueller, H.-F. *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus*. London & New York: Routledge, 2002.
- 'Ritual vocabulary and moral imperatives', in H.-F. Mueller *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus*. London & New York: Routledge, 2002, 108-147.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J., ed. *Paul and Qumran. Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. London [etc.]: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968.
- *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*. Wilmington: Glazier, 1983, GNS, 6.
- 'Relating 2 Corinthians 6.14-7.1 to its Context', *NTS* 33 (1987) 272-275.
- 'Philo and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1', *RB* 95 (1988) 55-69.
- *Paul. A Critical Life*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Mußner, F. 'Jesus und »das Haus des Vaters« - Jesus als »Tempel«', in *Freude am Gottesdienst. Aspekte ursprünglicher Liturgie*. FS Dr. Josef G. Plöger. (J. Schreiner, ed.). Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983, 267-275.
- Neiryck, F. 'Papyrus Egerton 2 and the healing of the leper', *ETL* 61 (1985) 153-160.
- 'The Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark', in *The New Testament in Early Christianity. La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif*. (J.-M. Sevrin, ed.). Leuven: Leuven University Press & Peeters, 1989, BETL, 86, 123-175.
- Neuman, L.W. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon,

Bibliography

- 1994.
- Neville, D.J. *Mark's Gospel – Prior or Posterior? A Reappraisal of the Phenomenon of Order*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press & Continuum, 2002, JSNTSup, 222.
- Newton, D. *Deity and Diet. The Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, JSNTSup, 169.
- ‘Archaeological Evidence for Corinthian Cults’, in D. Newton *Deity and Diet. The Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, JSNTSup, 169, 91-114.
- Newton, M. *The concept of purity at Qumran and in the letters of Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Neyrey, J.H. ‘Body Language in 1 Corinthians: The Use of Anthropological Models for Understanding Paul and his Opponents’, *Semeia* 35 (1986) 129-170.
- *Paul, in other words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters*. Louisville, Ky.: WJK, 1990.
- ‘Perceiving the Human Body: Body Language in 1 Corinthians’, in J.H. Neyrey *Paul, in other words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters*. Louisville, Ky.: WJK, 1990, 102-146.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Cambridge, 1973.
- *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah. A Historical and Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- Nodet, É. ‘«Les Nazoréens»: discussion’, *RB* 105 (1998) 263-265.
- ‘James, the Brother of Jesus, was never a Christian’, in *Le judéo-christianisme dans tout ses états. Actes du colloque de Jérusalem 6-10 juillet 1998*. (S.C. Mimouni, ed.). Paris: Cerf, 2001, 75-85.
- Norden, E. *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*. Stuttgart, 1956.
- Öhler, M. ‘Jesus as Prophet: Remarks on Terminology’, in *Jesus, Mark and Q. The Teaching of Jesus and its Earliest Records*. (M. Labahn and A. Schmidt, eds.). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001, JSNTSup, 214, 125-142.
- Paesler, K. *Das Tempelwort Jesu. Die Traditionen von Tempelzerstörung und Tempelerneuerung im Neuen Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999, FRLANT, 184.
- Paige, T. ‘Stoicism, eleutheria and community at Corinth’, in *Worship, theology and ministry in the early church: essays in honor of Ralph P. Martin* (M.J. Wilkins and T. Paige, eds.). Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992, JSNTSup, 87.
- ‘Who Believes in “Spirit”? Πνεῦμα in Pagan Usage and Implications for the Gentile Christian Mission’, *HTR* 95 (2002) 417-436.
- Parry, D.W. and E. Ulrich, eds. *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1999, STDJ, 30.
- Patterson, S.J. *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*. Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1993.
- Pérez Fernández, M. ‘4QMMT: Redactional Study’, *RevQ* 18:2 (1997) 191-205.
- Perrin, N. *Thomas and Tatian. The Relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron*. Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, Academia Biblica, 2002.
- Peursen, W. van ‘Qumran Origins: Some Remarks on the Enochic/Essene Hypothesis’, *RevQ* 20 (2001) 241-254.
- Pixner, B. ‘Jesus and his community: between Essenes and Pharisees’, in *Hillel and Jesus: why comparisons are important*, J.H. Charlesworth, ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997, 193-224.
- ‘Jerusalem's Essene Gateway: Where the Community Lived in Jesus' Time’, *BAR* 23 (1997) 22-31, 64, 66.
- Pohlentz, M. ‘Paulus und die Stoa’, *ZNW* 42 (1949) 69-104.
- Poirier, J.C. ‘Why Did the Pharisees Wash their Hands?’, *JJS* 47 (1996) 217-233.
- Ponthot, J. ‘L'expression culturelle du ministère paulinien selon Rom 15,16’, in *L'apôtre Paul. Personnalité, style et conception du ministère* (A. Vanhoye, ed.). Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters, 1986, BETL, 73, 254-262.
- Poorthuis, M.J.H.M. and Ch. Safrai, eds. *The Centrality of Jerusalem. Historical Perspectives*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- Porter, SE. and C.A. Evans, eds. *The Scrolls and the Scriptures. Qumran Fifty Years After*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Pritz, R.A. *Nazarene Jewish Christianity. From the End of the New Testament Period Until Its Disappearance in the Fourth Century*. Jerusalem: Magness Press / Hebrew University & Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- Qimron, E. and J. Strugnell ‘An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran’, *Israel Museum Journal* 4 (1985) 9-12.
- Rabin, C. ‘Hebrew and Aramaic in the First Century’, in *The Jewish People in the First Century. II: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. (S. Safrai and M. Stern, eds.). Assen & Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1976, CRINT, I/2, 1007-1039.
- Rahmer, J. “Er aber sprach vom Tempel seines Leibes”. *Jesus von Nazaret als Ort der Offenbarung Gottes im*

Bibliography

- vierten Evangelium*. Bodenheim: Philo, 1998, BBB, 117.
- Räisänen, H. 'Paul's and Qumran's Judaism', in *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls 2 World View, Comparing Judaisms* (A.J. Avery-Peck, et al., eds.). Leiden: Brill, 2001, HO, I, The Near and Middle East, 173-200.
- Rajak, T. and D. Noy 'Archisynagogoi: Office, Title and Social Status in the Greco-Jewish Synagogue', *JRS* 83 (1993) 75-93.
- Reed, J.L. *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus. A Re-examination of the Evidence*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- Reeves, J.C. and J. Kampen, eds. *Pursuing the Text. Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994, JSOTSup, 184.
- Reicke, B. 'The Constitution of the Primitive Church in the Light of Jewish Documents', in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. (K. Stendahl, ed.). London: SCM, 1958, 143-156.
- Reif, S.C. *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer. New perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- 'The Damascus Document from the Cairo Genizah: Its Discovery, Early Study and Historical Significance', in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998. (J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon, and A. Pinnick, eds.). Leiden: Brill, 1999, STDJ, 34, 109-131.
- Reinhartz, A. 'Jews' and Jews in the Fourth Gospel', in *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel. Papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000*. (R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt, and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, eds.). Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2001, Jewish and Christian Heritage Series, 1, 341-356.
- Reiterer, F.W. 'Gott und Opfer', in *Ben Sira's God*. Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference, Durham – Ushaw College 2001. (R. Egger-Wenzel, ed.). Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, BZAW, 321, 136-179.
- 'Opferterminologie in Ben Sira', in *Ben Sira's God*. Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference, Durham – Ushaw College 2001. (R. Egger-Wenzel, ed.). Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, BZAW, 321, 371-374.
- Renwick, D.A. *Paul, the Temple, and the presence of God*. Brown University, 1991, BJS, 224.
- Riesner, R. *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem. Neue Funde und Quellen*. Second Edition. Basel: Gießen, 1998, Biblische Archäologie und Zeitgeschichte, 6.
- *Paul's Early Period. Chronology, Mission, Strategy, Theology*. ET by D. Scott. Grand Rapids, Mich. & Cambridge, U.K.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998.
- Robertson, A.T. *The Pharisees and Jesus. The Stone Lectures for 1915-1916 delivered at the Princeton Theological Seminary*. London: Duckworth, 1920.
- Safrai, S. and M. Stern, eds. *The Jewish People in the First Century. II: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Assen & Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1976, CRINT I/2.
- 'Education and the Study of the Torah', in *The Jewish People in the First Century. II: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. (S. Safrai and M. Stern, eds.). Assen & Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1976, CRINT, I/2, 945-970.
- Safrai, Z. 'The Role of the Jerusalemite Elite in National Leadership in the Late Second Temple Era', in *The Centrality of Jerusalem. Historical Perspectives*. (M.J.H.M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safrai, eds.). Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996, 65-72.
- Saldarini, A.J. *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society. A Sociological Approach*. (First published: Wilmington, Del.: Glazier, 1988). With a Foreword by J.C. VanderKam. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans / Livonia, Mich.: Dove, 2001, The Biblical Resource Series.
- Sanders, E.P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM, 1977.
- ed. *Jewish and Christian self-definition*. Three volumes. (1980-1982). Volume One, *The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980. Volume Two, *Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*. (edited together with A.I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson). London: SCM, 1981. Volume Three, *Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World*. (edited together with B.F. Meyer). London: SCM, 1982.
- *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*. London: SCM, 1990.
- *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE – 66 CE*. London: SCM & Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992.
- 'Common Judaism and the Temple', in E.P. Sanders *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE – 66 CE*. London: SCM & Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992, 47-76.
- *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. London [etc.]: Allen Lane, Penguin, 1993.

Bibliography

- Sandmel, S. 'Parallelomania', *JBL* 81 (1962) 1-13.
- Sarason, R.S. 'The "Intersections" of Qumran and Rabbinic Judaism: The Case of Prayer Texts and Liturgies', *DSD* 8 'Qumran and Rabbinic Judaism' (2001) 169-181.
- Saß, G. 'Noch einmal: 2Kor 6,14-7,1. Literarkritische Waffen gegen einen ›unpaulinischen‹ Paulus?', *ZNW* 84 (1993) 36-64.
- Schiffman, L.H. 'The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls Sect', in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (H. Shanks, ed.). New York, 1992, 35-41.
- 'The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts', in *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. (J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein, eds.). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996, SBLSymS, 2, 81-98.
- 'Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in *The Centrality of Jerusalem. Historical Perspectives*. (M.J.H.M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safrai, eds.). Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996, 73-88.
- 'Ir Ha-Miqdash and its meaning in the Temple Scroll and other Qumran texts', in *Sanctity of time and space in tradition and modernity*. (A. Houtman, M.J.H.M. Poorthuis, and J. Schwartz, eds.). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1998, Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series, 1, 95-109.
- 'Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple', in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. (B. Ego, et al., eds.). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999, WUNT, 118, 267-284.
- 'Descriptions of the Jerusalem Temple in Josephus and the Temple Scroll', in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27-31 January, 1999. (D. Goodblatt, A. Pinnick, and D.R. Schwartz, eds.). Leiden: Brill, 2001, STDJ, 37, 69-82.
- Schreiner, J., ed. *Freude am Gottesdienst. Aspekte ursprünglicher Liturgie*. FS Dr. Josef G. Plöger. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983.
- Schuller, E.M. 'Prayer, Hymnic, and Liturgical Texts from Qumran', in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam, eds.). Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994, 153-171.
- 'Worship, Temple, and prayer in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls II Theory of Israel*. (A.J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner, and B.D. Chilton, eds.) Leiden: Brill, 2001, 125-143.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. 'Cultic language in Qumran and in the NT', *CBQ* 38 (1976) 159-177.
- *In Memory of Her. Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.
- 'Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Cor', *NTS* 33 (1987) 386-403.
- *Rhetoric and Ethic. The Politics of Biblical Studies*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
- Schwartz, D.R. 'MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees', in *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. (J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein, eds.). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996, SBLSymS, 2, 67-80.
- Scott, J.M. *Paul and the Nations. The Old Testament and Jewish Background of Paul's Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of Galatians*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995, WUNT, 84.
- Scroggs, R. 'The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement', in *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. (D.G. Horrell, ed.). (Reprint from J. Neusner, ed. *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults, Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty 2 Early Christianity*. Leiden: Brill, 1975, 1-23). Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999, 69-91.
- Segal, A.F. 'Paul's Thinking about Resurrection in its Jewish Context', *NTS* 44 (1998) 400-419.
- Sekki, A.E. *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1989, SBLDS, 110.
- 'Ruah as God's Spirit', in A.E. Sekki *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1989, SBLDS, 110, 71-93.
- Seland, T. 'Saul of Tarsus and Early Zealotism: Reading Gal 1,13-14 in Light of Philo's Writings', *Bib* 83 (2002) 449-471.
- Sellin, G. 'Lukas als Gleichniserzähler: Die Erzählung vom barmherzigen Samariter (Lk 10:25-37)', *ZNW* 65 (1974) 166-189.
- Sevrin, J.-M., ed. *The New Testament in Early Christianity. La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif*. Leuven: Leuven University Press & Peeters, 1989, BETL, 86.
- Shanks, H. ed. *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York, 1992.
- and B. Witherington *The Brother of Jesus*. New York: Harper, 2003.
- Shanor, J. 'Paul as Master Builder. Construction Terms in First Corinthians', *NTS* 34 (1988) 461-471.
- Sharp, C.J. 'Phinehan Zeal and Rhetorical Strategy in 4QMMT', *RevQ* 18 (1997) 207-222.
- Shemesh, A. 'The holiness according to the Temple Scroll', *RevQ* 19 (2000) 369-382.

Bibliography

- Siegert, F. “‘Zerstört diesen Tempel ...!’ Jesus als ‘Tempel’ in den Passionsüberlieferungen”, *Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels. Geschehen – Wahrnehmung – Bewältigung*, ed. J. Hahn. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002, WUNT, 147, 108-139.
- Simon, M. *St. Stephen and the Hellenists*. The Haskell Lectures, 1956. London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1958.
- Smit, J.F.M. ‘The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: A Deliberative Speech’, *NTS* 35 (1989) 1-26.
 ——— ‘About the Idol Offerings’. *Rhetoric, Social Context and Theology of Paul’s Discourse in First Corinthians 8:1-11:1*. Leuven [etc.]: Peeters, 2000, CBET, 27.
- Smith, M. ‘The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena’, *HUCA* 29 (1958) 273-313.
- Son, S.-W. *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology. A study of selected terms, idioms, and concepts in the light of Paul’s usage and background*. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001, AnBib, 148.
- Soskice, J.M. *Metaphor and religious language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Squirrell, J.M. ‘Review: M. Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran. A Comprehensive Reconstruction*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997’, *VT* 50 (2000) 411.
- Stanley Jones, F. ‘Introduction’, in *Le judéo-christianisme dans tout ses états. Actes du colloque de Jérusalem 6-10 juillet 1998*. (S.C. Mimouni, ed.). Paris: Cerf, 2001, 13-14.
- Steck, O.H. *Gott in der Zeit entdecken: Die Prophetenbücher des Alten Testaments als Vorbild für Theologie und Kirche*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001.
- Stemberger, G. *Jewish contemporaries of Jesus. Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes* (ET by A. W. Mahnke). Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
 ——— ‘Reaktionen auf die Tempelzerstörung in der rabbinischen Literatur’, in *Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels. Geschehen – Wahrnehmung – Bewältigung*. (J. Hahn, ed.). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002, WUNT, 147, 207-236.
- Stendahl, K., ed. *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1958.
- Stuedel, A. ‘The Houses of Prostration. CD xi 21-xii 1 – Duplicates of the Temple’, *RevQ* 16 (1993) 49-68.
 ——— *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat a.b)*. Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (‘Florilegium’) und 4Q177 (‘Catena A’) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden. Leiden: Brill, 1994, STDJ, 13.
- Stone, M.E. et al., eds. *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1998, STDJ, 28.
- Stowasser, M. ‘Am 5,25-27; 9,11f. in der Qumranüberlieferung und in der Apostelgeschichte. Text- und traditionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu 4Q174 (Florilegium) III 12/CD VII 16/Agp 7,42b-43; 15,16-18’, *ZNW* 92 (2001) 47-63.
- Strack, W. *Kultische Terminologie in ekklesiologischen Kontexten in den Briefen des Paulus*. Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1994, BBB, 92.
- Strange, J.F. ‘First Century Galilee from Archaeology and from the Texts’, in *Archaeology and the Galilee. Texts and Contexts in the Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Periods*. (D.R. Edwards and C.T. McCullough). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1997, 39-48.
- Strugnell, J. ‘Flavius Josephus and the Essenes: *Antiquities* XVIII.18-22’, *JBL* 77 (1958) 106-115.
 ——— ‘MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition’, in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*. (E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam, eds.). Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994, 57-73.
- Stuckenbruck, L.T. ‘An Approach to the New Testament through Aramaic Sources: The Recent Methodological Debate’, *JSP* 8 (1991) 3-29.
 ——— ‘Review: M. Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran. A Comprehensive Reconstruction*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997’, *JTS* n.s. 50 (1999) 658-664.
- Sumney, J.L. *Identifying Paul’s Opponents. The Question of Method in 2 Corinthians*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSOT Press, 1990, JSNTSup, 40.
- Sussmann, Y. ‘The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Preliminary Talmudic Observations on Miqsat Ma‘ase Ha-Tôrah’, in *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat ma‘ase ha Torah*. (E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, eds.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994, DJD, X, 179-200.
- Talmon, S. ‘Synonymous readings in the textual traditions of the Old Testament’, *ScrHier* 8 ‘Studies in the Bible’ (1961) 335-383.
- Taylor, Joan E. and P.R. Davies, ‘The So-Called Therapeutae of *De Vita Contemplativa*: Identity and Character’, *HTR* 91 (1998) 3-24.
- Taylor, Justin, S.M. ‘Why were the disciples first called “Christians” at Antioch? (Acts 11,26)’, *RB* 101 (1994) 75-94.
 ——— ‘The Jerusalem Decrees (Acts 15.20, 29 and 21.25) and the Incident at Antioch (Gal 2.11-14)’, *NTS* 46 (2001) 372-380.
- Taylor, N. *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem. A Study in Relationships and Authority in Earliest Christianity*.

Bibliography

- Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSOT Press, 1992, JSNTSup, 66.
- Tcherikover, V. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Reprint of the 1959 Edition by The Jewish Publication Society of America. Preface by J.J. Collins. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999.
- Theißen, G. *Lokalkolorit und Zeitgeschichte. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. Second Edition. Freiburg & Göttingen, 1992, NTOA, 8.
- Thurén, Lauri *Derhetorizing Paul: a dynamic perspective on Pauline Theology and the Law*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000, WUNT, 124.
- Tomson, P.J. *Paul and the Jewish Law. Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles*. Assen & Maastricht / Minneapolis: Royal Van Gorcum, 1990, CRINT III/1.
- ‘If this be from Heaven ...’. *Jesus and the New Testament Authors in their Relationship to Judaism*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001, The Biblical Seminar, 76.
- Tov, E. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1999, VTSup, 72.
- ‘The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the Septuagint’, in E. Tov *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1999, VTSup, 72, 285-300.
- Ulrich, E., and J.C. VanderKam, eds. *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- ‘The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text’, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after fifty years. A Comprehensive Assessment 1* (P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam, eds.). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1998, 79-100.
- Unnik, W.C. van *Sparsa Collecta. The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik 1 Evangelia · Paulina · Acta*. Leiden: Brill, 1973, NovTSup, 29.
- ‘Aramaisms in Paul’, in W.C. van Unnik *Sparsa Collecta. The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik 1 Evangelia · Paulina · Acta*. Leiden: Brill, 1973, NovTSup, 29, 129-143.
- ‘Tarsus or Jerusalem. The City of Paul’s Youth’, in W.C. van Unnik *Sparsa Collecta. The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik 1 Evangelia · Paulina · Acta*. (original publication, Amsterdam 1952). Leiden: Brill, 1973, NovTSup, 29, 259-320.
- ‘Once again: Tarsus or Jerusalem’, in W.C. van Unnik *Sparsa Collecta. The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik 1 Evangelia · Paulina · Acta*. (original publication, ‘Nog eens: Tarsus of Jerusalem’, *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 8 (1954) 160-164). Leiden: Brill, 1973, NovTSup, 29, 321-327.
- Urman, D. and P.V.M. Flesher, eds. *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery*. 2 volumes. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1995, StPB 47/1-2.
- VanderKam, J.C. ‘The Calendar, 4Q327, and 4Q394’, in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995. Published in honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten. (M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen, eds.). Leiden: Brill, 1997, STDJ, 23, 179-194.
- Van Herck, W. *Religie en metafoor. Over het relativisme van het figuurlijke*. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- Vanhoye, A., ed. *L’apôtre Paul. Personnalité, style et conception du ministère*. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters, 1986, BETL, 73.
- Wacholder, B.Z. ‘Historiography of Qumran: The Sons of Zadok and their Enemies’, in *Qumran between the Old and the New Testaments*. (F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson, eds.). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, JSOTSup, 290 / Copenhagen International Seminar, 6, 347-377.
- Walker, P.W.L. *Jesus and the Holy City. New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids, Mich. & Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Walker, W.O., Jr. *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press / London & New York: Continuum, 2001, JSNTSup, 213.
- Watson, F. *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, SNTSMS, 56.
- Webb, R.L. ‘John the Baptist and His Relationship to Jesus’, in *Studying the historical Jesus: evaluations of the state of current research*. (B. Chilton and C.A. Evans, eds.). Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 1994, NTTS, 19, 187-197.
- Weiß, K. ‘Paulus – Priester der christlichen Kultgemeinde’, *TLZ* 79 (1954) 355-364.
- Wenham, D. *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids, Mich. & Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Wenschkewitz, H. ‘Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament’, *Angelos Beihefte* 4 (Leipzig, 1932) 70-230.
- Wild, R.A., S.J. ‘The Encounter between Pharisaic and Christian Judaism: Some Early Gospel Evidence’, *NovT* 27 (1985) 105-124.
- Wise, M.O. ‘The Eschatological Vision of the Temple Scroll’, *JNES* 49/2 (1990) 155-172.
- *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990, SAOC, 49.
- ‘4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam’, *RevQ* 15 (1991) 103-132.

Bibliography

- *et al.*, eds. *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran site. Present realities and future prospects*. New York, 1994, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 722.
- ‘Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the Floruit of his Movement’, *JBL* 122 (2003) 53-87.
- Williams, H.H. Drake *The Wisdom of the Wise: The Presence and Function of Scripture within 1 Cor. 1:18-3:23*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill, 2001, *AGJU*, 49.
- van der Woude, A.S. ‘Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habbakuk Commentary’, *JJS* 33 (1982) 349-359.
- Ziesler, J.A. ‘Luke and the Pharisees’, *NTS* 25 (1979) 146-157.

SAMENVATTING

Paulus en Gods tempel. Een historische interpretatie van cultische beeldspraak in Paulus' brieven aan de Korintiërs

Aan het begin van mijn onderzoek naar cultische beeldspraak in Paulus' brieven aan de Korintiërs heb ik de historische vraag gesteld wat de beelden van offer, priesterschap en tempel betekenden voor de apostel en zijn lezers in de periode vóór 70 n.Chr., toen de tempel van Jeruzalem nog niet verwoest was. Het gevaar is niet denkbeeldig dat Paulus' beeldspraak stilzwijgend wordt geïnterpreteerd in het licht van latere christelijke noties van tempel, offer en priesterdienst. In het christendom na Paulus hebben deze noties namelijk een geheel eigen dynamiek gekregen, en ook het begrip tempel kreeg een andere connotatie in de periode na 70 n.Chr. Een retorisch-kritische benadering legt de nadruk op wat Paulus met zijn taalgebruik en beeldspraak bedoelde in de dialoog met zijn oorspronkelijke lezerspubliek.

In commentaren en studies wordt terecht gezocht naar een samenhangend idee over Paulus' cultische beeldspraak. Het probleem is echter dat de betreffende passages in Paulus' brieven samen genomen worden met andere nieuwtestamentische passages, en dat men zich niet beperkt tot Paulus' brieven. Een dergelijke synthese doet geen recht aan het retorische karakter en de historische situatie van Paulus' brieven, met name die aan de Korintiërs.

De meest in het oog springende synthetische interpretaties gaan uit van de ideeën van *spiritualisering* en van *substitutie*. Het idee van spiritualisering werd geïntroduceerd in een studie van Hans Wenschkewitz in 1932 die gespiritualiseerde noties van tempel, priesterschap en offer in het Nieuwe Testament in zijn geheel bestudeert. Wenschkewitz trok parallellen met hellenistisch-joodse teksten, terwijl de monografieën van Bertil Gärtner (1965) en R.J. McKelvey (1969) de hypothese van spiritualisering verder toepasten op de rollen van de Dode Zee. De spiritualiseringstheorie is vanaf de jaren '70 van de vorige eeuw bekritiseerd. De critici brachten ofwel vergelijkbare ideeën naar voren in een nieuw vorm, zoals die van *Umdeutung* in de monografie van Georg Klinzing (1971), ofwel zij wezen een samenhang tussen christelijke en joodse benaderingen van cultus van de hand. Een voorbeeld van radicale afwijzing van een dergelijke samenhang is te vinden in het artikel van E. Schüssler Fiorenza uit 1976.

De critici slaagden er niet in de benadering van 'spiritualisering' van tafel te krijgen en definitief een nieuw paradigma te vestigen. Dit blijkt alleen al uit het feit dat de notie van 'spiritualisering' hier en daar opduikt in recente congres- en symposiumbundels over het thema van de tempelcultus. Bovendien interpreteert menig exegeet Romeinen 12:1 als voorbeeld van een 'spirituele eredienst' die afstand neemt van Israëls eredienst in de tempel van Jeruzalem (Rom 9:4). Het boek van W. Strack over cultische terminologie in Paulus' brieven (1994) stelt Romeinen 12:1 qua spiritueel begrip van de eredienst op één lijn met 1 Petrus 2:2-6. Dit is mijns inziens een typisch voorbeeld van een harmoniserende benadering van nieuwtestamentische teksten. Het kritische onderscheid tussen Paulus' brieven en deuteropaulinische brieven dat gemaakt wordt in de nieuwtestamentische wetenschap blijkt soms tijdelijk opzij gezet te worden door exegeten die naar een synthese van cultische beeldspraak in het Nieuwe Testament zoeken.

De veronderstelling dat *substitutie* het basisidee is achter Paulus' cultische beeldspraak is niet minder problematisch. Substitutie wil in dit verband zeggen dat Paulus de nieuwe christelijke gemeente voorstelde als Gods tempel die in de plaats kwam van de tempel van Jeruzalem, het religieuze centrum van het jodendom. De eredienst van de joden zou volgens deze benadering voor Paulus afgedaan hebben en plaats gemaakt hebben voor de eredienst rond Jezus Christus. Impliciet of expliciet wordt dan aangenomen dat het voortaan de

christelijke gemeente is die geheiligd werd door God, waardoor Gods verbond met het joodse volk naar de achtergrond verdween. Voor het idee van substitutie wordt soms ook de literatuur van Qumran aangevoerd omdat hierin ook een afwijzing van de tempelcultus te vinden zou zijn.

De opvatting dat Paulus Christus' offer ziet als vervanging van de tempelcultus wordt gebaseerd op uiteenlopende passages, zoals Rom 3:21-26 en 1 Kor 5:6-8, maar ook op deuteropaulinische passages. Daarnaast speelt het achterliggende beeld van de tempelcultus binnen het jodendom en christendom van Paulus' tijd een rol. Er wordt in deze substitutiethese een samenhangende ontwikkeling van tempelkritiek verondersteld die uiteindelijk tot de afwijzing van de tempelcultus in het christendom zou leiden. Deze benadering wijs ik af op basis van hernieuwde studie van van de historische context van Paulus' cultische beeldspraak (deel 1, hoofdstukken 1 t/m 3 van het proefschrift).

Welke historische ontwikkelingen kunnen we überhaupt veronderstellen als achtergrond voor Paulus' cultische beeldspraak? Paulus schreef zijn brieven in de periode van ca. 49 tot 60 na Chr., dat wil zeggen aan de vooravond van de joodse oorlog tegen de Romeinen. Hoewel Flavius Josephus deze oorlog beschreven heeft als een dwaze onderneming van de rebelse Vierde Filosofie, is het, gegeven Josephus' aanvankelijke deelname aan deze oorlog, de vraag of de catastrofe van 70 n.Chr. wel te voorzien was. Pseudepigrafische teksten en de literatuur van Qumran geven geen eenduidige profetische vooruitblik op de verwoesting van de tempel van Jeruzalem. In tegendeel, de Qumran Rol van de Oorlog lijkt een perspectief te bieden op uiteindelijke oorlog tussen Israël en de Romeinen, waarin Israël zegeviert. De veronderstelling dat de verwoesting van de tempel in Jeruzalem vrij algemeen werd verwacht is daarom mijns inziens uiterst twijfelachtig.

Het ideaalbeeld van één tempel voor de ene God, zoals Flavius Josephus en Philo dit beschreven, werd door veel joden in Israël en de diaspora gepraktiseerd door pelgrimages naar en offergaven aan de tempel in Jeruzalem. Toch werd er ook door joden kritiek geleverd op de priesterlijke gevestigde orde en op de uitvoering van tempelrituelen, zoals blijkt uit de afgezonderde positie van de Essen en ten opzichte van de reguliere tempeldienst en de kritiek op de veronderstelde misstanden in pseudepigrapha en in de literatuur van Qumran. Er bestonden in de hellenistische en vroeg-Romeinse periode zelfs andere tempels die de eredienst van de ene God claimden. Niettemin gaat een overgrote meerderheid aan joodse teksten van de late tweede-tempelperiode uit van de centraliteit van Jeruzalem (hoofdstuk 1).

De rollen van de Dode Zee verdienen speciale aandacht als het gaat om visies op de tempelcultus. Ondanks de kritiek op de tempelcultus en de polemieken tegen de heersende priesterklasse, bevat de literatuur van Qumran aanwijzingen voor de hoop op een cultische eredienst in Jeruzalem in de eindtijd in overeenstemming met de reinheidsnormen van de Qumrangemeenschap. De voorstelling van de gemeenschap als tempel in de 'Regel der Gemeenschap' vormt een contrast met de tempelcultus van Jeruzalem. De Qumrangemeenschap schrijft zichzelf echter een priesterlijke voorttrekkersrol toe ter voorbereiding op de eindtijd; zij poneert geen definitieve tegenstelling met het idee van een eredienst in Jeruzalem (hoofdstuk 2).

In hoofdstuk 3 van mijn proefschrift behandel ik de historische problematiek waarvoor men zich gesteld ziet bij het reconstrueren van de visie(s) die Jezus en zijn vroegste volgelingen hadden op de tempel. Deze problematiek wordt gevormd door het feit dat de teksten over Jezus en zijn volgelingen veelal van na 70 n.Chr. dateren en door de vraag hoe canonieke en niet-canonieke vroegchristelijke literatuur met elkaar vergeleken moet worden. De teksten die van belang zijn, zoals de canonieke evangeliën, de evangeliën van Thomas, Petrus, de Hebreëen, de Nazoreeërs, papyrus-fragmenten, gnostische evangeliën, en de canonieke Handelingen der Apostelen, hebben verschillende historische lagen. De oudste laag betreft de overlevering van Jezus' woorden binnen de kring van vroegste volgelingen. Daarna

komt de (her)interpretatie van Jezus' woorden door zijn volgelingen in het licht van latere omstandigheden en inzichten. Vervolgens komen de ervaringen van de missionaire Jezus-beweging met de gevestigde priesterlijke orde in Jeruzalem. Tenslotte is er de tekst zoals die uiteindelijk op schrift gesteld werd, in veel gevallen *na* 70 n.Chr., al dan niet voorzien van redactionele bewerkingen. Uit mijn reconstructie komt Jezus naar voren als iemand die, gedreven door profetische cultus-kritiek, de sociale misstanden en het theologisch onbegrip bij de gevestigde orde in Jeruzalem aan de kaak stelde. Getuige verschillende tradities, zoals die van de genezen melaatse die Jezus naar een priester verwijst, bleef Jezus toch de tempelcultus als referentiepunt zien. Jezus' vroegste volgelingen bleven ook trouw aan de tempeldienst. Tevens geeft het hoofdstuk een overzicht van latere ontwikkelingen binnen de missionaire christelijke beweging en confrontaties met de gevestigde orde zoals die in verschillende teksten en passages weerspiegeld worden.

De vraag is dan hoe Paulus' perspectief op het jodendom van zijn tijd en de eredienst in Jeruzalem in deze context moet worden gesitueerd (deel 2, hoofdstukken 4 & 5). Een juist begrip van Paulus' verwijzingen naar de joodse tempelcultus kan pas tot stand komen als we een overzicht hebben van Paulus' relatie tot het jodendom. Allereerst is het van belang Paulus' omgang met zijn joodse achtergrond in kaart te brengen (hoofdstuk 4). Met name Paulus' brieven aan de Galaten en de Filippenzen verschaffen hierover informatie. Deze informatie moet echter begrepen worden in het licht van de retorische situatie van de brieven. In tegenstelling tot John Knox, die overigens terecht stelt dat Paulus' brieven, en *niet* de Handelingen der Apostelen, het uitgangspunt dienen zijn voor de reconstructie van Paulus' leven en werk, neem ik de mogelijkheid van Paulus' Farizeese vorming in Jeruzalem serieus. Op basis van de interpretatie van Galaten 1:11-24 en de studie van de historische context blijkt Jeruzalem ook de enige serieuze optie te zijn.

De studie van Paulus' relatie tot de joodse cultuur van bijbelinterpretatie in zijn tijd brengt nog meer verbanden tussen Paulus en de Israëlitische cultuur (hoofdstuk 5). In een overzicht van de synagogale cultuur van bijbellezing en –interpretatie past ook Paulus' verwijzing naar het 'lezen van Mozes' in 2 Kor 3:15. Paulus' taalgebruik bevat niet alleen allerlei semitismen, maar ook theologische begrippen, zoals bijvoorbeeld 'werken van de wet', die thuishoorden in de Israëlitische cultuur. Daarnaast werpen de teksten van de Dode Zee, waaronder Griekse bijbelfragmenten, nieuw licht op de variaties in Paulus' 'citaten' uit de Schrift, bijvoorbeeld passages die afwijken van de Septuaginta zoals wij die kennen.

De sluitsteen van dit historisch onderzoek in dit proefschrift is de interpretatie van Paulus' cultische beeldspraak in zijn brieven aan de Korintiërs. Enige inleidende kwesties aangaande cultische beeldspraak in het corpus van Paulus' brieven worden besproken in hoofdstuk 6. Hoofdstuk 7 gaat in op de cultische beeldspraak in Paulus' eerste brief aan de Korintiërs. Dit onderzoek naar de relevante passages brengt afzonderlijke beelden in verband met elkaar en onderstreept het retorische karakter van de beeldspraak. De retorische situatie van 1 Korintiërs heeft te maken met zijn boodschap aan de Korintiërs: hij wil, gezien hun verdeeldheid, hun van de noodzaak doordringen de gemeente samen op te bouwen in de geest van wat hij hen eerder heeft voorgehouden.

1 Kor 3:9-17 vormt een retorische eenheid waarin Paulus zijn lezerspubliek wil afbrengen van individuele drijfveren die de heiliging van de gemeente in gevaar brengen. Paulus' metafoer van de gemeente als Gods tempel waarin Gods Geest woont heeft een achtergrond in joodse tradities, zoals blijkt uit zowel de Qumran 'Regel der Gemeenschap' als hellenistisch-joodse en apocriefe teksten.

In 1 Kor 5:6-8 wijst Paulus de Korintiërs op de onverenigbaarheid van oude zondige gebruiken, het 'oude zuurdeeg', met de viering van het paasfeest door Christus' offer met 'nieuw zuurdeeg'. Deze metaforen ontleent Paulus aan het joodse pascha en past hij toe op de

christelijke viering van het Laatste Avondmaal. Het contrast betreft echter de oude zonden van de Korintiërs, ontucht in dit geval, zoals blijkt uit 1 Kor 5:1-5.

De metafoor van de tempel komt opnieuw voor in 1 Kor 6:19, in de context van een passage waarin Paulus over ontucht spreekt en de metafoor toepast op het lichaam. De passage recapituleert mijns inziens eerdere vermaningen van Paulus in 1 Kor 5 en 6 tegen verschillende vormen van seksuele immoraliteit. Een antropologische benadering brengt de samenhang aan het licht tussen Paulus' toepassing van de metafoor van de tempel op de gemeente (1 Kor 3:16-17) en die op het lichaam (1 Kor 6:19). Een vergelijking met Grieks-Romeinse, hellenistisch-joodse, en Israëlitische teksten geeft niet alleen de indruk dat, zoals eerdere wetenschappers al stelden, Paulus' metafoor van het lichaam als tempel haaks staat op hellenistische denkbeelden. Het brengt bovendien een connectie met Israëlitische tradities aan het licht die de reinheid van het lichaam associeerden met de heiligheid van de tempel.

1 Kor 9:13, een vers waarin Paulus een analogie ziet tussen de priesterdienst en de zending van de apostelen (1 Kor 9:14), is een goed voorbeeld van een los beeld dat op zijn plaats valt bij nauwkeurig onderzoek van andere teksten over tempelcultus en priesterdienst. Exegeten hebben een lichte voorkeur uitgesproken voor de associatie van de priesterdienst in 1 Kor 9:13 met de Israëlitische priesterdienst, maar lieten de mogelijkheid van een associatie met Grieks-Romeinse voorbeelden van een priesterdienst tevens open. Deze vrijblijvende exegese is niet terecht, omdat het Griekse woord voor 'altaar', *thusiastèrion*, dat Paulus in 1 Kor 9:13 gebruikt, niet in pagane Grieks-Romeinse teksten voorkomt. De analogie moet daarom de joodse tempeldienst betreffen. De consequentie is dat Paulus in deze passage de tempeldienst in Jeruzalem noemt als voorbeeld om de apostolische zending te verduidelijken zonder dat hij deze tempeldienst direct afwijst.

Tenslotte interpreteer ik 1 Kor 10:18, over de tempelcultus van het 'Israël naar het vlees', in de bredere context van 1 Kor 10:14-22: Paulus spreekt hier over de onverenigbaarheid van de eredienst van God met afgodendienst. 1 Kor 10:7 vormt voor mij geen reden om deze passage te lezen als Paulus' radicale afwijzing van de joodse cultische eredienst als afgodendienst.

Hoofdstuk 8 bespreekt de cultische beeldspraak in Paulus' tweede brief aan de Korintiërs. De retorische situatie van deze brief is Paulus' pleidooi dat zijn missie oprecht is ondanks groeiende kritiek en tegenstand. Zijn cultische beeldspraak duidt op een tegenstelling tussen Paulus' missie in termen van een God welgevallig reukoffer en de onoprechtheid van rivaliserende zendelingen (2 Kor 2:14-17).

De belangrijkste passage met cultische beeldspraak in 2 Korintiërs is omstreden, omdat de authenticiteit ervan wordt betwijfeld: 2 Kor 6:14-7:1. Op grond van een antropologische benadering van de ideeën van afscheiding en reinheid in 2 Kor 6:14-7:1 in vergelijking met onbetwist authentiek gedachtegoed van Paulus ben ik tot de conclusie gekomen dat deze passage wel degelijk onderdeel uitmaakt van Paulus' argumentatie in 2 Korintiërs. De metafoor van de gemeente als Gods tempel staat in 2 Kor 6:16 in scherpe tegenstelling tot de heidense afgodendienst, zoals dat ook het geval is in 1 Kor 10:14-22. Alleen nu benadrukt Paulus zijn solidariteit met de Korintiërs door te stellen dat 'wij de tempel van de levende God zijn' tegenover de tegenstanders van Paulus' missie die de legitimiteit hiervan in twijfel trekken.

Ter conclusie van mijn onderzoek stel ik dat de relevante passages in 1 en 2 Korintiërs een samenhangende visie van Paulus op de gemeenschap als tempel bieden die geïnformeerd wordt door joodse tradities van de late tweede-tempelperiode. De cultische symboliek en het zelfbegrip als heilige gemeenschap van de Essenen en de Qumran gemeenschap passen in bredere zin binnen tempel-theologische ideeën in Israël. Tradities die de reinheid van het lichaam in verband brachten met de heiligheid van de tempel komen niet alleen voor in Paulus' brieven en in de sectarische rollen van de Dode Zee, maar ook in niet-sectarische

Samenvatting

joodse pseudepigrafische teksten. Oorspronkelijk werden dergelijke reinheidsopvattingen op priesters toegepast, zoals wij weten uit het Oude Testament en uit Philo's *Speciale Wetten*. In de late tweede-tempelperiode vond er in Israël klaarblijkelijk een ontwikkeling plaats waarin reinheidsopvattingen in bredere zin werden toegepast op de gehele religieuze gemeenschap. Paulus' tempelmetaforiek moeten we aan het eind van deze ontwikkeling situeren.

In hoeverre Paulus' Schriftgebruik in passages met cultische beeldspraak eveneens aansluit bij meer specifiek te definiëren tradities is een vraag die nog nader onderzoek vergt. In dit proefschrift ligt het accent op de cultische beeldspraak in Paulus' brieven aan de Korintiërs. De cultische beeldspraak in Paulus' brief aan de Romeinen is een onderwerp voor verdere studie.